

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 17th March, 1982.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, March 17, 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 Miss J. CLARKE; Senator A. P. L. REECE; 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; and Senator the Rev. CAN. I. Mck. JONES.

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

ABSENT

Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS and Senator K. A. ROUSE.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

The Rules of the Supreme Court, 1982;

The Annual Report of the Child Care Board for the period April 1980 to March 1981;

The Estimates for 1982–83;

The Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of money orders for the months January to December 1981.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

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

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982;

A Bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act.

I wish, Sir, at this stage to indicate that in relation to the IADB Bill I shall be asking the permission of the Senate to suspend Standing Order 45(2) at the appropriate time in order to facilitate dealing with this. We are asking that the Bill be circulated. When Members see it, they will appreciate that it is not something which really requires a whole lot of thought, and therefore I think they will see it possible to accommodate the Government on this one. It is a very simple matter really, but it has an element of urgency, which is why we seek to deal with it today.

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, we propose to have Order No.4 as the first Order of the day and Order No.3 as the second. Senator Trotman will be taking charge of Order No.4, I will be doing

Order No.3, and then we will have Orders Nos. 1 and 2 which will be taken charge of by Senator Griffith.

At that point, Sir, I hope that the IADB Bill would have been circulated so that that can be taken next. Then there will be Order No.5 and then Order No.6 would be the Caribbean Community Bill. The next Order will be the National Conservation Commission Bill, and I will be taking charge of those three.

What are Orders Nos. 5, 6 and 9 would then be taken as the last three items, and Senator Trotman will take charge of those.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, the Order Paper will be taken in the manner suggested by the Leader of Government Business.

**RESOLUTION TO COMPULSORILY ACQUIRE
LAND AT QUEENS STREET, SPEIGHTS-
TOWN, ST. PETER**

The Fourth Order of the Day was called, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Queens Street, Speightstown, St. Peter.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Queens Street has been subject to flooding for some time and in the last two years or so the Ministry of Communications and Works, MTW as it is now, has been doing various surveys to see how best the flooding could be remedied. It has been decided that the answer to the problems with Queens Street is to have a drain for the purpose of taking the water off the road into the sea. In order to do that, it is necessary to acquire some small portions of land from I think six land owners. In a general way there seems to be fairly satisfactory negotiations. Nevertheless for the purpose of speed, it is necessary to have the compulsory acquisition done in Parliament while negotiation continues.

At this point, let me apologise for not having the plans which they say are not quite available yet, but I do not think that that should be allowed to hold up the process as it is now. The land owners are set out in the Sixth Schedule to the Resolution, and I believe that MTW is about to start work on the site.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Just a small point. I just wondered if the Minister would let us know whether the bits of land to be acquired have any buildings on them and whether these buildings are considered to be of architectural or historical interest. We are aware that there is a move to maintain the architecture in Speightstown as

best as possible and if I am right, I think Queens Street is the main street going through Speightstown. I just wonder if any buildings are on this land.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I think not. For one thing the spots of land are very small and secondly for the prices which are being negotiated, I do not think there could be any buildings on the land.

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

**RESOLUTION TO ABANDON THE ACQUISITION
OF LAND AT BANK HALL, ST. MICHAEL**

The Third Order of the Day was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the abandonment of the acquisition of land at Bank Hall, St. Michael.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, since this is an abandonment of an acquisition, there is not much point in circulating plans really, but I think we should carefully go through the reasons for the abandonment.

The area concerned is almost two acres of land; it is 6.776 hectares at Bank Hall. Government originally decided that the land should be acquired for housing development purposes at a price not exceeding \$50 000. The owners subsequently indicated that the land is a little less — not a little, quite substantially less, almost half an acre less than it was thought, and indicated their willingness to sell it at a price of not less than \$2 per square foot. What they discovered was that the land was 68 730 square feet and not 83 635 square feet as was originally thought. Anyway negotiations began and the owners then jacked the price up to \$5 a square foot. They advanced as a reason for their claim that since the original offer to sell at \$2 per square foot, Town and Country Planning permission had been obtained for the construction of a warehouse thereby enhancing the value of the land. In fact, that permission had been obtained since 1967 and Government had made no offer prior to 1979, so we have very clearly bad faith on the part of Yellow Transport who were the owners of the land.

Government therefore reviewed the whole matter and decided to abandon, particularly in view of the present critical financial situation. But I may add even if that had not been the case, in view of the other factors, the fact that the land in question is a flood-prone area and it has been established that the foundation top soil is unfavourable even for the construction of chattel houses which is what it was proposed to put there, in view of that particular point and the fact also that it is obviously not a matter which would be settled — because

where two people are negotiating and one is not negotiating in good faith, obviously there is little hope of being able to negotiate a settlement — the Government having considered all this and having also found other land at Bush Hall which can be used for housing purposes, and can be constructed on much more cheaply, decided that in those circumstances the acquisition should be abandoned. That is why this Resolution is before us.

We are asking permission to abandon the acquisition and the Yellow Transport are free to sell to the highest bidder. Who will pay them that for swamp land is a matter for them and the potential purchaser.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
OF THE REPAYMENT OF \$10 MILLION
BORROWED BY THE BARBADOS
DEVELOPMENT BANK**

The First Order on the Order Paper was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of the repayment of a principal sum not exceeding \$10 million and of interest thereon to be borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank for the issue of National Development Bonds.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, this Resolution seeks to get the concurrence of this Senate in a guarantee for the fourth issue of Barbados Development Bank Bonds.

These bonds will have a maturity of seven years and can be redeemed in part and on the whole after the expiration of four years from the date of issue. The price of the issue will be at par and the rate of interest will be at ten per cent per annum. The Barbados Development Act, Cap. 323 provides that the Minister of Finance and Planning may with the approval of Parliament guarantee authorised borrowing by the Barbados Development Bank.

Now, Sir, I would just like to go into a few details about the activity about the Barbados Development Bank. The Bank is a major arm of Government for the provision of long-term financing for projects in the productive sector of industry and tourism, and also in the field of energy. It is also responsible for the long-term financing of small business, small manufacturing projects and co-operatives and it obtains its funds from four major sources.

It obtains funds from international institutions like the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the European Development Bank. Total loans from those international institutions now total \$43.8 million. It also obtains financing for its operations from domestic loan funds through the issue of National Development Bonds such as the one we are talking about today. So far, this type of programme has produced some \$13 million for the operations of the Bank.

Another source of funds, Sir, is a capital subscription of the bank's equity. Capital subscriptions are provided by the Central Bank which has some \$5 million in capital in the bank and the Government of Barbados which is responsible for \$10.7 million for a total of \$15.7 million. The last source of financing for the operation of the bank, of course, is recovery from the loans and earnings from its operations, for example, interest, incomes and so on.

Now there can be no gain saying that the creation of the bank was a very good thing for this country. But one of the things that we should be careful about in the operation of a development institution like the bank, is falling into the situation where we can politicise or be involved in partisan practices where the operation of such an important institution is concerned, and we have had this before. If we look at the first eight years of the operation of the bank, for instance, we will find that there was no considerable amount of activity which went into the operation of the bank and which in effect did not satisfy the reason for which it was created in the early stages.

Up to 1976, there was a total of 209 loans from the Barbados Development Bank, but since 1976 we have been having a substantial increase in loans activity in the BDB. For instance in this financial year ending March 31, the bank would have processed over 400 loans for this year alone as compared with 209 loans in eight years. Now the highest number of loans made prior to 1976 were some 21 loans in a single year. At present the bank is processing something like 40 loans a month.

I know there is considerable talk about the needs of the small man and the record of the bank in this year, since 1976, is a very good one. Right now the taxi operators can obtain loans from the bank to buy taxis and so on. This was something unheard of before 1976. I should not say that they were not people who did not get loans then, but they were a favoured few. Even people who are employed in the business of digging wells can obtain loans from the bank now to buy compressors and get away from the old system of digging wells manually. That is a thing of the past, thanks to the activities of the bank.

Now as far as we are concerned, Sir, we are very happy to see that this new tranche has come out and we are encouraging the public to support the Barbados Development Bank in this new issue. The bank has had a lot of support in its three issues before. Indeed the last issue was not as well supported as it could have been because of the unattractiveness of the interest rates. The third tranche came out with interest rates of seven per cent which was not really attractive to investors. But there has been considerable support to the bank, as I said before — for instance, from insurance companies and other institutions in this country which give an indication of the kind of confidence that the public places in the operation of the bank.

With this in mind, Sir, I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, in rising to express support for this Resolution, I must express my appreciation for the words of the Senator who introduced the Resolution and indicated that the Development Bank should rise above partisan activity. But I would hope that this was not intended to suggest that there are other Government corporations which need not rise above partisan activities, and indeed I would hope that all Government corporations would seek to rise above partisan activity.

In saying that, one must remember that there are various shades of partisanship. There are shades of partisanship which might relate to being partisan towards identified political parties and so on. I can be partisan towards other situations apart from political parties so one would hope that not only at the Development Bank, but elsewhere, people with high responsibility in these institutions should never perceive themselves to be keepers of anyone but be true professionals who must act in accordance with principle rather than expediency as it relates to the person's survival and so on.

Again, I would like to express appreciation for the general importance which has been seen in the operation of the Development Bank for the past five years or so. I even note that they are embarking on the establishment of a Research Department and I would encourage them in this, because research is a necessary aspect of any developmental activity in terms of the development of the institutions and their performance, and I would encourage them to proceed along this path.

There is one aspect of the operations that I would ask that reconsideration should be given to. At the moment I think the bank is under policy constraint to restrict its lending to agriculture. I believe that this was done at a time when it was perceived that some other institution would take on that role but I do not think that we should put such a restriction on the Development

Bank. The Development Bank should be free to arrange any activity which can be conducive to the development of Barbados and I do not see that it is a question of giving responsibility for lending to agriculture to one institution or another.

Each lending institution should be able to preside freely over all sectors and make loans in accordance with the principles in which that organisation is supposed to be organised. I would therefore request that this matter be reviewed. I think that it is especially urgent because agriculture and fisheries, a related area, must continue to rank in the priorities of Barbados as far as developmental activities is concerned.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I am very mindful of the remarks made by Senator McClean. I do not think that we have to worry about the professionalism or about whether the people there have to worry about political favours.

I know that that topic has had some currency recently and I believe that in the public's mind, there is some feeling that this Government likes to have people who operate on the basis of the yardfowl concept and I can assure Senator McClean that this is not so, and contrary to what might have been coming out in the Press or in the programme called, "Guttaperk", one must not view the Rt. Hon. Minister of Finance as somebody who creates people.

This country is better served when it has people who are professional and who are independent. I can say with a certain confidence that the Government is very happy about the way the Barbados Development Bank has been conducting its business since this party assumed power in 1976. Indeed, the confidence is demonstrated in the fact that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister did not see it fit to change the Chairman whose record is particularly an outstanding one unlike some Chairmen who skipped the country as soon as the Government changed hands in 1976. This kind of activity does not go on in this operation.

I would also at this time just like to state that the bank would like to encourage more business houses in Barbados to adopt a "Pay As You Earn" system for employees to purchase bonds. This is something that the Government itself is looking into so that this facility would be available to employees of the Government who are interested in purchasing, and who for their own personal reasons or for other reasons may not be able to buy a bond outright. This is a practice which operates in some of the big countries — and it operates very effectively, and I believe that it would be good if

business houses could look at this operation favourably so as to enhance the fund raising capabilities of the bank.

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

The question was put to the Honourable Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY
THE MINISTER OF FINANCE TO THE CENTRAL
BANK OF BARBADOS OF THE
REPAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL
AND OF INTEREST THEREON
ADVANCED TO THE BAR-
BADOS DEVELOPMENT
BANK

Order Number Two was called — To move the passing of 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.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, what in effect we are trying to do is to guarantee the advance by the Central Bank of working capital for the Barbados Development Bank. Now the operations of the bank are such that when applications are made to national institutions on the basis of these applications, the BDB can seek short-term financing, and one of its sources of financing, of course, is the Central Bank of Barbados.

Now, some statements have been made recently in the Other Place about the absence of guarantees in the past, but let me state here and now, Sir, that this activity has gone on before. The Government in the past has in effect guaranteed advances by the Central Bank to the Barbados Development Bank. What has happened with the operations of the bank is that there is a significant number of loan applications, particularly in the small business sector. My information is that by the end of this financial year, Sir, there should be some \$3 million to \$4 million loaned to the small business sector in this country.

Now, there have also been some questions about the operations of the bank as far as loan applications are concerned and I dare say that the Bank has a very good record in this respect because of the public relations programme. People who want to borrow money from the bank are usually faced with a situation where there is a client contact. In effect, what it does is that the staff of the bank have discussions with people who are interested

in obtaining loans even before an application is filled out so that people themselves with ideas for investment or for making money are told up front whether or not their applications would make sense. What that system really does is to reduce the rejection rate of applications by the Board and indeed, this system has proved so effective that last year only one loan was rejected by the Board. Again this is so because as long as you can get past those people responsible for client contact staff at the bank usually assist those people who are favoured, in processing applications. So, it makes it easy for the Board. Indeed, what it does is to guarantee that by the time the loan gets to the Board, that there is almost automatic approval.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in this Resolution.....Senator McClean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN. Mr. President, I wonder if Senator Griffith would give us some information on the terms by way of interest charges, if any, which are currently in existence in relation to such bridging finance. In addition, I would like to suggest if it is not already done, that perhaps the Development Bank could look to the Barbados National Bank as a first source of bridging finance. And in circumstances where the Barbados National Bank does not have sufficient liquidity, then the Central Bank can be the source of last resort so to speak, for this particular activity.

I say this for two reasons. One is that it is always to be desired that the Central Bank minimise the amount of local assets which it acquires because of association between the rate of growth of the local assets held by the Central Bank and the decline in the foreign assets in the country. When the Central Bank advances the \$2.5 million, that is \$2.5 million high powered money which gets into the system that can serve as a basis for expanding credit while if it is advanced by the Barbados National Bank no such expansion in high powered money takes place. That would have to be done out of the available resources of the National Bank at that point in time and presumably, sometimes in competition with other loans.

The second point is that the National Bank should be afforded early chance to operate profitably and this would be one source if the National Bank found itself in excess liquidity. It would be preferable if the Development Bank drew on that excess liquidity rather than going directly to the Central Bank. Perhaps, these things happened already but I just mention them in case they are not now happening.

I thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Seale.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE. Mr. President, I rise to support this Resolution. To allay the fears of Senator McClean, right now what takes place is that we borrow bridging finance from the Barbados National Bank from time to time, but the money to repay those short-term loans come from the sale of bonds or from recoveries. So we use the facility of the National Bank. However, in the case of the Central Bank, this particular loan here is really to increase the speed of disbursements. You will appreciate that development cannot start until money is actually lent out.

This is specifically for loans that we are getting from the international lending agencies so that the Central Bank here is only bridging us for foreign exchange received. Now, the rate of interest at present is four per cent, so that it makes a lot more economic sense to borrow from the Central Bank at this rate rather than go to the Barbados National Bank which, like all commercial banks at this time, has a liquidity problem, and we would have to borrow at something like 24 per cent about two per cent above the rate the National Bank is borrowing from the Central Bank itself.

Sir, just to add a little bit to what the Minister said regarding the bonds, the rate of loans to small businesses — where all this money really goes — has increased rapidly, in that for the coming financial year we are projecting to lend out something like \$8 million to small businesses. When we take into account that between 1969 and 1976 only \$264 000 was lent out for those eight years, this is quite a step and that is why we need a lot of funds. Right now the Bank is not very liquid and we tap all sources at all times. Thank you, Sir.

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

THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, at this stage I would like to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2), as I had intimated before, to facilitate dealing with this Bill.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Bill has been circulated and it appears, from reading the Bill, that it is an amendment of a minor thing. I think members can be satisfied that we deal with it today.

The question that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the intention of Cap. 323B was to ensure that the Inter-American Development Bank, pursuant to its agreement with the Government of Barbados — the aspect with which we are concerned today — should be freed of taxes — it should not have to pay tax or duty in respect of its activities in Barbados.

Now, Sir, Section 5 of the law which we are dealing with says: "The provisions of Sections 2 to 9 inclusive of Article II of the Agreement which relate to the status, immunities and privileges to be accorded to the Bank shall have the force of law in Barbados." That is where it is sought to legalise the tax free status of the institution.

However, what we see there is Article II and that is a misprint, it is supposed to be Article XI, and Roman numerals were not used with the result that what should have been Article XI was printed as Article II. The mistake has now come to light because the Agreement, for example, states: "The Bank, its property, other assets, etc. shall be immune from all taxation and from all Customs duty," and this is stated in Article XI.

Now that the Bank has in fact been purchasing property, the mistake in the law has come to light, and therefore the force of the amendment is merely to delete II where it appears in section 5 and to replace it with XI. It is merely a matter of correcting an error of that sort.

Cap. 323B was passed by Parliament some time in 1969 and the commencement date is February, 13, 1969, but we are not concerned with who made the typographical error.

I move that this Bill be read a second time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resumed. Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

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

THE CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY LOANS GUARANTEE ACT, 1982

Order Number Seven was called — to move the Second Reading of a Bill to regulate the participation by

the Government of Barbados in projects of the Caribbean Community either jointly with other member states or severally, and also to regulate the giving of guarantees, with the approval of Parliament, for the repayment of loans for the financing of the development of the projects.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, at the fifth meeting of the Standing Committee of Ministers responsible for Finance, a paper was considered entitled "Towards the Removal of Legal Impediments to the Financial Participation in Regional Enterprises", and principally Sir, what happened was that it apprised Ministers of the problems of regional enterprises which were caused by the general lack of legislative capacity and by the lack in some States of legislative capacity to enable those States to participate in the financing of such enterprises.

The Committee therefore agreed, and this was in November 1979, that member States having such legislation should communicate to the Secretariat their legislation which empowered Government to participate financially in regional enterprises so that the Secretariat could then circulate such legislation to the Attorney-General of the region. Those who had no such legislations were therefore in a position to do something about their own situation.

The importance of such legislation, Sir, is pretty evident. The whole idea of having any kind of regional body such as CARICOM and a CARICOM Secretariat, and the whole idea of regional integration in the promotion of regional projects, requires that from time to time Governments should participate in the financing of regional enterprises.

On a different level we look at the University, but that is financed differently. Here what we want to do is that if there is an enterprise and funding can be raised and Governments can guarantee that funding, then we would wish to know that Governments are in a position to do so in the same way that they can guarantee funding within the territories which are under their direct control.

In Barbados, Government definitely lacked the statutory authority to participate in such regional enterprises as guaranteeing and making loans or purchasing shares in regional enterprises or the payment of subsidies. We have just a moment ago been dealing with the business of loan guarantees, so we are aware that wherever there are such loan guarantees, our legislation requires that Parliament approve of such guarantees. In order therefore for the financial participation by this Government in any regional enterprises, we need to pass specific legislation.

The Bill before us is a short Bill and what it does is to set out the legal authority for the guarantee, stating clearly that the guarantee can be made on such terms and conditions only as Parliament should approve. And it sets the limit on the total amount of such guarantees as may be outstanding at any one time. The aggregate amount of all loans guaranteed by the Government — you will see in Section 5 — must not exceed \$50 million in the currency of Barbados or the equivalent thereof in any currency.

In this Bill, Sir, if you look at Sections 3 and 4, you will see that there was reference not to Parliament although the Objects and Reasons and the preamble and the whole scheme of the Bill is a Bill of Parliamentary guarantee — and that would normally mean guarantee by legislation which is passed in both Houses of Parliament — you will find that in Sections 3 and 4 there is reference to the House of Assembly and not to Parliament. Accordingly when we go into Committee, I shall be moving to amend this Bill at Section 3(1) line 2, at Section 4(1) line 3, and at Section 4(2) line 2 by deleting the words "House of Assembly" wherever those words appear and substituting therefor the word "Parliament".

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

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I think that this Bill provides an occasion for us to remind ourselves of our commitment to regional integration and our perception that our future lies in that direction.

I say this because at the moment, we are about to be involved in something called the Caribbean Basin Initiative which at the moment seems to have distinct bi-lateral features, and I would hope that in attempting to derive benefit from this initiative, we do not lose sight of the longer term interest of our countries — but that we would in our attempt to derive benefit from the CBI try to place whatever we do in relation to that initiative in the context of a wider development strategy, in the context of our commitment towards an integration of the region.

I say this because it seems to be a fact of human nature that people can very easily be diverted by the appearance of gain. You can quickly lose your head because you seem to see you can get something over there for nothing, or quite easily. We should never allow ourselves to be so diverted. Look to see what you can gain, but at the same time keep focussing on your overall objectives.

I say it again, because CARICOM and regional projects and so on seem to imply a high degree of

Government involvement, and the Caribbean Initiative at least as far as one Government is concerned seems to emphasise private participation, and I can see that some of these projects designed for private participation can cut across potential regional projects and make them non-viable.

It is against this type of background that I would hope that in relation to the Caribbean Initiative and all other things that come our way we should always remember our commitment to CARICOM, and the earlier perception that our destiny lies in the direction of deepening the integration movement and do not be sidetracked into things which may be more illusory than real. I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, Senator McClean has in a way stolen my thunder, but with much more effect, because I was wanting to say that I saw this legislation as an affirmation of the Barbados Government and its people towards the ethic of regional integration. I really want to associate myself at this stage with Senator McClean's remarks and to point out that in the final analysis all that is going to happen to the Caribbean must come from the Caribbean. It is an illusion to think that our future and our well-being and our real interest can be perceived by someone else as well as we can perceive it. The road is very long, but I hope that we are not deluded into thinking that somebody else is going to see after us better than we can see after ourselves.

Further to that thinking, Mr. President, I wonder if the Leader of the Senate could let us know how many Caricom members have legislation similar to this. Is Barbados one of the early ones to make this affirmation or is it the last one? I should really like to know and I am sure some members of the Senate would like to know whether similar legislation exist in the statutes of other members of the Caricom Community. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, while we on this side agree with the concept of joint ventures among the Caribbean people, it would be rather remiss of me, Sir, if I did not mention one or two areas which to my mind should be looked at as early as possible.

When this Bill was before the Other Place — only last week I think it was, Sir — my colleague, the former Minister for Trade responsible for Caribbean Affairs, lamented the fact that there had been no Heads of Government Conferences. As a matter of fact I think the last one was in 1975. Now, Sir, it is in this area that I am a little concerned, because since Caricom was put together in Chaguaramas in 1973 and then the subsequent meeting in 1975, we have seen or heard little or nothing about our leaders coming together to discuss the many problems that obviously beset us.

It is my considered view that anytime that our leaders get together in one room, regardless of their ideologies, I feel that only good can come out of it. As it is now, we seem to hear mouthings from our political leaders as to who is right and who is wrong and in the meantime, hardly giving us the true parts of the matters. This leaves the people at large very concerned about regional integration.

It is true, Sir, that I shared the views of Senator McClean and Senator Wickham when they alluded to the fact that this is indeed a great thing for West Indians and I remind honourable Senators that Errol Barrow was the architect of it — I must remind you, Sir — along I must admit, with Messrs Bird and Burnham. And I do feel, Sir, that since communication is very important or indeed since the only thing that really separates us from animals is the ability to speak, it behoves our leaders to get together and discuss the pertinent issues of the day, Sir.

There are three issues that I would like to speak on that stick in my mind which might be of a great relevance in the very near future. We saw last year, Sir, a visiting team coming to the West Indies with one or two players, at least one, who had played in South Africa and even though we knew for sure the stance taken by Grenada and indeed Jamaica on that matter — that they had to leave Guyana, we saw that there had to be fantastic telephone linkages, hook ups, in order to save the day.

As a matter of fact, it was embarrassing. Subsequent events have proven that it has embarrassed us because those same very players are today in South Africa playing cricket. So even though one might have to compliment the ability of negotiators to get the thing going last year, subsequent events have proven that we could have been the laughing stock of the whole world because few of us know the intentions of those people, and as a result, Sir, I think that is one area where the Heads of Government, having met, would have been in a better position to solve this very vexed situation.

I know I referred to the Leader of the Opposition as Mr. Errol Barrow. I think it should be the Rt. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir. I just say that for the record.

Sir, the other area that really comes to my mind is the CBI which was mentioned by the two honourable Senators. We know for sure, Sir, that some leaders are for it, obviously so. Some of them have very personal interests in it but we also note with concern that others are not so for it. We also note with equal concern that others are very mum on the subject, Sir, and I feel that this is added testimony that the Caribbean Heads of Government should meet. They have a lot to talk about, Sir. They have plenty to talk about. With every passing day we seem to hear about issues that should be aired

and I think it should be best to air them behind closed doors where they would be in a position to get things going properly.

I am quite sure, Sir, that the impending visit of the President of America will make them meet. It will, Sir. But why should they meet just like that because the President of the United States happens to be passing through here. They should be easily of the view that it is important that they should meet.

Another area that has vexed me personally — and honourable Senators might feel it has no great significance — is the fact that some Caribbean leaders met some time ago and concocted a job for Sir Garfield Sobers, they made up one like you mix margarine and flour — no job description, Sir, no real job content — and the result is history, Sir.

What is happening, Sir, is that the Caricom Secretariat would just give him a secretary and put him up in the Garrison Hill and call that wally. Now I know that Ministers of Sport like Ministers of Trade and Ministers of Energy, meet sometimes. I know that, Sir. What I am saying is that there are issues that concern these Ministers. There are issues that are very big and of concern to all Caribbean people and what I am saying, Sir, is that having not discussed the issues regularly and seen the problems, Sir, one then sees the man absolutely disillusioned, and I would say that he emigrated. It does not really look good, Sir. I have a personal interest in this one and I suppose some Senators may see the point, but what I am trying to say is that when things went wrong, if our leaders had been meeting regularly perhaps some dialogue on the matter would have saved the day.

I am saying, Sir, that there are even more important issues today. I just mentioned that by the way because if you go to Hong Kong, Germany, Australia, England, France, or any country in the world, the name of Sir Garfield St. Alban Sobers will live and stand very tall among all people. So I am just pointing out that very important issue to say that at the moment in Australia — he is there, not as a recluse — oh no, Sir, not in magnificence or in isolation either, but perhaps making a contribution there that could well have been made here. That is all I am trying to say, Sir, and indeed I feel that if we could only have these Heads of Government conferences regularly, it would be of great benefit to our people.

Now, Sir, is it not amazing that we may go thousands of miles to Sydney, Australia to a Commonwealth Conference, Sir. It takes, as you know, about 46 hours to fly there, even in these days of modern technology. I believe, Sir, that in flying to Australia, you run the risk of becoming an astronaut — it takes you so long up there, Sir — and yet, we are able to go to these

Commonwealth Conferences in Sydney, Australia — in far off lands — and yet we can never seem to arrange a Heads of Government Conference in Bridgetown, Georgetown, St. Georges, Basseterre, or what have you. I find this to my mind nothing short of ridiculous and as I said before, I thought it would be rather remiss of me not to mention it because I do feel that leaders must understand that they have to sit down and talk about the issues of the day and report to the people exactly what has happened.

As I said, Sir, we have no particular quarrel with the concept of joint ventures among Caribbean people. We agree totally with the concept of the Caribbean man and Caribbean integration, but I thought that I should not allow the opportunity to pass to remind not only the Head of Government in Barbados but indeed all of those in the entire region. This is not a criticism that is destructive, Sir. This one is a plea to all leaders throughout the area not only in Trinidad, Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica — I am talking about from Antigua right away down to Guyana, the entire Caribbean area, and I do feel, Sir, that if this is done, we will see great benefits being reaped by Caribbean people.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke.

SENATOR MISS J. CLARKE: Mr. President, I would like to support this Resolution on the basis that I see it as seeking to regularise what may be termed an anomaly. I say this because I find it surprising that we are only now doing this and I think that it is necessary that we proceed with all haste to ensure that the organization of which we have been a founder member, should not have to face difficulties which could occur if this piece of legislation were not in place.

I would also like to support the sentiments expressed by Senators McClean and Wickham with regard to the need to maintain our integrity, interest and drive within the CARICOM setting. But at the same time, I would caution that we must not overlook the fact that the member countries of CARICOM are all sovereign states — each with their own national agenda, and therefore, it is important that we retain the right to pursue such courses as we see to be beneficial to our own developmental thrust while at the same time retaining a commitment to CARICOM.

I do not believe that it is going to be always possible for each and every one of the member states to entirely support the CARICOM processes, but this is not to say that we should do anything which would seek to weaken the movement. I would also like to suggest in terms of some of the points made by Senator Hall, that while it is a pity that the Heads of Government have not met for some time, I do not think we should read into this any suggestion that the movement has failed as a result, because in fact, there has been much work taking

place over the years. And while I support him in the need for regular meetings of the Heads of Government, I do not myself see this as being essential in the very strict sense of the word.

I would also like to point out that within the Caribbean, we have had much difficulty over the years with this whole question of integration and many of these difficulties will be with us for some time to come. I think only yesterday, there was a statement in the paper to the effect that the European Community, which is older than our own Caribbean Community, is still experiencing difficulties, and therefore, I think that while we must be conscious of this fact, and we must move to support the movement wherever possible, we must be in recognition of our responsibility to our various economies. Therefore we must be in a position to support wherever possible and also to go our own way whenever this is seen to be fit and proper.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, Senator Wickham wanted to know whether there are other countries which has this legislation in place already, or rather what countries since I had intimated that they were some countries.

The other countries which had such legislation in place at the time this legislation was circulated were Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana and Jamaica. I do not know how many other countries have since passed this kind of legislation. It may well be that we are the fourth to pass the legislation.

Also, Sir, I note with interest the points made by Senator McClean and Senator Wickham, particularly concerning Caribbean Basin Initiative. And I take Senator Clarke's point that countries do in fact have their own agendas and therefore, whether we are talking about the Caribbean Basin Initiative or not, it is always a fact that we will have to consult our own national agendas and that may at times lead us into forming other arrangements other than through CARICOM, and that what in fact is important, is that such arrangements as are so formed should never be in conflict with the aims and objectives and the actual activities of CARICOM.

Let me also at this point take note of Senator Hall's comment that some countries are for it, some are not so for it and that some are distinctly mum on the subject. I believe it is a fact that the Government of Barbados has said nothing on the subject and I believe that that silence is eloquent. What we are here looking at, Sir, is the fact that legislation such as that before us has as its *raison d'être*, a commitment to Caribbean integration and to the progress and development of the Caribbean area. And therefore, I believe that it is not inappropriate for me to state that all CARICOM Govern-

ments must indeed be aware of the fact that unless we examine very clearly whether somebody else's commitment to our cause can be as strong as our own commitment to that cause, we may in fact find ourselves being sold the mess and pottage.

Beyond that I really do not know that there is anything to say. If we are talking about the Caribbean Basin Initiative, just let me say that I do not understand it yet, and until I understand it I am not prepared to make any public comment. I see some people look at it in terms of who is getting money and how much money. Maybe that is the way to understand it, I do not know. Others of course would look at it in terms of what potential it provides for training, and if certainly I were to find that it does have great potential for increasing trade, that it would really open up the U.S. markets to Caribbean countries, I would certainly support that aspect of it.

If, however, as the spokesman tended to say on television the other night when he was asked in an interview by Mr. Vere Walcott a question about the attitude to Grenada — he said that Grenada could receive a part of the United States allocation provided the President was satisfied that the country was following the right policies and there was a sufficient private sector initiative — one has to wonder what is happening to the principle enshrined in the United Nations Charter about the rights of countries to self-determination.

Therefore, I would not wish to stand up here and condemn the Caribbean Basin Initiative when I do not know anything about it, nor at the same time would I wish to say anything whatever that would suggest that I would be party to interference by any one country in the internal affairs of another. I think we just need to do what the Barbados Government is doing, which is to say nothing about it until we know enough about it that we can say something that makes sense. I believe that that is the only position we can take.

Referring also to other comments by Senator Hall, Sir, Senator Hall referred to the Jackman affair and then he seemed to do a leapfrog in his logic. I do not know what were the facts he wished to adduce, all I know is he did not worry to adduce them for us, to come to the conclusion that subsequent events have proved that we were wrong in the way in which the Jackman affair was handled. I believe, Sir, that whether the Jackman thing was handled right or wrong, people who are going to be bought for what by any standards is a lot of money, would still be bought.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: On a point of order, Sir. I did not say that subsequent events proved that they were right or wrong. I said that subsequent events proved that

those cricketers intended to go there anyhow, ever since 1976 — that I know that to be a fact.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not make another speech. Actually, the impression I got from your remarks was the same impression that Senator Barrow got, but if you were to elucidate a little in that vein I suppose he would accept it.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, I do not wish any argument with the Senator, the fact is that if Senator Hall was not saying that subsequent events proved that the way it was handled was wrong, then I do not know what he was saying, and therefore I do not have a point to reply to. I am at a loss then to find out why he was referring to the way in which the affair was handled.

The other thing is that there is a strong suggestion in the Senator's comments that had the Heads of Government been meeting regularly, then Sir Garfield Sobers might not have emigrated to Australia. Evidently, Sir, if there had been job satisfaction, there would be grounds for saying he would not have emigrated. I do not believe that Sir Garfield Sobers emigrated because he entirely considered the matter one of free choice.

With the best of intentions, people can do things for you, but in fact will be doing things to you. If you make budgetary provision for a man and also provide him with an office, a desk and a secretary and a certain amount of paper, ink and pens, that may be evidence of very good intentions, but certainly would not necessarily mean that you are doing anything for the person, because that does not mean job satisfaction.

I am aware of some of the frustrations involved, and I can understand how it is that someone whom we would never have wished to have left our shores, an eminent son of the soil, could have taken that decision. I think it is regrettable that the circumstances were such that he took that decision, but I do not think that we should confuse that with whether or not the Heads of Government are meeting.

In the first place, Sir, there are institutions of CARICOM — and I am referring mainly to the Standing Committees of Ministers — and those institutions do a lot of work, and had they not been working this legislation would not be before us. There is a whole complex and vital matter on arrangements of trade within CARICOM which receives a great deal of attention and which is in fact something that is ordinarily publicised, so there cannot be any doubt that the institutions of CARICOM are alive and are functioning. That is not to say that there are not faults in the system — I would never make statements like that — but CARICOM is alive and functioning and there is absolutely no doubt about that.

A call for a meeting of the Heads of Government is a totally different matter, because that is a call for the Heads of Government to sit down and deal with matters which in our view have the kinds of complexity that they should at least have discussion at the highest level in the Caribbean. That is a totally different matter, and I should add, Sir, that now that it is appearing — if I understand the Secretary General of CARICOM — as though such a meeting is a real possibility — and indeed a real probability in that a lot of the elements of the past which seemed to be the bar to such a meeting are now absent — now that it appears that such a meeting is probable, we now have the side of the Opposition jumping up and calling for such a meeting.

It is not Senator Hall's fault, Sir, if prior to September 1976 he did not call for a meeting of the Heads of Government in CARICOM, and I dare say it would have been totally out of place for Senator Greaves to call for any such meeting in those days, and therefore if they can call for the meeting I would like to urge them to feel free.

We all know, Sir, that if some of the principal leaders did not consider it worthwhile to sit down with one another until either the people or the Creator did something which eased those principal leaders out of position, there was really no hope that there would have been a Heads of Government conference. We have had, unfortunately — we are all sorry about it, but in fact Dr. Williams did die — and while Mr. Burnham has continued from strength to strength, Mr. Manley and Mr. Barrow did lose political office.

Therefore the stage was changed almost dramatically and a CARICOM Heads of Government meeting is obviously more likely now than it had been in the fairly immediate past.

All I wish to say about Senator Hall's call for a Heads of Government meeting in that context is that I am very glad that it is recognised even on the other side that things have improved to the point where it makes sense to call for a Heads of Government meeting, because it really did not make any sense calling for it before. Therefore it is not necessary, I think, to make the comment that the visit of the President of the United States will make them meet, or that people can go as far as Sydney, Australia, to a meeting, presumably a reference to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting.

I would be happy, Sir, if a Heads of Government meeting does become a reality in the near future. I believe, Sir, that there is a lot to be talked about that we should have been talking about for a long time. I believe, Sir, those were all the points that were raised in the debate to which any attention would be required at this time.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resolved itself into 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. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3(1) be amended by the deletion of the words "House of Assembly" at line 2 and the substitution therefor of the word "Parliament".

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clause 4 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 be amended as follows: at line 3 of 4(1) the deletion of the words "House of Assembly" and the substitution therefor of the word "Parliament" and at 4(2) line 2, the deletion of the words "House of Assembly" and the substitution therefor of the word "Parliament".

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, Clause 4 as amended was passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee with amendments to sections 3 and 4 by the removal of the words "House of Assembly" wherever they appear and the substitution therefor of the word "Parliament".

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Bill as amended be read a third time forthwith.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Bill as amended was passed.

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

THE NATIONAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION ACT, 1982

Order No. 8 was called — to move the second reading of a Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to public parks, beaches and caves and related matters.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. The Leader of Government Business is requesting that the Item that appears on the Order Paper as No. 9 be now taken as the next Order of the Day and not the one read by the Clerk, the one dealing with the Police which we can probably get through much more quickly than starting the other one. If that is satisfactory, we will take No.9.

POLICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

The Ninth Order was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Police Act, Cap. 167.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, one can never be assured that no matter how trifling a matter may be, that it would be dealt with quickly. The fact is, Sir, that at least the introduction can be as brief as the matter merits.

This Bill before us is a very simple Bill which has come before us really to permit of the recruitment of women into the Police Band. I do not believe, Sir, that today in this age of equality, that there is anybody to be found in this Chamber who would regard this as anything more than a most desirable piece of legislation.

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

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, even at the risk of prolonging the debate, I really must record my personal and, I am sure, the community's appreciation for the spirit of this Resolution. I do not believe that women are any better musicians than men. It would be stupid to suggest this, but I am constantly remarking on the lack of fanfare, the ease with which women in Barbados are moving into careers and vocations which in many other countries seem to demand headlines.

We have women members of the Mounted Police. They have entered into the transport service and they do all sorts of things which a decade or two ago seemed to be denied them. But it has been done, in what I regard, as a particularly low profile Barbadian way — without headlines, with the easiest of assimilation in the erstwhile provinces of men. I really do in fact think that the Bill is in earnest part of that kind of philosophy and if this is the kind of legislation and the kind of integration which women can look forward to, I really have great hope for the country. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR MRS. M. O. REECE: Mr. President, I rise in support of this Bill before the Chamber. I would be failing in my duty here if I did not get up to say some words and to let a male Senator speak for the women of this country.

The Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto of 1976 pledged to end discrimination against women. It is a promise and now it is performance. The Barbados Labour Party in November 1976, set up a Commission on the Status of Women, a Commission on which I had the honour to serve. I am proud to see today that some of these recommendations have been enforced. The Police Band is no exception.

Women belong to bands, whether they belong to military bands as we have seen or musical bands — the ones which go around and play at night clubs and what have you. The Police Band is no exception. The Police of this country have been doing a good job. We cannot let them say that one bad apple can spoil the whole lot.

The Police at one time had a club called the Boys' and Girls' Club. Out of that club came some of our famous people one of whom was mentioned earlier by Senator Hall. I look forward to the day when I can see the Boys' and Girls' Club in the Police Force really functioning again and producing men like Sir Garfield Sobers.

I must say that I support this wholeheartedly and look forward to other recommendations by the Commission being enforced. Thank you. (Applause).

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

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate was resumed and the Bill reported as having been passed, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I propose to suspend this sitting at this stage for 45 minutes. This sitting is suspended for 45 minutes.

On Resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Sitting is resumed.

DOMESTIC EMPLOYEES (HOURS OF DUTY) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

Order No. 5 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir the Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) Act as passed in 1961 set out to regulate the hours which domestics spend at households of their employers. The schedule for that Act in fact specifies what hours a domestic may work and what hours are not counted as working hours. That Act was passed at that time, Sir, because it was considered that domestics were working for too long hours and something had to be done to bring those hours nearer to the hours of other workers.

It is now considered that legislation should not only provide for the hours of duty which employers can have domestics at their house, but also, that the Hon. Minister responsible for Labour should be empowered to set minimum wages to cover the wages of these domestics.

The proposal, therefore, Mr. President, is to expand the Act from merely being an Hours of Duty Act to become an Hours of Duty and Minimum Wage Act. To that effect, we are changing the caption of the Act so that the Act shall now be cited as the "Domestic Employees (Hours of Duty) (Amendment) Act." I am sorry, the short title will now become the Domestic Employees Act.

Under the amended Act the Hon. Minister will be empowered to make orders from time to time to regulate the hours of duty and the rates of pay of employees. At present, if the Hon. Minister considers it necessary to amend the hours of duty, it would entail coming to Parliament for the purpose of making an amendment to the Act. The proposed amendment empowers him to change the conditions of service by order and so save Parliament the problem of doing what is in fact an administrative job which probably could be done if domestics were unionised. But domestics are not unionised people and it is considered that somebody has to carry their battle for them. In this case, the Hon. Minister of Labour is the one on whose shoulder the responsibility for their problems lie.

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

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

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I rise to support the intent of this Bill that is to give the Minister power to prescribe the minimum wages for persons occupied as auxiliary housekeepers. I use that term because I know that the people who hold these jobs consider the term, "domestic", offensive, and that feeling is a hangover from history and from notions about the relationship between a domestic servant and the master of that domestic, and so on. People find that term obnoxious and as such, my own sensibilities will not permit me to use it. So you must forgive me for using a term which is not as yet recognised within the Act by way of referring to this Act, and I refer to the people in a more generic sense in terms of what they actually do as auxiliary housekeepers.

I rise to support the idea that the Hon. Minister should acquire the powers to prescribe minimum wages for such workers. But I do not believe that the amendment to this Bill has gone far enough. I think Government should give early consideration to further amendments and I would like now to detail such areas that Government should consider. Some of them, I do believe, can be considered this afternoon.

The first one which I believe can be considered this afternoon is the question of the designation that is given to these workers. It is not a matter which raises policy issues of the type which would raise issues for Government. It is a matter which the Senate can, in its right, recognise as an appropriate refinement which we should bring to this Bill and I would suggest that consideration should be given to deleting the words "domestic employee" wherever they appear and substituting the words, "auxiliary housekeepers".

The second amendment which I feel is deserving some attention at some later stage, relates to Section 2 of the Act. Section 2 of the Act, Cap. 344 relates to the designation of various terms and I am directing attention here to the meaning of day time which according to the Act means the hours between 6 o'clock in the morning and 8 o'clock in the evening. This might have been all right when the Act was passed, but I wish to suggest that today, that is an inappropriate definition of day time and I further wish to suggest that perhaps it should be 6 o'clock to 6 o'clock.

Auxiliary housekeepers — most of them have children and so on — need to be at home to look after their children and I should believe that any duties which would take them out to 8 o'clock in the night should be regarded as extraordinary and overtime. Therefore,

the day time when you would have normal duties should, in my view be constrained between the hours of 6 o'clock and 6 o'clock. Some people may even suggest earlier, but in the present circumstances I would suggest 6 o'clock to 6 o'clock. I believe that Government should give some consideration to such an amendment.

Beyond that, I would like to suggest that considerations should be given to have different levels of minimum wage.

Auxiliary housekeepers perform different duties, some of them may be required to perform just one duty that is say, cooking or laundering or cleaning and some may be required to provide all of these duties along with child care. I do not believe that a person who is required to perform all of these duties in a household should be paid the same minimum wage as a person who is just doing a single duty. And so, perhaps, you could have a minimum wage which is related say, to one specific activity — cooking, cleaning, laundering, child care whatever it is, and then some differential for every other duty which the person would perform.

This would not call for an amendment, this would be entirely within the discretion of the Hon. Minister when he gets the power to fix it in such a manner. I am just throwing this out by way of a suggestion, in relation to the fixing of minimum wages.

Some reference has been made in other places, it has reached the Press and it has reached the streets, so to speak — people are believing that this minimum wage is going to be \$66. I do not know how true that is but I want to suggest that that figure might be well above what many auxiliary housekeepers are working for now. And I wish to suggest that the minimum wage for an auxiliary housekeeper should bear some relationship to minimum wages elsewhere.

I further wish to suggest that the duties of an auxiliary housekeeper are, in terms of the contribution which they make, far greater than the contribution made by a shop assistant. The job of an auxiliary housekeeper is far more onerous, far more technical, and we should recognise these things and fix a minimum wage for auxiliary housekeepers which bears favourable comparison to those for shop assistants.

I recognise that at the moment the wages of the shop assistant are tax deductible, so to speak. That is an operating expense of the particular business or particular firm, but that is not the case for the householder. What I think is needed here is some adjustment whereby householders will be given some form of tax credit which they make to auxiliary housekeepers.

Already we have an arrangement like that for gardeners, and I would have thought that such an arrangement for auxiliary housekeepers would have been given priority over that type of arrangement for a gardener. That should be the case having regard to the higher strategic importance of the house-keeping function to the community, because the house-keeping function on occasion would release certain people from work and a person might be someone with a scarce skill who might otherwise have functioned as a housewife, and a housekeeper would allow that person to go out and work in an area of scarcity.

If those people who are already working and cooking and so on, are released from some of the household duties, they can become rather more productive in their work. So in a sense, the involvement of the auxiliary housekeeper in the economic affairs of our country is conducive to improvement in productivity within the country, so to speak.

Therefore, I believe serious consideration should be given to giving tax credit. I mention a tax credit as opposed to an income deduction because if it is a tax credit everyone will benefit to the same extent in actual dollar bills, while if it is just an income deduction the person who is earning a high income will get, say 60 per cent 70 per cent off, and persons lower down will get 25 or 30 per cent off. So it should be a tax credit which would have the same significance for everybody employing auxiliary housekeepers.

The magnitude of this should be informed by what is a realistic and desirable minimum wage, having regard to the needs of these people in terms of maintaining themselves at some satisfactory level of subsistence, and also having regard to the significance of the type of occupation *vis-a-vis* others. That is one consideration — what we should pay them, and the other one is what persons lower down the scale who at the moment would employ auxiliary housekeepers can afford to pay. And the tax credit should be designed to reconcile those two things: to make the cost to the householder to be in the range of what they can afford, while the remuneration to the worker would really be what is desirable and necessary for a reasonable existence.

I would also suggest that some attention should be paid to the question of overtime rates and so on. I believe that you should have different rates of overtime. The same rate of overtime should not apply, say, between the hours of 6 and 8 o'clock as between the hours 10 o'clock to midnight or after midnight. There should be some idea of time and a half up to such an hour and double time beyond such an hour.

Again, I think that this particular Act, Cap. 344, has a provision in Section 4 which says that every employer shall keep a record of the hours of overtime worked by every domestic employee employed by him. I wonder how many people in Barbados are aware of this. I do believe that although there is a view that the average citizen should make himself aware of the law — and ignorance of the law is no excuse for any type of non-compliance therewith — I do believe we have a responsibility to educate these people about the basic features of the law that they should abide by. I think that this is one area that our G.I.S. can take up, and many other matters pertaining to this said Bill and the amendment thereto.

With those few remarks, Mr. President, I do support the intention of this Bill, but there are many other things that need to be done by way of amendment to the principal Act.

I thank you.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, we on this side really have no objection to the setting of minimum wages and maximum hours for domestics, but at the risk of being at the wrong end of Senator Griffith's vituperative tongue, which is nothing much to worry about, there are things that need to be said and will be said.

I agree with Senator McClean when he says that the tasks of the domestic are more onerous, and indeed more technical, than the shop assistant. At the same time, Sir, we must understand that the shop assistant's minimum wage in Barbados is \$84 a week, and the Government now seeks to have a minimum wage of, I understand, \$66.

What we on this side are calling for is a broad minimum wage for workers, not just shop assistants and domestics, but a broad minimum wage. I think this is rather important and it would go a long way to having industrial peace and harmony in this country. I am not even going to refer to the \$140 a week that BIGWU is asking for, all I am saying is that I feel that the Government should set a broad minimum wage for all categories of workers.

Senator McClean alluded to the fact that it is offensive in some people's eyes to call people domestics. In fact I would agree that some people think it is derogatory, but is it not a curious paradox that even in the days of slavery, domestics as we know them, or auxiliary helpers as Senators McClean called them, were the most trustworthy of people. They were the type of people who were allowed to learn to read and to write. One only has to look at "Roots" to find out that that is true. I say it is a curious paradox that today, 150 years later,

the whole society seems to have gone past that and it is now regarded as offensive to refer to someone as a domestic.

Indeed, Sir, in the Other Place it was suggested that the name should be changed, but I say that a rose by any name is still a rose, and we do not really have to look at the fact of whether you call them domestics or household helpers or what have you. I think that what is needed is an attitudinal change to those workers. I am getting some applause from Senator Griffith, but anyone from the proletariat will understand and appreciate the sentiments expressed by your humble servant.

We must understand the importance of the influence that domestics have over our children. There are a few families in Barbados where you will find that the mother and the father are going out by 6 o'clock. This means that the domestic has to come in before the lady of the house leaves. She might have one or perhaps two very young children in the age group that one becomes very impressionable, let us say between one and five, and, Sir, any domestic as she is called, is expected to mould that child, or those children.

In Barbados in 1982 there is a lot of work. Families work, work, work. There is a lot of working and no homing. The influence that domestics wield on young children in their very impressionable age is fantastic, and therefore I do feel that one must not look at it as a matter of whether we call them domestics or helpers or anything like that. I think what we need to understand is that these people are the ones that are caring our children, they are the ones that are cooking our food, they are the ones who themselves have children of their own that they cannot get home to. They are up early and at work at 7 o'clock and most times get home after dusk, and what is more, when our socialites want to party, the maid is asked to come back and baby-sit, and I do not know if the emoluments derived are commensurate with the output of the work load that they would get from the maid.

Frankly, I am not going to criticise the idea of a minimum wage and maximum hours for domestics. What I would like to do is to remind honourable Senators that in far off lands, Europe, England, Australia and these places, there are no such things as maids — maybe there are in Buckingham Palace. You do not get any maids. You get a charlady who comes and does the dusting, and it is significant that that same charlady comes to Barbados as a tourist. So you see we cannot look at people who perform these duties and dismiss them just so when we know very well that there are at home all day with our young children. It is important, Sir, that we look at it from a point of view of where their emoluments should be commensurate with the work performed, and I daresay

if we have to give them a salary, it has to relate to the cost of living.

I think the sooner we do this in Barbados, the better it will be, because people leave here every week and go to the United States of America and indeed to Canada to do these same domestic jobs. They do not mind you calling them domestics because the "bread" is good and they can send back home and support their families. They also have a standard of living that is unknown to their counterparts in Barbados. They have their own room with T.V. and video and things like that, so they do not mind looking after an old lady or dusting a room.

I remember so well when my mother used to work around the Sea Rocks at Mrs. Lang for \$3 a week — half day I must say — dusting and making beds. I think the honourable Senator Howell would know this very well because he is a man of the soil. The reason why I say that is that today there are some people who still have people doing the little menial tasks that can be done by anybody, but the labour is cheap and these people cannot afford not to take the little pickings that come before them, so they must do it rather than walk the streets doing nothing.

I say that simply to say that we have to understand that the days of the domestics as we knew them are over. You had better believe that. It is going to be over simply because the people that employ domestics will find that with the increase in wages, they could probably make the same extra bed that they never did before. What it has done to our children is simply this: it has made us sort of give up in a society where our daughters and our sons do not know what it is to make up their own room and how to cook. Some girls in this country will burn jello. There is no doubt about that, and I feel that we have to seriously look at this. If we don't, it would mean that you would be creating a Frankenstein which we can do nothing about in the years to come. I am not joking. I think this is a very serious matter.

I believe that maybe the reason why the wages have been so low throughout the years is that men have never done the job of helpers, although men in recent times have become hairdressers and the best designers in the world like Tidlins who make the clothes for the Queen and all dignitaries. You look on the European scene and you will see that the fashions for all women in Barbados are determined by a few blokes in France and Italy.

There is no question of effeminacy. You are not effeminate because you can make a dress for socialites, but I must say if you do that in Bridgetown you are certainly regarded as that. There was a middleweight boxer called

Emile Griffith who was a milliner — he made hats — and when Bob Parrett alluded to the fact that he was only a little girl making hats, it so incensed Emile Griffith that he killed him in the ring. That is a fact. Senator Griffith probably would have known this since he was in New York.

I am saying that men have never entered into the realm of this business of domestics, and perhaps that is the reason why the ladies who did so were so badly paid.

There was a time, Sir, when people employed four or more maids; one to cook, one to wash, one to sew and one to iron — sometimes one to walk out the children in the afternoon, and it is funny that Senator McClean said that there should be different levels. There was a time when there was one level, when you had to do the whole lot; and what was more to be very proud of the fact that when Master Richard or Master Henry comes in you were there. Sir, this is 1982 and I feel that the domestics should be given a decent wage.

I think when it comes to national issues, when it comes to an issue that affects a broad section of the community, one cannot really think in terms of party lines and this side and that side. It does not matter if it is my mother or your mother; the point is that we need them to have a way commensurate with the workload, and also bearing in mind the inflationary times that have beset us in the last eight or nine years.

So, Sir, I believe that we need to get this right. We need to be in a position where these domestics can feel that they belong. These people come into your house early in the morning and look after your children, cook your food, and sometimes these domestics do not get the same quality food that the people who employ them eat. When you have that, pilferage is the order of the day. (*Asides*) Senator Linton would not understand this. He probably pays his maid \$10 a week.

I am saying that broadly speaking, the Government has to look at this very seriously. Maybe they have begun to see that I am not over-critical of the situation. All I would say is that there was a Department for Women's Affairs which was set up in 1976, but I find it has never had a permanent Director. I wonder what the ladies of this country are thinking. It has been shifted from the Ministry of Education to the Ministry of Labour and to the Ministry of Community Development, and I understand that it is now in Culture. I know, Sir, that the former Attorney General was a champion of the women, but I note with alarm that just before he — I cannot say before he elected not to be a Minister — but just before he became a backbencher that Ministry was moved from his portfolio, and Sir, I wonder after all of that fanfare and things like that, what the ladies of this country feel.

I invite the Government to look seriously at this situation. Let it not be said that it was a show — a pappy show — to impress a few people, and let them seriously look and properly staff that Women's Affairs Department. Women are primarily the domestics. There are no men that are domestics that I know of, although in movies you always see a reliable butler but we have no butlers in Barbados that I know of, Sir.

I feel that when we are talking about domestics, we are speaking of 99.9 per cent of women and I feel that it might be an area for, if not the Department of Women Affairs, or the lady Senators, or the National Organization of Women, Sir, I think that it is time that the women of this country are given the opportunity to speak up boldly. And if we find that the ladies of the country are oppressed, then it is for who are in the positions to do so — to speak up boldly.

Sir, I have broadly stated my views on this domestic scene, Sir. I feel very sensitive about it. I am sensitised about it because of the fact that I know at first hand what is the situation. I would even say that the fact that the Government has set a minimum wage and maximum hours of work is a step in the right direction. I would not deny that but I am also calling for a broad minimum wage for all workers, not only dependent on the shop assistant \$84 and the \$66 now for domestics. With those few remarks, Sir, I hope that the Minister while replying, would tell us that like John the Baptist, this is the forerunner for better things and that he would be able to give us some further food for thought so that our domestics will find themselves in better and happier and congenial surroundings in the workplace.

SENATOR MRS. M. O. REECE: Mr. President, I rise in support of this Bill before this Chamber. I do not know what it is — if the Senator sits with these Senators on the other side, but it seems as though we are agreeing on everything this afternoon.

It is nice to see when people forget their political affiliations and look at national issues and support them as they should be supported. The plight of domestics has always been discussed in our House of Assembly or Chambers. As far back as 1788 it was discussed. It was proven then that a quarter per cent of the slaves at that time were in menial services and this included domestics, and unlike Senator McClean, I like the word "domestics". I support Senator Hall in this.

We have to try to encourage people to take pride in their jobs. We try to call them soil technicians, rose tree trimmers and whatever you call them, but as he said, a rose by any other name is just as sweet. We have to train our domestics. We have to encourage them to go to Housecraft Centres. We have to encourage organizations to reach out for them. I make no apology for this.

I belong to a women's organization which allows for 15 per cent of women engaged in business or professions. Our membership has no domestic on it, Sir. They have never applied for membership in the club to which I belong. I believe they look at us as a bunch of snobs and they refuse to apply for membership.

If you go out in the evening you can hear, with all due respect to ladies present, the ladies talking about "what nice ladies they have" — "they come in whenever I want them to come in; if I want them early, if I want them late, they will come in to suit me." There is no overtime paid to these persons, there are just hand-me-downs. These hand-me-downs only go to supplement the meagre wages that these people are being paid. The leftovers are given to these people to take home for the little folk at home so that they can supplement their income.

The average woman cannot afford to pay a domestic \$140 a week. As one Senator said, in other countries some of the people of our standing cannot employ domestics. We plan our housework, maybe call in a charlady or a charwoman or a cleaner once a week to come and assist us in these chores.

I am looking forward to the day when working hours in Barbados are staggered. I would like to see stores open at 10 a.m., closing at 6 p.m. or 8 p.m. and having a shift system so that maids can come at 6 a.m. and go away at 1.00 p.m. with maybe another one in the afternoon. I believe in the area, I think, where Senator Hall lives, there is a group of people who employ two maids a day. I do not know what they pay them, but the point is they are employing two persons in one day. The maid comes in the morning before you go off to work and another one comes in the afternoon. That is giving that domestic time for her work at home, maybe to attend to her children.

She also has children and she leaves home to meet 6 o'clock on mornings or 7 o'clock and gets back home at night when the children have gone to bed, thus causing the children to be on the streets getting involved in things they should not be involved in. I hate to keep referring to the Commission on the Status of Women, but I must do this. Like Senator Hall, I am concerned that there is no Director of Women's Affairs appointed. Women in this country have to stand up and speak out for their rights. I am not a women's libber. I believe that people should speak out according to their conscience.

Domestics have to be trained. They must be trained. I know that when we were doing the investigation, that there were no unions which went out to try to encourage them to become members of any particular union, whether was BIGWU or Little Wu or BWU or whatever kind of union it was. But I believe that the trade unions

can play some part in trying to get these domestics come together and make some representation for them.

I have heard one person in the Other Place who decided they should be called, "household assistants". But I said earlier on that I am totally against the change from domestics. They have kitchen assistants sold down town, they operate with electricity. Maybe other people look at these household assistants as somebody to operate off of gas or solar energy or something like that, but they are human and they have to enjoy some of the same things that we enjoy on maybe meagre salaries, as we know they are paid today.

I look forward to the Bill being passed and the Hon. Minister responsible providing a decent wage and proper working hours for these domestics. I thank you. *(Applause).*

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Reader.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. President, whilst I rise in support of this Bill, there are one or two points that I would like to bring out.

I would like to know why it is that no union has yet taken up the cause of women, to the extent that women are allowed three weeks after they have babies for payments but no babies are taken into the day nurseries until they are three months old. So, the women are supposed to put those babies in a box and leave them under the bed until they come home? Nobody has even thought about this.

A lot of these women do not have anyone to look after their children and if they stay away from work until the child is three months old, they may not get back their job. This is something that I have raised time and time again with various organisations, but no one has looked into it.

Now most of the people in Barbados have been raised by domestics either as their nannies or their parents. It is a pity to see so many of these people going overseas because they are leaving a lot of their children here who are not getting the benefit of parental guidance and these children are the delinquents that we are seeing today. When you go overseas and you send money back to Barbados, it does help, but the children do not have you there to guide them. Nobody can guide you and help you better than your own parent and it is very unfair to these children to be deprived of parental affection and guidance at an early age.

I speak very feelingly on this because I know of some women who have gone and left up to 12 children in Barbados and these children have eventually had to come into care because there was no one to look after them. I

know of five small children that were left with a blind grandmother whilst the mother went overseas to work as a domestic. Now, eventually these children had to come into care because the grandmother just could not cope with them. I hope that before they are given visas to emigrate, that these circumstances be looked into well, because too many children suffer too much and nobody can bring you up as well as your own parent can — except it is your nanny.

I speak very feelingly because there was a woman who brought me up from the time I was two and who has brought up all my sisters and all my children and stands in such high regard in our feelings that my children regard her as a grandmother. The affection for her is such that when they leave the airport on arriving back in Barbados, they drive straight to her house.

Now, domestics have not always had a fair deal and a lot of them have been overworked and underpaid. We know this. But you have got to realise if you make the salaries too high, you are going to put a lot of people out of work. There are some very old people in Barbados who can just manage to scrape enough money to pay somebody to come in for half of a day to help them look after a relative who is incapacitated in some way so that they can get out to do the shopping, pay the bills and to do things like that, because there are a lot of these old people who cannot be left alone and they must have someone there to help them.

If you are getting a very small pension and just \$37 a week from National Insurance, it is very hard to pay somebody \$140 a week out of that and to live and pay your rent as well. Now I speak feelingly on this because the pensions of the older people in this island were geared to 20 years ago — not today, and the National Insurance under that does not help very much. Rents have gone up, food has gone up, everything has gone up, but they are forgotten to a large extent and having someone, to come in full-time to help them out, is the only way that they can really make ends meet and manage their business affairs.

I feel that domestics should be proud to be domestics because no other category of worker is trusted with everything that you have. Many men and women go out to work and leave a domestic with the key to their house and everything that is in it — and trust them implicitly, and they have taken this trust, they have borne this responsibility, they are people that we can be proud of. Most of them are the salt of the earth and this is what we should realise when we are talking about salaries.

I realise that you have got to find the happy medium between too high a salary and too low a salary because you have got to take everything into considera-

tion. If as Senator McClean suggested, we could have tax relief, I think tax credit on this would be a great help. I do feel, Mr. President, that these women have done a magnificent job and we must try to hold on to this type of employment for as long as we can, because it is doing much good to many people. And believe me — there are many domestics in this island better qualified to bring up the children of the people who employ them than the people are themselves.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I had no intention of speaking on this Resolution today, but the speech which was made by the last speaker — Senator Reader — has caused me to rise just to point out a few things, and particularly to say that we in this Honourable Senate are assumed to be *au fait* with legislation and therefore, when one gets up to make a point, rather than talking nonsense and trying to give the wrong impression, one ought to be *au fait* with what is contained in the legislation. All I am doing really is just to point out to Senator Reader what exists in legislation which we have passed and which forms part of the laws of this country.

I want to refer, Mr. President, to a law that was passed on July 19, 1976 entitled, "Employment of Women, Maternity Leave" and it is an Act to provide for the grant of maternity leave to female employees and for the protection of the employment of those employees during such leave.

Senator Reader said women when they go on maternity leave do not get any more than three weeks after they have had the baby but the day nursery does not accept the babies until after three months and whether the women are expected to leave the babies in a basket. This is the kind of impression which she gives. That is a total and complete misrepresentation of what actually takes place and indeed, what the law provides for.

I rise because she indicated, and I notice in the speeches which have been made so far, that references have been made to unions not doing anything to help the situation and that kind of thing.

She also indicated that she has not heard a union doing anything to help this particular situation. I would like to enlighten her in this particular regard. As far as this particular piece of legislation is concerned, I will quote the relevant section after I make this particular point. This was a result of representation which was made by the Barbados Workers' Union to get this particular bit of legislation on the Statute Book, and what does

it provide for? Among other things, Sir, Section 4 of this Act, Cap. 345A, reads as follows:

"Except where an employee otherwise desires, maternity leave shall be of a period of not less than twelve weeks and shall be so arranged that the employee is allowed —

- (a) such period, not exceeding six weeks, as she desires before the expected date of confinement; and
- (b) a period of not less than six weeks from the date of confinement."

And it goes on.

What happens in most instances is that you will find that a number of women — and it can be done under this legislation — would work up to as near as possible the date of confinement, because the 12 weeks can be taken after the date of confinement. Some people get their holiday coinciding with that particular period. The point is that there are adjustments which can be made in this, and the law is not that watertight that a female worker cannot have a longer period after confinement. And I would dare say that there are very few women who would not use the legislation in this kind of way to get a longer period after confinement than even the six weeks which is provided here. So, to say that it is three weeks some women have to get back to work in is surely a misrepresentation of what is in the existing legislation.

For Senator Reader's enlightenment I merely rose to point this out so that she would not fall into that false situation again.

Another point which she made really pained me, and I would just want to refer briefly to it. It was when she said that domestics should be proud to be domestics.

I really do not know if I need to comment on that in the way I would really like to comment on it. All I would say is that this is a clear indication of the backward thinking, the 18th century thinking which we still have in this society, and I think that kind of thinking ought to be wiped out. One would have thought that today we were living in a progressive society.

There is nothing enlightening or nothing so enjoyable about being a domestic, and when we can get an honourable Senator getting up in this Chamber in this day and age and making that kind of statement, one must wonder what our society is coming to. I am ashamed to be sitting in a Chamber where an honourable Senator could get up and make that kind of statement — that domestics ought to be proud of being domestics. That

is the meaning, as far as I am concerned, and I do not think that anybody with any kind of social conscience should be associated with that kind of statement.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, I will begin first by referring to certain remarks made both by Senator McClean and Senator Hall. Senator McClean suggested that wages should relate to wages in other countries, Senator Hall suggested that wages should relate to inflation.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On a point of explanation, Mr. President, I said they should relate to wages in other areas of employment, not in other countries; say the wages of shop assistants and so on in Barbados.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, Senator McClean's point is taken. However, the point I would like to make is this: no Government and no trade union can sit down and legislate unemployment for people. It is all right to talk about fixing a minimum wage for domestics like BIGWU has done, and sit down and read it. It sounds plausible. I, like any other Barbadian, would like to see the day when people are working for reasonable salaries, but when you are talking about legislation it is a very serious thing.

If someone is working for \$1 200 a month — let us suppose it is a woman — and she is the only bread winner in her family, and let us assume we take the argument of BIGWU and accept that \$140 should be the minimum wage, then when at the end of the month she sees what she has to pay to a domestic, it is going to predispose her in a particular kind of way. She will probably come to the conclusion that she should either stop working or stop employing a maid. Therefore when people get up and talk about wanting legislated wages to be at some far-fetched figure, one has to be very serious about what one is talking about, and therefore it is in that light that I respond to both Senator McClean and Senator Hall.

Mr. President, Senator Reader made a very salient point when she suggested that the unions were not representing a particular kind of worker. I listened to the remarks made by Senator Greaves, not necessarily agreeing with everything he said. Yes, there is legislation dealing with maternity benefits, and I know of certain companies which conform to the legislation, but Senator Reader made the point that those workers should be negotiated for by a union. That is true, but there is no existing legislation in this country which mandates any employer to sit down and enter into any contractual arrangement with a union, and that is the problem that we have today with the same BIGWU and those two respective companies. If there was legis-

lation to inform the Minister of Labour as to the direction to take, the malaise which is existing now would not happen.

We still operate on a system of voluntarism, and by that I mean an employer could if he is so disposed, or if he is not, he does not have to sit down and negotiate with a union, and I am saying the time has come when we need laws on the Statute Book to make it an obligation on the part of that employer for him not only to sit down and know that ILO Convention 87 and ILO Convention 95 are things with which he should conform.

In this country we have ratified the ILO Conventions, but beyond that we have gone no further in terms of the question of recognition, and I am saying that Government has a responsibility to make sure that legislation is there to take care of those recalcitrant individuals in this society who can come here, set up companies and refuse to accept the trade union as the collective bargaining agent for their workers.

I agree with Senator Reader. The union should be negotiating for these workers, but there is absolutely no law. I heard an aside which said that the union is not interested, and I do not really want to respond to that.

Mr. President, there is much talk about the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and that in itself — its effectiveness — presupposes a stable industrial relations climate. It posits a stable industrial relations climate, therefore, anybody must be made to understand the requirements, the norm and values that you must conform to when he comes to these shores. You should not come down here first and then decide in your mind that you are going to sit down or not sit down with a union. The law should be there. He should know beforehand what he has to face. The same thing can go for any company that is in dispute now.

I am unlike other people. If a particular trade union has the legal right to negotiate on behalf of the workers, then it is the responsibility of any employer to sit down and negotiate with that particular union. It has been given an instrument by which it can effectively operate as a union, so it makes no sense anybody in the society suggesting that it should not be recognised, it should not be given the credence which it deserves. It has been already determined and accepted as a legitimate union, and without identifying the particular union, I think that if there was legislation to deal with this question of recognition, what we have going on would not happen, and the question Senator Reader asked would not arise because any employer would know that he has an obligation — the right is that of the worker — to sit down and negotiate with that union, but we

have none. On the one hand while we do not have legislation to deal with recognition, we do not even have legislation to deal with trade union rivalry.

In other Caribbean countries the question of recognition has been taken out and in one instance, it has been given to what is regarded as a Recognition and Certification Board, because trade union rivalry although it is something new to Barbados, has existed in reality for centuries. But in the Caribbean, the history is there, and therefore while we sat on our laurels over the years and said there was only one trade union and the question of rivalry was nothing that you have to worry about then, you have to worry about it now because there are other unions, and you will find that one union will try to get workers from another union, and one union will try to seek recognition vis-a-vis another union in Barbados. I believe Government has a responsibility to enact the necessary legislation to deal with these problems.

I would hope that the day will come, when on an issue like the one we have now, the Minister would be able to sit down and say I am going to be guided by certain principles and certain legislation, and on the basis of that he would be able to determine whether recognition should be granted to a union, or whether one union as opposed to another should be given recognition. To Senator Reader, I say therein lies the problem. It is not just a problem of a union sitting on its laurels and not wanting to represent that particular worker, but you see when the employer does not have to sit down, it is a different thing.

Mr. President, like Senator Milroy Reece, I think that it is necessary for there to be some officer dealing with the national affairs of women. Senator Hall is making the point that he also said that, is also correct.

Mr. President, Senator McClean made a point about overtime. I do agree that like other companies and organisations, people find it humanly possible to give workers different rates of pay depending on the time they work — after 8 hours probably time and a half, after 12 hours probably double time. On this question of double time, I think that the rate of pay for domestics on days like Sundays and bank holidays and after a certain number of hours in any one day should be computed on the basis of double time. People are called upon to work on Sundays and they are paid in some instances the same weekly wage. In some instances I suppose people compute it as time and a half and that in itself should not be the case.

I previously alluded to the fact that one should not legislate people out of work and I still hold that view. Mr. President, I have no difficulty indeed in supporting this Bill.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. President, on a point of clarification, I am sorry that I accepted Senator Greaves' suggestion about the confinement and the time taken off work afterwards. I have read the law very carefully, and if a woman is told by a doctor that she would be confined on day X.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute Senator Reader, you cannot make another speech. If you want to say that something you said was not clear or was misrepresented, that is in order.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: What I want to say, Sir, is that a woman has no idea on what specific day she is going to be confined, and if she takes her time off, it may end up that she has only got three weeks at the end of the time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think that is what you said at the beginning.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: This is what I read out, and I know I have had women coming to me with the problem that they have nowhere to leave their babies, because even after six weeks, there is nowhere to leave them until they are three months old. That is the point of clarification. Thank you.

SENATOR St. C. E. HOWELL: Mr. President, I rise in support of this Bill, and I must start first of all by congratulating the Government for taking what Senator Hall described as a positive step in the right direction. Indeed, Sir, if the Minister had intimated at the beginning what was in fact the minimum wage thought of in this amendment, it could be a gigantic step.

I do not envisage much dissent in this Chamber as regards support for this Bill. The vast majority of us do realise that domestics, and I prefer to refer to them as domestics, — I sympathise with Senator McClean, but I think that regardless of whatever we call these dear ladies, we very snobbishly in our minds still think of them as domestics — do a very useful job, and I think it does not really matter what we call these people.

What really matters is that we pay them a decent wage for the work they do. I think that is what is important, I think that is the problem. It is not what you call them, treat them as decent people, human beings, who are coming in to our homes which enable us to go out and increase our own earnings. I think that is what is significant.

It is significant, Sir, to point out that by introducing the amendment to the existing legislation, that Government is, in fact, taking on the task of the unions. I do not say this, Sir, on a partisan basis because

before I wore a wig and a gown, I was a trade unionist. I was one for 20 years, Sir, and I do realise and to some extent do sympathise with the unions in this respect because this area is not the most easy area in the world to organise.

In every country in the world, there are certain categories of workers who, by their very nature, make it very difficult for trade union organizations to organise and therefore there is nothing unique about the difficulty faced by the unions of this country in organising domestic workers. What is unfortunate, however, is that the unions in this country, to my mind, have permitted the difficulty in organizing these workers to allow the workers to go their free way and organise other working groups where they are in a position to earn already high wages.

I think that the approach in this country as far as trade unions are concerned, Sir, should not be the same as in other countries — that is, if it is difficult, then it is best to leave them alone and leave it to the Government to do something for the people who are less able to defend themselves. Judges in this country adopt an attitude when they are assessing damages. Their approach in this — the fact that a particular matter would present some difficulty in the assessment of damages, does not deter them, nevertheless, from assessing the damages. There is always room for improvement and I think this is an approach that the unions can take. It is not going to be easy, but they should try to do something.

The reason why we are in a position now where another union has just come along and has decided on a minimum wage of something like \$140, if the media is correct, seems to me to be unrealistic. It would certainly increase the amount of marginal jobs in this area. I think it is quite easy for that union to do that because it does not have any real power at the moment. I think the existing unions do realise the difficulty in doing this, and therefore it is easy to say \$140. They can say \$200 because they are not given the problem of getting fragmented people around a table and trying to say, what do you feel as a result of your job description, or, what do you feel your minimum wage should be.

I would like to see a minimum wage of at least \$60 for these people. I think that the Minister should also take it upon himself to increase this amount from time to time, bearing in mind the increase in the cost of living. I think the inflationary factors should be taken into consideration and whatever figure you start at, be it \$60, that this figure should be reviewed quite often in order that you do not start at a minimum wage of \$50 or \$60 or whatever and then you do not look at it again for another five years.

I think that the Government must really be congratulated for taking it upon themselves to look after a section of people who are really in no position to organise themselves, and I hope that as time goes along they would continue to do so in other fields as well. Thank you.

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH: At first I was minded not to get involved in this because I know that it covers a very wide area and certainly can encourage a considerable amount of debate. But I am particularly glad to see that this Bill takes a step in the right direction simply because here we are dealing with one of the oldest professions, as it were, and we have not reached a point in time where we have, in effect, to legislate for certain conditions of service for people who have made such a significant contribution to this society. When I talked about a significant contribution, I am not talking only in terms where these people have been going into the homes and relieving prospective bread winners to go into other areas of activity in the society; I am talking about a profession which has contributed significantly to the standard of living in Barbados through those women who have gone abroad and worked in households under some very adverse conditions.

Now one Senator from the Opposition made mention of the fact that they were overseas and some of "the bread" is good, but I must take exception to that because I have been in the position where I had to deal with some problems affecting Barbadian domestics in the United States over a period of four years, and I must state categorically that working as a domestic in any environment is not a very easy thing.

Indeed, in the United States where Barbadian girls have gone to work in households, they have done it for the principal reason of trying to establish legal residence in the country of prospective adoption as it were. The people who employed them, knowing that they have come looking for sponsorship, seek to take advantage of them and I have had several cases in the Barbados Consulate where I have had to intervene to let employers know that Barbadian girls have their rights too.

Indeed, the most sparkling case I had just before I left New York was where one Barbadian girl, just before her employers were to sign the final form, was accused by them of stealing thousands and thousands of dollars worth of jewellery and they had her sign a confession. That is the kind of thing that goes on, so we must not fool ourselves that because they are working in a big country that there are better off.

What is significant is that while they are working in these big countries and they are going through degradation by working inordinately long hours, sometimes

sleeping in — as a matter of fact most of them are requested to sleep in — sometimes working until 10 or 11 o'clock at night and having to wake at 6 o'clock the next morning and start working, that they do not get a decent wage. I remember that Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm in 1972 had an amendment to the Minimum Wage Act in that year which brought domestics under the umbrella of the minimum wages. When they were brought under the Act, it was not that they were in effect benefiting because we find that most employers still found a way not to pay them a decent wage.

These girls have made their contribution. For instance, some of them have left this country and gone abroad and they have remitted cash to the point where it has really improved the living standards of their families here in Barbados to a significant level. They can be no gainsaying this and that is why I thought it important that the Government of Barbados in its offices overseas, ensured that these people worked under some of the best conditions obtainable, although it was very difficult to supervise that kind of working condition.

The other thing is this — those girls who worked and got sponsorship eventually, were able to bring their immediate families into their newly adopted country which again made it easier for those people in the extended family to make an additional contribution.

And what are we having here today? We have having a situation where we are talking about trying to control working conditions for people who in effect make such a significant contribution.

I am concerned that we have to have legislation to do this kind of thing, because when we start to analyse the job category of a domestic, what are we really dealing with? We are dealing with someone who comes into your home, someone in whom you have confidence, someone who may have to prepare your meals, as it were, someone who may have to share a lot of secrets — and they do share a lot of secrets — and again, someone who is subjected to considerable abuse. There is no denying that there are some very unscrupulous employers who in effect make advances to these unfortunate and unsuspecting women and on pain of keeping their jobs, they must in fact hand up, as it were. There is no denying this. (SENATOR W. W. HALL: Succumb is a better word.) I said hand up. This is a fact, Sir.

There is considerable talk about changing the nomenclature, as it were. While I agree with that, I am wondering if that would solve the problem. The most significant thing is to change the working conditions. We may be able to legislate for better wages or more reasonable working hours, but we cannot legislate for

attitudes. This is the problem you have to deal with and I think that it is important that we understand that these people who come into our homes, and who in effect make life very much easier for us, should be treated better than they have been treated in some homes. Indeed, I think that it is a difficult thing for unions to get involved in the organising of these workers because of the logistics of the situation.

I proposed at one time, when I was working overseas for the Government of Barbados, that because of the significant number of problems that these girls face working in these homes, what we should have been doing is trying to look at some type of contractual arrangement on a Government to Government basis where, in effect, there would be a greater impact and influence brought to bear on the employment conditions of these people. This was based on what I saw. I thought that if we could make provision for a Government to Government relationship just as we do with other international relationships, where say, a domestic could work for three years under contractual basis and then the option is there for sponsorship, that this would help alleviate the problems. Unfortunately, this suggestion was never taken hold of.

I dare say that there will be continuing debate, not only in this honoured Chamber, but all over the place on this whole question of working conditions of people who have to work in the household of people who need them. I think it is important that we continue this debate and we try and find ways and means of solving some of the most pressing problems affecting domestics. But one thing we must understand is that they play a very significant and critical role in the development of the country.

Thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Linton.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I thought I detected a note of surprise on your face when I rose to speak, not having spoken in this Honourable Chamber for some time now.

We are familiar, Mr. President, those of us who were in here during the last Session 1976-81, are all familiar with this type of legislation which comes before this Honourable Chamber from time to time where each Senator is afforded the opportunity to say something or the other. I would not go so far as Senator Greaves went to say that anything anyone says is nonsense. I do not think it is right to do that.

But we will be confronted with this sort of legislation from time to time because you see, Sir, it touches and concerns us all. It concerns some of us as politicians,

it concerns some of us as employers, it concerns some of us as persons with humanitarian spirits, in different ways, Sir, it touches and concerns each and every one of us and therefore, I can understand why it would give rise to such a prolonged debate; whether or not much of that debate is worthwhile is not for me to say.

I can however, understand though, Sir, that Senators, such as my good friend Senator Hall, for example, when he goes home this evening, would want to be satisfied and be sure that his two maids which another Senator says he was listening to the radio, would have heard that Senator Hall has been defending the cause of the domestic, the auxiliary helper, the maid, the servant, the home help — call it what you may, Mr. President, it is important that everybody gets in his say.

I have risen however, Sir, to make three essential points, which I think were omitted from the debate. The first relates to this question of the minimum wage which was called for by Senator Hall. That call, Sir, that clarion call for a minimum wage for domestics, whatever you call them, told me that obviously Senator Hall had not discussed his contribution with his colleague, Senator Greaves, in advance, because I would have expected that call to come from Senator Greaves. He being a leading member of the union should have been in the forefront of this battle cry for a minimum wage but he was mum on this subject.

And indeed, Sir, I go further. I state that if the Barbados Workers' Union led by Senator Greaves had been for some years calling for a minimum wage, BIGWU would not have got the spring that it has got now, and whether you like the leader of BIGWU as a political activist, whether we like him, Sir, as the legal representative for Maurice Bishop or what have you, you have to admire him, Sir. Regardless of the capacities in which we find it possible to hate him, we have to all stand up and admire him now and rather than the Barbados Workers' Union describing him or the union as a nuisance, whereas that same Barbados Workers' Union did not describe BIGWU as a nuisance when he came to their rescue and support during the discussions relating to the sugar workers, when BIGWU came out in support, although they came out in the voice of one Ladipu Salanki or something so, it was nonetheless BIGWU and they never referred to it as a nuisance, Sir, but now they can find it fit to refer to it as a nuisance.

They should come out and applaud the BIGWU for representing the workers at that level, Sir. I think they ought to be applauded because that whole question of bringing about a minimum wage level is not only tied up, Sir, with domestics, it is tied up with our industrial workers too. I read in the papers about two weeks ago

when this whole fracas with the industrial workers and the BWU and the BIGWU started, that some of those workers are working for \$60 a week. So, if we have industrial workers in the productive sector — not that domestics are not productive, they are productive in a different sort of a way — working for \$60 a week, it seems clear to me that the minimum wage applies to them, too.

I can do no better than to say that the Barbados Workers' Union has been lacking in its duty so far as those workers are concerned, not to mention the domestic workers at all. If it cannot, or will not organise the industrial workers who lend themselves more readily to an organisational structure, where will the Barbados Workers' Union get the will to organise the domestics?

We did not hear a word from Senator Greaves about this minimum wage that Senator Hall spoke so eloquently about. Mark you, Sir, Senator Hall has taken a difficult route, a dangerous route too, because the last two Senators who got over there and supported the Government found themselves out the next day. They got fired at Government Hill. If we wake up tomorrow and find that there is a meeting of the Democratic Labour Party at Government Hill and Senator Hall is not in here we should not be surprised. (SENATOR W. W. HALL: I will get another job, man).

So far as the minimum wage and the hiring of domestics is concerned, I want to support Senator McClean and Senator Reader in their calls for a tax credit in this regard. My colleague, Senator Trotman, reminded me that during the last Session this whole question of a tax credit in respect of domestics was raised by Senator MacKenzie. If I remember correctly, the Government was outvoted on that occasion, which shows that that suggestion has some merit, and also that it is not new. I want to support the Senators who raised the point, and I would hope that when the economy rights itself, when it is on a sound footing, as no doubt it will be again, Sir, that the Government will be in a position to give adequate consideration to this question of a tax credit to those persons who employ and pay domestics the minimum wage.

Most of all, Mr. President, the point which has struck me most forcibly, the point which most people in this country appear to have missed, is this — that from the time the Barbados Labour Party came to power it has embarked upon a series of social and humanitarian legislation of which this piece of legislation before us today simply falls part. Mr. Henry Forde, the former Attorney General, who now sits in the Other Place as a back bencher, is liked by half of the people in this island and he is hated by the other half, primarily because of the policies which he either introduced or sought to introduce

to benefit the women of the country. (SENATOR E. E. GRÉAVES: So he has divided the country, then).

Mr. President, this idea of the Barbados Labour Party setting out to help either women, deprived groups, or minorities in this country, is not new to this party — it is essential to the very philosophical fabric of the Barbados Labour Party.

In 1976, there was not one woman in the Barbados Fire Service. I passed a cane fire yesterday and saw the hoses, trucks and everything handled by women. Only the driver of the truck was a man, and I hope the time will come when women will be driving those trucks. For some time prior to 1976, a halt had been brought to the recruitment of women to the Royal Barbados Police Force, and the former Attorney General put a stop to that practice, and I am pleased to see as I go to the courts every day, the courts adorned by the presence of these beautiful female officers.

You yourself, Mr. President, may have witnessed the recent Passing Out Parade and the opening of the medical facility within the Defence Force, and I have no doubt, knowing you as I do, Sir, that you would have admired those beautiful women who were taking part in the parade — as I admired them too, and as I noticed Senator Barrow admiring them as well.

Sir, in all spheres of our activity, social and otherwise in this country since 1976, there has been an obvious and meritorious increase in the number of women who are being permitted to take part in the life of this country at every level. So, this piece of legislation is nothing new to the Barbados Labour Party, we have set out since 1976 to chart a course for the women of this country, so that they will indeed in truth and in fact be equal to their male counterparts. I know earlier we had a little bit of chauvinism from one of the female Senators with respect to another matter, but the point is the Barbados Labour Party has been consistent in this matter of making greater provision for the women of this country.

I have no doubt that Senator McClean's wish that the name be changed from domestic to auxiliary helper will materialise under the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. If it does not materialise by 1986 it will materialise between 1986 and 1990, because we have a long time to achieve these things. He did not call for a date, we will achieve them, Sir.

I understand from the speeches on the other side that the minimum wage proposed is \$66. I heard my friend Senator Howell talking about \$60, I hope it will be \$66. I hope that the hours will be so controlled that they do not have to work all sorts of odd hours, but I have no

doubt that under the able guidance of the Minister responsible, the Minister under whose portfolio that area falls, it will be ensured that the women are protected, because he too is one of the Ministers who have been in the forefront of the battle for the proper recognition of women so that women could achieve the natural fulfillment of their lives within the society as we know it.

Consequently, Sir, although this piece of legislation has been laboured, I know each Senator wants to hear his name in the news espousing the cause of the domestics. I regret very much that the Barbados Workers' Union representative sitting in the Senate did not see it fit to call for this minimum wage level and it had to be left to Senator Hall who knows little or nothing about it, but nonetheless I appreciate the reasons.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, let us be serious about this. I object very much to a conundrum like Senator Linton telling me I do not know anything about industrial relations. I object to that and I wish that he would withdraw it.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I withdraw that, Sir. Senator Hall knows something about industrial relations.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us keep it on the amicable basis we had all the time.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Fair enough, Sir. I however question his judgment about domestics. I welcome the discussion that we have had on this Bill. I also, like Senator Howell, want to congratulate the Government on bringing forward this piece of legislation so early in this term. I welcome it as another piece of social legislation which is designed to benefit the female of the species in our society, and I hope that the ladies whom it is proposed to benefit primarily, will recognise it for what it is worth, and that the Barbados Labour Party will be the recipients of their goodwill in return when the time comes. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, in a general way Senators agreed with the Bill and there seems to be little need for me to reply, except to Senator McClean who raised some specific questions, for example, the definition of day time and night time.

The Employment (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act which endorses an ILO Convention to do with hours of duty sets out night as 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. I believe maybe 10 p.m. in some places is not so dark and maybe that might have influenced the time limit. We have adjusted it in the two Acts in Barbados. In the Employment (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, it is 9 p.m. to 7 a.m. as night, and we have a separate definition in the Domestics Act, so in

fact what the local law has done is to in some way try to localise the International Convention, but nevertheless they had been keeping the International Convention as their general guideline.

Whereas Senator McClean and most of us would agree that domestics seem to do various kinds of jobs at different kinds of levels, the question of job definition in the household setting is not an easy business as to who is a cook, for then we have enquiries as to if you are a qualified cook or an unqualified cook, and whereas these things are desirable, they are not easily achieved because of the kind of setting in which domestics find themselves working. Some people do laundering and some don't; some do some laundering and some cooking, and the question of job classification could not be an easy exercise in that situation.

As Senator Linton said — he made one good point — this question of tax credits was raised in an earlier debate when Senator McKenzie used to sit in that very chair that Senator McClean is in, so it seems as if tax credits and that chair have something in common. It has been considered by the Government as a result of our raising it here, and the question of tax credits for gardeners came into effect, and I believe we should probably remind the Minister of Finance that the Senate is still concerned about tax credits for domestics as a way to encourage people to pay better wages, etc.

On the question of the unions not organising domestics, I appreciate the unions problems. It is now established that there are certain categories of workers which are difficult to organise. I am not carrying any flags for Senator Greaves, I do not ever propose to do that, but there are difficulties in organising shop assistants, domestics and workers where you have one or two workers working for a single employer. As a result in the shop assistants categories and certain other areas, the Wages Council Act comes into play and Wages Council Orders are made in respect of those workers.

The domestics are not covered by the Wages Council, and so it is necessary to have separate and independent legislation to take care of domestics. So we need not worry to knock Senator Greaves too hard for allowing BIGWU to get into the area of domestics and these other areas.

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 went into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the specifics of this Clause 2, I notice here that there is a proposed amendment to the Short Title of the Bill and this amendment retains reference to domestic employee. We did discuss this point in general terms on the second reading, but I notice that the Minister did not refer to it in his remarks. I take this as an indication that Government would be thinking about the matter further. As such there are one or two points that I would want to add to this further consideration which I presume the Government would be giving to this point.

Essentially, based on the contributions of some other Senators, it seems as though people are believing that the suggestion of a change of name is a substitute for a change of attitude. That was not the intention at all. The idea is that a change of name can facilitate a change of attitude because there is nothing more powerful than words, and words take on particular connotations because of the historical experiences which the people using those words have gone through. The word "domestic" itself does have a meaning for Barbadians, at least certain sections of Barbadians — those who are employing domestics, and for others too, but they are the ones who are more severely concerned and it is not perhaps a mere chance that domestics do not go and join some of these high-flying women's organisations. If you call them something else, maybe they might not be so hesitant.

Again, it is not so much a question of what any particular Senator including myself likes. We ourselves have to be sensitive to the feelings of the community, and it is more important for us to try to understand how the people that matter in relation to this terminology feel about it. It is not a matter of whether I like the term or not. I know that other people do not like it and they are the people who are directly and personally involved, and as such I feel that one should give expression to their feelings in the matter.

You will remember that an earlier Barbados Labour Party Government in 1961, when the particular parent Act was introduced, addressed the very point about the styling given to such workers. They were called domestic servants in those days and the idea was that you wanted to get away from the idea of "servant", so you had "domestic employees", but the offending word is not "servant" because you have civil servants. The offending word was "domestic" which remains, but they are still domestic or domestic servants although you call them domestic employees.

I am saying, therefore, that in supporting this amendment I am only supporting it at the level of a direct consequential amendment to the Act given the extension of the Act, but I would not be supporting the specifics of it in terms of the idea that we call people domestic employees.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I had noted it, but somehow I slipped the question of the change of name. First of all let me take a slight difference with my friend, Senator McClean. I do believe that the offending thing in "domestic servant" was "servant" because I believe that whereas "civil servant" has one prestige about it, "domestic servant" has another, and it was not the domestic end of it in my opinion, because I believe that the domestic servant came out of the old master and servant arrangement and people did not want to be called "servant" in relation to the master and servant arrangement that went before. Whereas the plantation owner, or whatever he was, had servants at the house, people wanted to get away from that term.

The position on the name of the Act is not a strong thing with the Government as to what it is called, except that our toying with the naming of the Act could result in delays, because we then open ourselves as to what shall we call it.

We can call it a Maids Act but some employers would say, "but my maid cooks so she is not a maid", so we can call it a Cook Act. We say these things loosely about auxiliary housekeepers but a housekeeper has a particular job description which some of the people who work in households could never meet and so we can end in all kinds of confusion. So it is better to have regulations for their pay and hours organised than to get ourselves delayed because of the splitting of hairs as to what we should call the Act. That is our general approach on that.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: I beg to move that the Senate now resumed 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'BRIEN TROTMAN, the Bill was read a second time and passed.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1982

The Sixth Order of the Day was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Occupational Training Act, 1979.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, the Occupational Training Act provides for the establishment of a National Training Board for financing of the Board, and it sets out the duties which the Board is obligated to do for the young people of Barbados in terms of training them in skills and making them useful citizens.

In the last Budgetary Proposals, the Minister of Finance proposed that the Board be financed in part by contributions to be deducted by the National Insurance Board in the way that other levies which are collected by that Board are paid over to the appropriate fund.

The Bill therefore seeks to amend the Parent Act to provide for the National Training Fund into which the monies collected from the levies can be paid, and it is supposed, Sir, that the funds so collected be used for the financing of skills training, the non-military National Service in the Defence Force, the provision of a revolving fund to be used by employers for training programmes and even, Sir, for the financing of supervisory management employers through BIMAP.

Since we were amending the Act to provide for that, opportunities were also taken to provide for the raising of the limit for apprenticeship from age 15 to 16 in view of the new provisions under the Education Act for education to age 16. It also places responsibility on apprentices to prove their physical fitness before they can be taken on as apprentices.

I move that the Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, this is not a controversial piece of legislation. I would like to say that on the outset. Indeed, I very well recall that in the Lower House when this matter was discussed, and even before that, that calls were made for closer attention to be paid to this whole question of skills training, occupational training — call it what you wish.

I made a contribution in the Lower House when the original Bill was introduced and I really do not intend to repeat that except to reinforce the point which I made then — that the question of training in skills and various occupations is of fundamental importance to our national development and it is quite clear that we have to be able to devise a policy and a programme towards this particular activity. I think one of the areas of concern — and I certainly would hope that the Hon. Minister who

has introduced this Bill, Senator Trotman, would give us some indication — is what approach the Government is using towards the whole rationalisation of training in this country.

Now as I recall, for example, in the area of occupational training, in areas that could be identified, what do you have? You have a National Training Board which, generally speaking looks after the training of people in area of skills. Then you have, I think, a Skills Training Programme in Community Development — if Senator Trotman does not know, there is — I think Lomer Alleyne is in charge of that — and then you have the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic at another level and, of course, in our secondary schools, we have the Industrial Arts wings.

It would seem to me, Sir, that there might be areas of duplication, and whereas one would not seek to reduce the opportunities which are available to our young people, and indeed our not so young people, to have access training and development of skills, one must make the point that the time has come when some proper strategy towards the problem of training must be worked out with a view to what appears at the present moment to be some duplication and possible lack of direction. I think there is a need for a tightening-up in this particular area and I believe that the Hon. Minister should be able to give us some general indication as to what the Government's thinking is on this particular matter.

But not only should there be a concentration on providing opportunities for young people, we have to also recognise that attention will have to be given to setting up retraining programmes. In this age of technological change and rapid industrialisation, there will be situations arising where a number of people, through the very technological changes which I have just referred to, will find themselves out of a job and will, therefore, have to undergo some kind of retraining to allow them to continue to be productive persons within the society. I would hope that this particular point is not lost sight of because I could cite a number of areas where there will be a need for this, and we ought to be given the benefit of the comprehensive thinking of the Government in this particular area.

Relative at least to the amendment which we have before us and the establishment of the fund — unfortunately, I cannot remember the exact date but, I think it goes back to somewhere about 1973 or 1974, certainly Hansard will show that when I was a Member of the Lower House, in one of my presentations down there I had suggested that this is a direction in which we should go — that a levy should be established which would be devoted directly to the whole question of training, and I remember distinctly being taken to task by one of the columnists in the Advocate who goes under pen name of

ELC., nom de-plume of ELC — whosoever he or she may be. (Laughter)

The point is that it is not a new thing in the question of training and I would think that any effort in this particular direction be supported, and as you would quite rightly see, we do not see any controversy in this. We are at one in this particular area because I think that both parties, the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party, recognise the importance of this particular activity for national development. Indeed, I could recite the fact that when this aspect of training fell under the Ministry of Education, I think there was a study which was done by Dr. Oxtoby. He came out to Barbados and did a study on the whole range of training activities in Barbados and made certain recommendations to the then Government and as I recall, it generally accepted that the Bill which eventually emerged included a number of the recommendations and certainly thoughts, generally speaking, of the then Administration on this particular area. We are not at war on this particular bit of legislation.

What I would like to find out on this, Sir, is that I notice that on page 10 Section 12 (e), talk about the fund and the purposes for which the fund may be used — for financing the training of programmes organised by the National Training Board, the Ministry of Labour and by any other organisation approved by the Minister responsible for Finance. Also, under (e) — financing supervisory management and small business training programmes conducted by the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity.

I pause here, Sir, to make a point which I would hope the Government would take into consideration. It is a point which I have made in the Other Place and which I will make again here today, and when the Estimates come around, I will make the point again, because I believe firmly that it is an important one. The point is about this whole question of training, management training, which seems to occupy the attention of Governments to such an extent that they make all sorts of provisions for the training of management within our society.

Now, there are many aspects to management and you can have the best trained managers in any industrial situation, but if workers are not trained to — not necessarily to the level of the management, but certainly to a level where they can understand the ramifications of the industrial relations situation, and certainly have some firm grasp on our society and how it functions, then you can get all sorts of difficulties placed in the way of our development in terms of the whole question of industrial harmony and industrial peace.

I recall making allusion to the fact that in 1968 the then President of the United States of America set up a Commission on Labour Education in that country, and when that Commission reported, one of the very first things that they said was that the education of workers is as important as the education of doctors, lawyers, dentists, agriculturalists and the whole range of professional people. You can have some of the best trained engineers in the world, some of the best architects but if you do not have people who are involved in getting in the nuts and bolts, understanding the system and certainly having some way of being able to relate at a level that they can feel confident about, then you are going to get a whole set of industrial dislocations and certainly, no country can develop when you have a whole set of industrial dislocations.

I think one of the major contributors to what stability there is existing in this society has been the almost total absence of industrial dislocations when one compares our situation with our sisters in the Caribbean and indeed, if you go further afield. And, I believe, Sir, that one of the factors responsible for this is the very responsible position which has been taken by the Barbados Workers' Union in terms of providing an opportunity for the membership of that organisation to be exposed to a basic grounding in the trade union movement and in industrial relations practise in this country.

So that when I read the provisions of this legislation, and see that BIMAP is mentioned — it is not that I have anything against BIMAP, Sir, — I believe that the institution which has been created by the Barbados Workers' Union — the Labour College — does just as much a useful job in this particular area as indeed BIMAP and ought to be given some recognition in terms of being mentioned in the legislation as one of the institutions which benefit from this particular fund. I believe that Senator Trotman will reply to the effect that under the Ministry of Education, you would probably see a grant to the Barbados Workers' Union Labour College of \$20 000. I am aware of all of that, Sir, but if my memory serves me correct, I think that BIMAP also gets money from the Industrial Development Corporation. The IDC every year does provide some financing to BIMAP and this would now be another source of financing.

I believe, as I said, that an institution like the Labour College ought to be benefitting in a greater way than it is benefitting at present. I would want to hear the Minister on this particular point. I said I feel that that institution should be mentioned and certainly should get the opportunity also to get some funds from this particular area, because we are involved in a serious aspect of training which takes on national importance.

The reply might very well be that if you look under (f) of page 11, "financing any other training activity approved by the Minister responsible for Finance," that might very well be the answer. The point I am making is that if you mention BIMAP in this regard — and I know sometimes Governments hesitate to name institutions as BIMAP has been named — I feel that the Labour College should also be mentioned and should also be allowed to make representation from this particular fund. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, in rising to support this Bill, I would first like to say that when the Skills Training Programme was initially set up, even at that point in time it was recognised that at some point in time it would have to be incorporated into a larger scheme. I think the time has come when we have to look at occupational training as such in more macro concepts. The Skills Training Programme has been successful over that period of time. Since it was in operation we have trained approximately 700 people, we have been able to get as high a figure as 90 percent job placement, and people now are able to work as a result of skills training for figures as high as \$150 a week.

The Act in itself is attempting to revamp the old apprenticeship scheme which previously came under the Ministry of Education and now is going to fall under the Ministry of Labour, where it should have fallen in the first place. The previous Administration used a more institutionalised approach to occupational training. They preferred to go for something like the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, and while I am not saying that the polytechnic itself does not serve its purpose, you will find that there are certain criteria laid down in terms of entry qualifications, and any time you have a system where you have entry qualifications, it will ultimately eliminate a particular individual or a particular group. To make sure, as Senator Hall would say, that the working class individual is not left out of such a programme, the Occupational Training Act becomes absolutely necessary.

The system obviously is less costly than something like the polytechnic. Such an institutional approach costs a lot of money — the polytechnic runs into millions — and this system that we have had cost very little to operate. Yes, we have paid those individuals who participated a stipend which took care of bus fare and lunch, and we hope under the new Occupational Training Act that again we will be able to pay the trainees a figure somewhat bigger than that.

Senator Greaves referred to the grants that will be made. I want to say that not only will those grants be made to BIMAP, but the amending legislation will also take care of grants to be made to employers who put on relevant programmes, what we would call approved training programmes.

The point that interested me very much was one Senator Trotman alluded to earlier — that it also provided for a non-military National Service Scheme. What I hope would happen would be for Government not only to touch the surface of a non-military National Service Scheme, but to create the framework where the character of the individual could be formed via that scheme. We still have a few remnants and trappings of colonialism. Such a service would completely eliminate this. It would see both the doctors and the lawyers, and as Senator Hall would say, the average man in the street, all involved in national service where we would all become equal. At some point in time we would all do the same jobs, we would not have the situation where time and time again people would make derogatory comments about a man standing propping on a hoe, because he cannot appreciate the fact that the same kind of work becomes routinised and there are no motivating factors involved. A national training service would eliminate that kind of attitude.

We have also had the situation where people have certain fads. I do not believe that there are true Rastas in this country. We do not have in this country the dynamics for social change. People do not have that consciousness and awareness — they look for trappings from outside and that is why we have the so called Rastas. We do not have the economic conditions in Barbados which prevailed in the 1930s which gave rise to Rastafarianism, but I am saying that a National Service Scheme would make sure that the character of the individual is fashioned so that he has a certain consciousness.

In terms of our culture, we do not have any cohesion in terms of a culture. One of the good things that a National Service Scheme would do is to create in us the attitude that we must produce, and productivity is a very, very important thing for any developing country and the youth have got to understand that they have got to produce.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I hope Government seriously looks at the National Training Scheme which comes as a consequence of this Bill. Thank you.

SENATOR Mrs. M. O. REECE: Mr. President, I rise in support of this Bill. There is just one point I want to make. I believe that the composition of this Board is predominantly male. I would like to know, if the Minister can tell me, what is the life of the Board and if he could find it fit at the end of that time to see that a woman, maybe the Director of Women's Affairs or somebody, could be put on that Board. That is the only point I want to make, Sir.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Mr. President, any measure which seeks to train young people in this coun-

try and particularly those from a certain underprivileged group is bound to receive my support. As to the funding and so forth, I do not want to go into that. I believe that has been fairly well covered by Senator Greaves.

There are only a couple of points I would like to make about the amendment to the existing Act. Sir, one of the things that I could never understand, and it is probably because I myself had walked that way before, is that whereas in this country as well as in developed countries, England for example, it has always been possible to train a graduate at a University in three years, the traditional period in terms of apprenticeship schemes has always been five years. Under the principal legislation, the 1979 Act, I think that period had been reduced by one year to four years, but even today, Sir, in England if one thinks in terms of the various trades, the printing industry for example, an apprenticeship scheme can last as long as six years. I could never understand this. I think it is a little offensive to the intelligence of some of the young people in our various apprenticeship schemes, so I must welcome the amendment to Section 4 of the principal Act where the period of training has been reduced from four years to three years. I think that is certainly a step in the right direction. I even think that the period basically of three years can be made even shorter.

As I understand the Occupational Training Act, this is going to be a more comprehensive type of training. In the present Skills Training Programme, I think the average period for training young persons lasts about six months. That to my mind was very wise as a sort of short term effort because over the last five years or so in this country we had experienced a boon particularly in the building industry, and at the same time there was a scarcity of skilled people to carry out the work in that particular industry. One of the main reasons given for this is that in the Fifties, particularly the mid Fifties, many of our skilled people emigrated to England, Canada and the United States and there has been no replacement, or at least not sufficient, to match the outflow from that industry.

Unfortunately what we do have in this country today is a number of intelligent young people leaving school, but it does not appear as though there are sufficient facilities for training these people on a two or three year basis to put them into the building industry. At the same time we have a building boon that is somewhat balked because of the scarcity of this skilled labour, and a lot of the labourers in this industry, although we welcome it, are people from countries other than Barbados. I think this piece of legislation is a step in the right direction, because it is a true saying that home drums must beat first, and if we are going to continue to develop this country, then each and every industry must be catered for appropriately, and it is incumbent upon Government to train the young people in this country in every sphere.

I think the building industry is the one industry in this country that is crying out for young people to be trained, and I would like the Government to continue this not only in that industry but in other industries too. Get our young people off the streets. Get them into the institutions or create some sort of intermediate training facilities not necessarily the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, not necessarily the Skills Training Programme that would last for six months, but something in the middle that could take the youngsters off the streets and give them a proper training so that they can earn money. I beg to support the Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Senator Greaves raised the question of possible duplication of training. The Government is quite aware of the point he has raised. In fact when he thought I was not with him, I was trying to help him along by mentioning the Community College and other programmes — but he thought I was not following him. There are several institutions carrying on various training programmes, and the Government is aware of the fact that there seems in some areas to be slight overlapping and it is not without notice. We have the Community College apparently overlapping in some areas with the Polytechnic, the Polytechnic in some areas overlapping with the Skills Training etc.

There is one point that we have to remember, however, and it is that whereas we have the National Training Board and the Skills Training Programme doing their apprenticeship and short term programmes, we are also committed to institutional industrial education at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic.

I heard from this side that we are going to all become one and do the same job. That comes from the Senator from St. John. I hope that does not happen because if all of us start doing the same job, there is going to be a real manpower problem in Barbados. I hope that what will happen is that the various institutions with their various efforts, whether it be through institutional education at the Polytechnic or the Community College or through the Skills Training Programme which has 11 or 12 centres going, will eventually be able to train enough Barbadians to take up a lot of the vacancies which are going abegging in this country.

It is unfortunate, Sir, that a lot of our training apparently is aimed at lower and middle income jobs, and every day I see persons who are non-nationals having to be granted work permits to do the better paid jobs because in the hotel school we train waiters, we train barmen, but we do not train hotel managers, and the whole question of training in industry will have to be examined very carefully to ensure that we do not train and overtrain at one level and completely ignore training at a higher level which is just as important.

The Workers' Union College made a very passionate plea through its Principal for inclusion under the Bill, but if the Principal of the Labour College had looked carefully, he would have noticed not only does the Bill say that the funds will be used for the financing of other training activities, but it also says in (b) – "for financing the training programmes organised by approved organisations." So that there are two avenues left wide open for the Principal of the Labour College to make representations to the Minister of Finance for his funding, and that will take care of his problem. I do not think he need worry too much about that.

I was not here, Sir, but apparently some question was raised about the Board as to whether it was male or female. The Women's Lib apparently are questioning why the Board is male but unfortunately it is one of those Boards on which the Minister does not nominate people. The Board is a representative Board. The people are nominated by the Employers Confederation, the Sugar Producers, the Barbados Workers' Union and other organisations, and therefore the Ministry is not responsible for people who come to the Board.

One would assume that the Board members are the representative of their organisation, so the Minister can no more say to an organisation to send a woman or to send a man, otherwise the whole point of asking for a recommendation from the organisation is dead. If the Ministry can say to the union to send a woman on the National Training Board, then somebody will soon start saying that we can send Senator Greaves to the Other Place – and we are not going to do that. The women would just have to be contented with equality on this occasion. They either win the election or they lose the election.

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, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

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 motions of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION ACT, 1982

The Eight Order of the Day was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to revise and consolidate the law relating to public parks, beaches and caves and related matters.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this Bill is a little longer than those before us. If anything, in its objectives, it is at least as simple and perhaps even simpler than most of what has been before us.

The Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party of 1981 foresaw the amalgamation of the Parks and Beaches and the Caves Authority. In bringing about this amalgamation, you will notice, Sir, from the framework of this Bill that the opportunity has been taken to treat the necessity to have a general service commission rather than simply bringing the two together. So, we find in this Bill matters which relate to the wider environmental purpose such as the protection of historical sites and monuments, and you will also find a few things in the Bill more clearly drawn than they were in the previous existing legislation.

In short, Sir, if we recall what was to be found in the Parks and Beaches legislation and what was to be found in the Caves Authority legislation, we would have to add a new dimension by looking at that part of the legislation which add the dimension of cultural protection to the general area of environmental legislation.

If we look, Sir, at that section of the legislation dealing with the two functions, Section 5, you will find, Sir, among the functions, "The Commission may upon a request being made to it in writing, clean, maintain or develop the lands

(a) in the possession of any person; or

(b) comprising a cemetery or other burial place of a church"

It goes on to talk about when work is done by the Commission:

"The Commission may subject to provisions of the Regulations charge a fee for the work done".

And then, it goes on to talk about the arrangements for advising the Minister – it was before that, (h) on page 6: "to advise the Minister generally on areas to be declared as caves under Section 3 and sites, buildings or monuments of national interest designated by the Minister under this Section,".

It is that particular provision that gives the key to what is different in this Act when we just take the provisions of the previous two Acts.

There are some of us, Sir, who are acutely aware of the academic activities of a Mr. Jerry Handler who took away some very valuable artifacts from the old slave cemetery at Newton and there was no legislation in place really to deal with the point. It is inconceivable that after this legislation, that that cemetery should not be declared a place of national and historical interest and therefore get the protection which can be given under this Act.

I would like incidentally to inform the Honourable Senate that all was not lost in the hands of Mr. Handler. He brought back some of the stuff, a lot of the stuff, indeed, he brought it back in a form in which it would be of greater value to educational and cultural purposes than it would have been if it had just been left there anyway. Not that I am defending in any way his taking it away. All I am saying is we were able to negotiate some of it back. A number of people in the Museum took the position that they had to fight and get these things back and it meant that Mr. Handler got a trip back to Barbados at the expense of the Museum, but the Museum was able to win back important artifacts relating to our cultural heritage.

That, Sir, is an extremely important thing to me because we cannot just perceive this as a Commission to protect and develop parts of the beaches, a Commission to protect and develop caves, a Commission to protect and develop other areas of the environment, we have to see the thing as a whole and recognise that there is a national conservation purpose to which legislation must give effect.

Specifically, Sir, in relation to this Bill, there is one other thing, Sir, which I want to mention. It is this — that there are some areas in the law in which the preservation of things of great cultural value can be achieved other than through direct legislation.

This, of course, was the point demonstrated a few months back, almost a year ago, I believe — no, it is just a few months back — when within my Ministry, the decision was taken to put furniture on the list for which one would be required to have an export licence, the reason being that if we are not careful, young people will grow up in this society without any idea whatever of some of the most important crafts that were available to the society and without examples of the work done by distinguished Barbadian craftsmen.

In the same way that we have to think in terms of the output of craftsmen to the importance of preserving skills within the society, in that same way the very basis of the culture from which people draw inspiration must be protected. So, I see this legislation as being part of the general movement in relation to cultural preservation and cultural development, and therefore, it is with a feeling of pleasure that I introduce this Bill this afternoon.

The other thing I would wish to say, Sir, is that it was drawn to my attention that Clause 5 (1) (g), where we talk about the functions of the Commission, says:

“to advise the Minister on the removal of coral from the ocean bed or any other thing the removal of which might cause the encroachment of the sea.”

Not being a Marine Biologist, I am not in a position to say that my interpretation is correct, but proceeding, Sir, on the basis that the intention must have been for a general protection of marine life, I get the feeling, Sir, that the instructions to the draftsman must have described marine life only in terms of its value for preventing the encroachment of the sea, because here it is a reference to things from the sea bed. It is a specific protection of coral, because we are talking about advising on “the removal of coral from the ocean bed or any other thing, the removal of which might,” *et cetera*, and since coral and other things, the removal of which might cause the encroachment — put together obviously — it is a very limited way of looking at coral in that we are looking at it in terms of its function for this purpose.

I believe, Sir, that all of us in here know that black coral fetches very high prices and no public educational job — and I put the word, “public” before “educational”, Sir, so that it would be clear that I am referring to the role and responsibilities of the Minister of Information and of the Minister of Education — has yet been done to instill in people’s minds what is happening to coral every time some diver comes up and makes a good sale of black coral, having raped the sea bed, and what are the dangers of this kind of activity. Of course, when you make these points, people say you want to stop somebody from making a living, but — I am afraid the national good is what has to be taken into consideration.

All in all, Sir, I believe that it is not necessary for me to go through this Bill in any kind of detail. It is, as I said, a direct and simple Bill. A lot that appears here was in one or, the other of the two Bills. The two things, that I am aware of that are new are the historic sites and monuments and so on, and the other the transitional provisions that those who were working with one or either Commissions would enjoy a state of continued employment. In other words, if there is any decision that X or Y is not to continue in employment, then that would be a decision on severance which would have to be taken care of in the normal way. But what is being done here, is that there is a general protection given to the jobs of those who work with one or either Commission.

There is, Sir, just one final thing I want to say and it is this — whereas we are fairly clear as to what the Parks and Beaches Commission does, the Caves Commission is a newer Commission and not everybody has had the opportunity to go to visit Harrison’s Cave yet. I must say, Sir, I had the pleasure of doing that on

Boxing Day and I enjoyed it. There are other people who went and got caught in some of the teething problems and, therefore, their experience would not be as pleasant as mine.

You would remember that the Cave was opened one Saturday afternoon and that — on the very next day, a newspaper in this country, Sir, I believe it is called the "Sunday Sun" — lit all Barbados up with the information that the cave was losing money. I do not know how they knew that so early, Sir, but the information which we have is that since its opening to the public on 1st December, 1981 — indeed, I may add that the day on which the publication informed the public that the cave was losing money, the cave had not yet been opened to the public — Harrison Cave has realised income for the three month period December to February of \$232,314.85 with 33,000 paying visitors touring the cave. This year the cave, which employs about 30 people, is budgeted to bring in three quarters of a million dollars in revenue and to incur expenditure of about \$650,000.

The Parks and Beaches which has 96 monthly paid workers and 374 weekly paid workers has a unit comprising on average 100 persons exclusively employed on the commercial programme of the Commission. These are the people who landscaped the Grantley Adams International Airport and who are doing the landscaping at the Heywoods Project.

The Commission in its commercial programme also undertakes work for private persons and for private businesses, so that those Senators who have been complaining about not being able to get anybody to come and do their elaborate gardens for them, at least they know that they can turn to Parks and Beaches who will only be too happy to provide this service in its commercial programme.

I should also like to say a little bit about the capital expenditure on the caves. The project which started in 1975 incurred a total capital expenditure of \$4 743 696.73 over a full four year period.

There are, in the main, two organisations. One of them is not only of great value to our culture and a great boon to Barbadians and to Barbados generally, but within the context of tourist development has the potential to be a money spinner. The other one is a great environmental agency of the State and it has been now spread out into a commercial programme which enables it to do an even wider service. Now, added to these two, we have dimension of the protection, preservation and general enhancement of that part of the cultural heritage which is to be seen through the preservation of national sites and monuments. The Ministry which is responsible for this Commission is the Ministry of Lands, which is also the Ministry to which the National Trust relates.

In closing I wish to say one thing — that I would hope that those who will advise the Minister of Lands in the declaration as to what is a national site worthy of preservation will not make the same mistake which the National Trust makes — and which CBC a few Sundays ago in what was an otherwise good programme made — which is to believe that stately houses — and I admit they have moved away from the stately stone houses also to some of the more distinguished wooden houses — are the only buildings of cultural heritage in this country and of historical significance. In St. Lucy at least, there are to be found slave huts, and I do not understand how people can talk about a National Trust programme relating to buildings and behave as though the slave huts are none of our business. So I would hope that those who are going to advise the Minister of Lands will take into consideration the need to have a rather more careful view of these matters than the National Trust has so far been able to impress upon the minds of the local public.

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

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to welcome this Bill, and there are a number of points which I would like to raise. The Leader of the Senate in fact did touch on the first one I had in mind, which was, although the Commission was expected to conserve the natural beauty, the topographical features, historical sites and monuments, there was no mention as to who were to designate them, and the designation of these things, especially historical buildings, is really in the heart and mind of the kind of person who is designating.

For example, the slave hut is a fairly obvious illustration in point, but there is another one, and that is the chattel house. The Barbados chattel house is a unique example of what architecture really means, that is, a marriage of a dwelling, a building, to the society which gives it birth and for the purposes for which it was developed. It is really quite unique in its suitability to the environment and the history of Barbados. The history of sugar, the history of the plantation system is really seen very clearly in the chattel house. More than one person, especially Barbadians outside of Barbados, will regard the chattel house as something which ought to be preserved in its entirety. In fact, I foresee the day when it will become very chic and perhaps very very classy to live in a chattel house. It will have gone full circle.

I would simply draw to your attention that chattel houses do not need air conditioning, to make the point of the marriage between architecture and the environment.

The second point I would like to make, referring to the Minister's point about antique furniture — and in a

way this has some relation to the Bill we have just discussed — is that while everybody is trying to collect antique furniture as they can afford it, nobody is really preserving the design and the craft of it. It would be a good thing if such occupational skills as we perceive we need should include an apprenticeship system, because the manufacture of antique furniture cannot be done *en masse*, and the apprentices would be able to continue the work of the master craftsmen. It is not something that can come off a production line, and I would really like to see some of the skills which still exist with the old craftsmen passed on by the apprenticeship system. As is often the case things get respect outside of their context much more rapidly than they do at home.

The Bill makes a great point on several occasions of the danger to beaches and coasts by erosion, and the Bill provides for a lot of steps to be taken to prevent this. It makes little or no mention of pollution, and although anti-pollution measures can be implied in some of the texts, the pollution of our water and our beaches is too important to be implied. I think it ought to be stated very clearly.

Marine life between Rockley and the West Coast is absolutely dead. It died in ten years, and it was forecast. Ten years ago you could see fish swimming in that Careenage — now, no fish swim, so I think pollution should be precisely mentioned and made a charge on the people who are going to operate this Act.

The next point is regarding the removal of coral from the ocean bed. This matter is really subsumed in what I have already said because it is erosion and encroachment which is mentioned in Clause 5(g)(iii), but the life is dying.

The Minister mentioned a film, a work which CBC is doing, and a week or so ago the Stavronikita exercise was shown. Now one of the people who figured in that film whose picture was seen was a young man, and I have no hesitation to mention his name because not much is known about him and he has done remarkable work. He is a young American Peace Corps volunteer who figured in the film and he assures me that the marine life is in great danger of complete extinction not only by pollution but by the souvenir hunters, visitors to our shores with the most modern sophisticated diving equipment who just go and really pirate the sea bed, so that they are in fact destroying precisely what makes the sea-bed attractive. I would like to be assured by the Minister that the Bill which we are now about to pass has sufficient teeth to deal with that kind of pillage and piracy. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I rise just to make a couple of points following from what Senator Wickham said. Firstly to deal with pollution, I do not

think this Act is designed to deal with pollution at sea at all, as indeed it cannot, because it would be necessary to change the concept of the National Conservation Commission altogether. It simply does not have the resources to do that sort of thing. Parks and Beaches never did it, the Caves never did it, and this is just a merger of the two organisations with, as Senator Barrow said, the additional responsibility of looking after historical sites, monuments and things of that sort.

Pollution is too big a matter to be dealt with by any National Conservation Commission except that body in itself becomes a very big body. At the moment, what few measures we can undertake to grapple with the problem of pollution, which incidentally is an international problem, are conducted by the various Ministries — the Ministry of Housing and Lands in conjunction with the Port Authority and the Harbour Master — and I believe that the Coast Guard now plays a useful part in assisting with pollution at sea. We in Parks and Beaches assist in our small way when it comes ashore by providing baskets and hoes for people to rake up what we call the tar. That is the limit of the contribution which we can make because we do not have boats and we do not have the advance technology that is required. I do not think that the National Conservation Commission will be saddled with that sort of technology either.

In any event, I do believe that the responsibility for controlling marine pollution ought to reside within the bosom of a different body altogether. It is a very large operation in itself.

As far as the question of removing living bodies from the sea bed or other bodies which can give rise to the encroachment of the sea is concerned, I think that particular piece of legislation — I think it is Section 5(h) — to do with the removal of coral was deliberately put in to tackle the specific problem of coral, because we already have legislation on the Statute Book to deal with the preservation of other marine areas such as the Underwater Park and any other such area which may be declared an underwater park, and the living organisms and sea life which would be found there. So that sort of protection is already in existence outside the scope of this Act, and to my mind, it was not necessary at all to incorporate these provisions in an Act such as this.

On the problem relating to coral, at the moment certain studies are being carried out in this island, I believe with assistance from the United Nations or some other aid donor country, into the effect of the removal of coral from the sea bed and the movement of the sea, the movement of sands and rock formations and this sort of thing, and consequently almost nobody in Barbados is in any full possession of the facts relating to the effect

which the removal of the coral from the sea bed has on the sea environment.

As a result, the Parks and Beaches Commission on its own initiative, Mr. President, has refused to issue licences to vendors of beach coral. In so doing it was felt that that would at least curtail or reduce the incidence of the cutting of the sea bed in terms of the removal of coral, because we found that the people who harvested the coral were the same people who applied for the licences and in fact sold it, so in our own little way we sought to control the removal of coral from the sea bed. That was because of studies going on and we are not too sure what is the result.

Indeed it may turn out not to have disastrous results at all. That is why the Act is no stronger, and it just gives the NCC the right to advise the Minister on the problem and not to make any directives at all. I have no doubt, Sir, that as soon as the report is handed to the Minister and he is aware of the precise effect that the removal of coral has on the sea environment, he will take appropriate measures to control that. But I do think that that particular provision relates specifically to the removal of coral, and I welcome it because of these beach vendors who sell coral. They sell a lot of things beside coral.

The other point I want to make, the one before the last perhaps, relates to the question of the Stavronikita. Although the young man portrayed in that film, Mr. Patrick Cotter, a Peace Corps volunteer, did a remarkable job in bringing the Underwater Park to the stage which it has reached, I have not seen anywhere either in that film or in any of the literature or anywhere the origin of the idea for the sinking of the Stavronikita, and I must put it on record, Mr. President that that idea originated with the Prime Minister of this country himself.

I well remember the Prime Minister of this country phoning the Parks and Beaches Commission a day when I was there and instructing the Manager to get hold of the Chairman and members to investigate the possibility of going down to the Deep Water Harbour and making a bid for the Stavronikita with a view to having it sunk as an attraction for the underwater park.

It was the Prime Minister's idea. It originated with him, yet a lot of other people, Mr. President, including one Mr. Bill Miller who resides in the same parish in which I happen to reside, keeps seeking to take the accolade for the sinking of the Stavronikita. One Mr. Bill Miller writes to the newspaper every day to say that he was the architect, he was the origin of the idea for the sinking of the Stavronikita. We saw the film "The Stavronikita" and nowhere was it mentioned that the idea originated with the Prime Minister of this island who is himself not only a strong gardener but also a strong environmentalist. I remember clearly and distinctly the

first meeting after we made a bid for the Stavronikita when the Parks and Beaches Commission decided to express its sincere thanks to the Prime Minister for the idea that we should buy the Stavronikita and sink it in the underwater park.

Now when we bought it, no monies of that sort had been voted by Parliament at all. We had to make a bid, and then scramble for the money. I want that to go on record, Sir. I am sorry the media is not here to clear it up. That Chairman is a joker, Sir.

Another thing is that I hope the National Conservation Commission does not suffer the same fate as the Parks and Beaches Commission. I do not know if I will be asked to sit on the Board again. I know my appointment has been revoked with the Parks and Beaches Commission as from March 31 and really, Sir, it does not matter if I am asked to sit again or not, but I want to take this opportunity to clear up a few points on behalf of the Parks and Beaches Commission while it is still in existence.

Now quite recently there was another documentary or film, or what have you, on television relating to the beautification of the Military Cemetery and no mention at all was made in that film of the part played by the Parks and Beaches Commission. We have made complaints to the persons who did that documentary and they have acknowledge the incorrectness of their action, but I want to make it crystal clear that when the Parks and Beaches Commission was called in, when the Cemetery was handed over to it, it was nothing but a forest, Mr. President. The Parks and Beaches spent over \$45 000 on that cemetery, and then the Defence Force comes in on television and takes all the praise for it. I do not want any praise myself but those workers came to us and said to us, "but look we have devoted a lot of attention to the Military Cemetery, we went through it when you could not see us for the grass, we went through it and we removed the grass, we laid pathways, we watered the plants, we put in plants that would stay there, we did all the graves, we painted the headstones and whatnot - now we are seeing this film on television and we do not see one word of mention made of the part the workers played."

That is what annoyed the Parks and Beaches Commission, Mr. President, the workers, ordinary workers that my friend on the other side - Senator Greaves - is always talking about are playing their part in society, are making a valuable contribution to the society and then other people who cannot be called workers are seeking, perhaps not deliberately, perhaps inadvertently, but are seeking none the less to take all the praise for the contribution that the workers have made. I think it is wrong. In the case of the Stavronikita it would be

different because it was the Prime Minister who brought up the idea.

But there is one Bill Miller and one other person who is now trying to steal this thunder. Perhaps I will be afforded another occasion to speak about this. I do not want to talk too much about a person who is not here to defend himself, Mr. President, and that is why I am being very constrained this afternoon in what I say about this Bill Miller but perhaps I will get another opportunity to talk about it.

I want finally to say, Mr. President, on behalf of the out going Parks and Beaches Commission — not the Commission itself but the management — that I have been extremely pleased about the way in which the management accepted the transition from the previous Government to the Barbados Labour Party 1976.

I particularly want to congratulate the present Manager, Mr. Don Grant who was hired since 1971. He has done, in my view, an extremely good job and has never really and truly received the praise to which he is entitled. I know that sometimes it is wrong to praise people who still have a large part of their working life to live because the praise tends to get to their heads and then their performance drops proportionately. I do not think it will happen to him, but in any event, I trust that if he allows what I have said about him today to go to his head and cause his performance to dwindle that the National Conservation Commission will use the powers given to it under the Act to curtail whatever are the various discretions, but I want it to go on record that I am very happy with the contribution he has made.

I think it is a wonderful thing because in these days when we are seeing that everybody who came over from the last Administration in the DLP is being moved and you cannot hire anymore out of the DLP and no doubt in 1990 or 1996 when the DLP comes to power they will want to fire the people who we hire too. I think it is all wrong. I think we should look at them individually and work out, Sir, those who have made a contribution regardless of the politics and Mr. Grant falls into that category. I think he has made a valuable contribution, along with the Senior Executive Secretary, Mr. Albert Lynch. I want at the going out of the Parks and Beaches Commission to place on record my own personal thanks for the contribution which they have made, and I am certain that the Government of Barbados would wish me to place on record their sincere thanks and appreciation for the contribution made by those two senior officers in the Parks and Beaches Commission who will never have the opportunity to have their praises sound. The members of the Commission can speak for themselves. I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR A. P. L. REECE: Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to speak in favour of a Bill which I am sure will not only improve our national heritage but enhance our national environment. I have made a few observations on the Bill and have a few comments to express on it.

Basically, I have observed that the Bill now seeks to put a part of the work of the National Trust in the hands of the Commission. I would like to think that we are not going to be duplicating the efforts of any party, that we do not end up with any measure of competition on either side. This caution is necessary because we do not want to know, for example, in the case of some building of historical value to the island and to the national heritage that there are commissions or bodies competing for acknowledgement in respect of the particular building. For sure, most of the buildings in Barbados have already been acknowledged as buildings of historical value and the likelihood of such competition is perhaps minimal. There is however scope for more competition and I would like to think that while the Bill is being reviewed that the work is not being duplicated on either side.

Section 11, subsection 2 of the Act refers to what the Commission will be allowed to undertake. This is interesting, Mr. President, for the simple reason that I look forward to the day when the Commission will be self-sufficient. I feel that the Commission can set about undertaking sizeable development projects or projects which have an infinity to a sizeable development. In that way, the turnover from those projects can supplement the funds in the hands of the Commission and the loans which the Commission then has to approach Government for, as provided for in subsection 2 of Section 11, would be minimal.

We have big organisations in Barbados which are self sufficient. I feel that the Commission can approach the stage where it can be run in a business-like manner. I am not suggesting that the Parks and Beaches Commission which this is replacing is not run in a business-like manner, but we want to see a full autonomous body, a body which is self sufficient and can even put monies, if necessary, at the disposal of the Government as part of its investment portfolio in the Commission.

In Section 19 subsection 1, it says, "the Commission shall cause to be kept a register in which there is recorded the address at which the business is conducted." My fear on that clause, Mr. President, is that there are some beach vendors, for example, who may be traversing on the beach and they qualify for a licence but they want to sell in more than one place. The subsection seems to suggest that there may be a slight

restriction on the place at which the beach vendor can carry on his or her trade and perhaps there should be a greater flexibility in that section for the purpose of the beach vendors.

Under another Section -- I have been perusing Section 5 (1) (j) -- the Commission can:

"enter into written agreements with owners and occupiers of land for the right to access to and the right to control, conserve and develop any cave."

The point I would like to suggest on this subsection is that perhaps this could be extended to include rights of way. There are a number of rights of way to the sea in Barbados but there has been a tendency to develop areas and develop buildings and hotels in such a way that rights of ways are being curtailed.

We know only too well of the old now non-existent right of way of which goes from Highway 1 in Black Rock down to Paradise Beach Club gap to the sea. There is an established legal right of way going through that area to the beach which has now suffered at the hands of the development of that hotel. The poor residents of that area some of them in the area adjoining Free Hill and the residence of Mr. Maurice Ward now have to walk a considerable distance in order to reach the beach at Paradise -- and Paradise is still one of the most beautiful beaches on the West Coast of the island in the constituency of St. Michael North West.

I really would like to see, Mr. President, an extension of this subsection so that not only agreements may be entered into with owners to develop accesses and control and conserve caves, but develop rights of way to the beach. I am sure that there are other examples besides the example at Paradise where the development to the hotel has curtailed access to the sea by that right of way that was developed many years ago and that there are other places in the island which suffer similarly.

My final observation of this very well meaning Bill, Mr. President, is in paragraph (j) of subsection (1) of Section (30), I believe, and I would like to think it is a typographical error. The letter "y" has been left out of "carring":

"generally for the better carrying out of its functions under this Act."

That is on page 21 of the Bill.

Mr. President, I totally support this Bill and look forward to consideration being given to those recommendations. (Applause)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I just want to reply to a few of the points raised. If we take Senator Reece's comments which were the last made, the honourable Senator refers to the business of a right of way and indeed, I think if he is trying to make a point that the Commission might have the power to negotiate with people and create new rights of way, that is certainly a different point. If he is talking about an inadequacy in the Bill relating to public access, then he should look at Clause 5, subclause (1) paragraph (d), where one of the functions of the Commission is to maintain public access to, and provide a lifeguard service at such of the beaches in Barbados as it thinks fit.

Senator A. P. L. Reece rose.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Are you on a point of order?

SENATOR A. P. L. REECE: Clarification. Mr. President, on a point of elucidation. I was not considering the inadequacy of the Bill at all, I was just thinking that the Commission perhaps could be invoked with the power to negotiate new rights of way to the beach.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, if the honourable Senator is talking about new rights of way, then there is a perfectly ordinary way in which this happens and it is something which does not have to be provided for in this Bill at all.

You see, the casting of this Bill is within the framework of the beaches of Barbados and access thereto being public property. Consequently, to talk about new access to the beaches and so on, you would hardly find provision for that in this Bill. What happens is that if access is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the Crown Law officers and the Ministry responsible will first of all research whether in fact someone has encroached on a public access and then decide what steps must be taken to have the access cleared and restored to public use. Only after it is established that no adequate right of way exists to the beach would the Government then be prepared to purchase property in order to create such an access.

While the Bill provides for the maintenance of public access, there are many examples of access which was once usable by the public but has fallen into such a state of disrepair that really in actual, factual terms, there is no access available to the public. But if the honourable Senator wants to suggest that there are places where you now need to build new access, well then that is a different matter which has nothing to do with this Bill.

Senator Reece also refers to Section 19, the one about the address in which a business is conducted, and this seems to be the provision that was giving him trouble — “the Commission shall cause to be kept a register in which there is recorded”, a number of things, and that is one of the things. It seems perfectly reasonable to me that the Commission must keep that sort of information available because that is the register that is at all reasonable times open to inspection at the principal office of the Commission. If you do not have that information register, how is anyone who is desirous, for example, of laying a complaint that someone is in breach of the terms for the licence under which he is selling be sure that the complaint he wishes to make is a valid complaint? I mean, just looking at the negative side of it. There are other reasons of course for this. The licence will provide for how and when and where a vendor shall operate, and as a lawyer, I am sure the honourable Senator knows that if it is a contractual licence, if you have a licence to operate that it is what that licence says that he may do that he may do and nothing else. So, I cannot understand, unless it is something else he is reaching for.

In Section 11, Senator Reece again has problems with the provision made for borrowing money. As I understand it, the provision is to be found in all the Acts relating to Statutory Corporations. It relates to the fact that for the normal conduct of their business.....(Asides) Yes. But the only point, Sir, is I think that after you have been in here for a little while, Senator Reece can learn that if you say something, somebody is going to reply to it.

The point is that this does not have anything to do with borrowing money from Government. Any Commission has from time to time to raise money to carry on its business. That is what a Statutory Corporation is, and consequently they will have to borrow money from time to time, and what is done here is that the Board is clearly subject to the law under which the Commission may borrow, and the restrictions under which that Board may borrow are also set out.

SENATOR A. P. L. REECE: Mr. President, I am compelled to rise on a point of elucidation. The point I did make in my statement was that I looked forward to the day when the business will be run at such a level that they do not have to go to any place to borrow, Government or otherwise. They would be promoting sufficient funds within its own body to carry itself. That is the point I was making, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The point is extremely clear. In fact what he said was he was looking forward to the day when they would not have to approach Government for loans. I wrote that down. In the running of a business you have to go to a bank and borrow money. (Aside). As I say, Sir, if you do not listen you will not learn.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do let us have a little order. I personally want to follow what is going on.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The point really has nothing to do with going to Government for money.

Now to the questions raised by Senator Wickham, first of all the point about whose business it is to designate a building to be of national historical interest. It is envisaged that the Minister will designate, so that what is happening is that the Minister, not being the fount of all wisdom, would have, one presumes, appointed a Commission of such calibre as would be able competently to advise on these matters.

This is not a matter of duplicating the work of the National Trust. There is a national responsibility which cannot reside in the National Trust or any other voluntary organisation when it comes to historical sites and monuments, as indeed with any other matters of deep and abiding cultural significance. So it is not to be assumed that because the National Trust is a voluntary organisation which proceeds merrily along its own road on these matters, that because it has recognised the responsibility of the Government to ensure that national sites and monuments are protected as important historical sites that there is no objection. That is not the way in which Government works.

To refer again to another point made by Senator Wickham — the point which is very much in my mind and which was very much in my mind when I was making my opening remarks — the effect of exporting all of the antique furniture is loss of important crafts. I have myself been careful in going around to places where you still find men working their tools and producing furniture according to good old Barbadian designs, the kind of furniture that sells anywhere. All of those men are clearly 60 years old and over. That to me is one of the most dangerous statistics that one can ever face in a country where indeed so good is our work that the furniture dealers have been making a very good thing out of the export of furniture with authentic Barbadian designs, because it is very difficult to interpret what is an antique.

Some people would try to impose a hundred year rule on you as though somebody had the authority from God to determine that antique furniture must be at least one hundred years old, when what we are talking about is the impoverishment of the society if these crafts are allowed to die out. I think, Sir, that it is an urgent matter that in our skills training programmes and all our training programmes that we get seriously into crafts. I think that as we have intimated in the party's Manifesto — and I know that even though it finds its way only into the Labour Party's Manifesto that does not mean that the Democratic Labour Party disagrees with it, it just means

that we are the thinkers — and my friend reads our Manifesto all the time, he does not read his own — I think the design centre is an absolute must if you are talking about doing anything for craft in this country.

I could not agree more with Senator Wickham that it is desirable that we have apprenticeships designed for young people to work along with some of the old masters. There is a bit of the old ball and claw design in mahogany furniture that is coming back in. You can see a distinct difference between what now passes for modern design and the old ball and claw design of about 40 or 50 years ago. I think there are people who still feel that the posts from a four poster bed are appropriately used to prop up the pig pen, but I must confess that I sleep on my four poster every night, and nobody can buy it either.

The other point made by Senator Wickham to which I want to pay special attention is his reference to pollution: If he is referring generally to marine pollution, then Senator Linton has made the point. But there is at Clause 5, subclause (1) paragraph (e), a reference to the other kind of pollution where the Commission has a function to secure the observations of sanitary and cleanly conditions and practices at and in respect of public parks, etc., so there is a very direct charge in relation to that element of pollution.

In relation to the piracy of the sea bed, Senator Linton also dealt with that point, and indeed it is when the studies are completed that we will know the extent to which we need to move on what to all of us seems a very serious problem. I for one cannot believe that the destruction of marine life is going to have no effect, and I therefore would expect to hear what is the extent of the damage done by the removal of coral rather than whether its removal does any damage at all. Apart from that, Sir, I do not recall any other points raised which would attract a reply at this stage. I am sure Senator Linton does not expect me to reply to his eulogy which formed a significant part of his speech.

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

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Parts I, II, III, IV and V were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the debate on the Appropriation Bill commonly known as the Estimates Debate takes place in the Other Place from next week Monday 22, and will continue there, one expects, for the whole week. As you know, it is necessary for the Estimates to be through both Houses by March 31, and it seems to us that in keeping with past practice, if we start early enough on one day and we need to go over into a second day, the two days would normally be adequate for debate.

Accordingly I propose that the Senate do now adjourn until March 29, 1982, at 10 o'clock in the morning when members should come prepared for the debate on the Appropriation Bill.

It is our custom, as you know, Sir, to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 45(2) on that day so that you can get through the debate on the Estimates. If we need to go into the second day, we will go into the second day.

I beg to move that the Senate stands adjourned until Monday March 29, 1982, at 10 o'clock in the morning.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly. 5.40 p.m.

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Monday, 29th March, 1982.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Monday, March 29, 1982 at 10.15 a.m.

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 J. E. D. WILLIAMS; Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Senator Miss J. CLARKE; Senator A. P. L. REECE; 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.

ABSENT

SENATOR C. A. GRIFFITH.

PAPERS

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

The Drawback of Duties (Imported Tobacco used in the Manufacture of Blended Tobacco or Smoking Tobacco for Export) Regulations, 1982.

The Drawback of Duties (Locally Manufactured Cigarettes) Regulations, 1982.

The Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders for the month of January, 1982.

The Post Office (Licensed Vendors of Postage Stamp) (Amendment) Regulations, 1982.

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS OR SITTINGS OF THE SENATE MOVED BY A MINISTER

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, when we adjourned, we gave notice that we would meet this morning at 10 a.m. and that we would expect to do the Appropriation Bill today. Accordingly, Sir, members have come prepared to deal with this and should not be surprised that we need, therefore, to suspend Standing Order 45(2) to enable us to get through the entire debate on the Appropriation Bill today.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Accordingly, Sir, I move that Standing Order 45(2) be now suspended.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

APPROPRIATION ACT 1982

Order Number one was called — To move the First Reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending March 31, 1983.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that this Bill has been read a first time.....Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have no intention of being particularly lengthy this morning. Indeed, I definitely intend to be brief. Members of the Honourable Senate would no doubt, have had the opportunity to study the Estimates which contain material for the debate and accordingly will be raising points as the debate progresses. On certain areas of Government Business, the reply will be given by Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman and the rest will be given by myself.

The background against which the Estimates are being presented this year, is one in which the Government finds itself with distinct revenue problems. Whereas we estimated that revenues would have been \$483.7 million, it now looks like \$463 million, or just over \$20 million less, is likely to be reached. This falling off of Government revenue is due to a number of reasons, none of which we need to go into at any length, at least I believe I don't need to go into them at any length, because we know that we had problems with our sugar receipts — we had that last year, we know that tourist arrivals are down this year, and the short fall of tourist arrivals has, so far, had its impact on our receipts, and that largely because of the recession, we have had a short fall in investment.

We must also remember, Sir, if we look back to the period beginning September 1976, there have been consistent and substantial reductions in the levels of direct taxation. And while relief of nearly 30 per cent given in 1980 was most welcome, it means that unless the economy continues to perform at a particular level, and therefore generate more earnings for taxation purposes, the impact is going to be picked up. So once you begin to have a fall in the area of tourism, and in the area of investment, it would automatically mean, Sir, that our tax receipts are going to be down — unless we can point to any other area of our economy where the performance has been so outstanding as to make up for what, in fact, has been substantial tax give-aways over the last few years.

The Government has a choice of approaches to dealing with problems where the economy is not performing as well as we would wish, and where Government revenues are down. The course which we have elected to follow is one in which there would still be a certain level of Capital Works going on, and, therefore, there is still a substantial provision in the Capital Estimates. In order to ensure that employment continues to be generated. The other is to try and restrict expenditure on Current Account.

Now this approach is important to us, because if one decides to use a certain amount of discipline in a country where, I believe, the Government is the employer of about 20 per cent or 23 per cent of the entire work

force, and in a number of areas in the Public Service some of us are of the view that the number of jobs has grown — not necessarily under an eye that has sought to prune here and prune there, and re-adjust where necessary — you may well find areas of the Public Service where there is an absolute increase in employment, without, necessarily, a weeding out of some of the posts which are no longer fully relevant to that area. On the other hand, you would find other areas of the Public Service where there are less bodies that you need to do the work, but work can be proceeded with because the key areas of concern are the areas in which you have adequate staff.

This sounds as though I am advocating a particular point of view on Civil Service reform, and, perhaps, I am. But it is not something I want to take up at this time this morning. What I want to do is just make the general point that we need, perhaps, to have a good look and see whether there is a certain amount of padding which, if we approach correctly, could result either in a redistribution of resources or, perhaps, some level of retrenchment without being any loss of service to the country. I do believe, Sir, that when you employ wasteful employment practices that anybody benefits — and that includes the people who are employed to do less than what they should be doing.

In regard to the Public Service, let me say that nothing I am saying is to be construed as an indictment of the Public Service. If there is to be any indictment, it has to be the indictment of those who have to take managerial policy decisions as to what must be done for the orderly development of the Public Service. So there is absolutely no intention here to abuse or criticise anything of the Public Service, I would prefer that we look at the matter in a completely different light.

I am saying this, Sir, because if the times continue as they are, we are definitely going to have to find more efficient ways of delivering services to the country. There are certain areas, in my view, in which we are delivering services at a high price. I don't think it is true all over, but it is certainly true in some areas.

As I said, the policy on which we have decided is to ensure the employment, which at the end of last year was down to 10.1 percent of the labour force — we may as well face the facts that developing countries don't see single digit employment statistics — and we have been managing to keep the employment figures at a certain level.

I heard a report on the radio yesterday in which the comment was made that the Prime Minister had said that unemployment in this country was lower than in Great Britain at the present time, and as though to exhibit the

full force of his ignorance, Mr. Hurley, who was reading the report, went on to say, "For what that may mean." But people should be careful to editorialise only when they understand what is being said.

The point I am making, however, is that when we, in a developing country, are able to keep unemployment down to ten percent, we are, in fact, managing something which is not usually seen, and things like that do not happen by accident. On the other hand, only too often we are accustomed, in these Caribbean countries, to seeing unemployment of the order of 22 percent, 25 percent and 30 percent.

So, we have to continue, Sir, in what are not easy times, to try to keep the avenues open through which people may be employed. In September last year, when the National Housing Corporation had to let some of its staff go — we were down at the Post Office site — and almost before they had left National Housing, they were being taken up by other builders like the people building the Post Office.

One of the things we have to recognise is that the drive to provide employment in this country created jobs to the extent that skilled workers, at no time in the past couple of years, and certainly still not now, simply had no difficulty finding employment. As a matter of fact, the need for more skilled workmen has become more and more apparent over these past few years.

The other aspect of Government's policy too, Sir, is to try — and we have been, again we have got some success to show for it — to keep the rate of inflation down, so that when prices go up outside of Barbados — and because we are an importing economy, to such a large extent, some of that inflation feeds its way back into our economy — we do not have the runaway inflation, with which we have not been unfamiliar, and therefore the dollar earned means a little more than it may otherwise have meant.

I believe most of us watch the prices of vegetables fairly closely, because they can get fairly high and they can also come down, like cabbage have been down recently. But the thing is that these price movements have a very, very considerable effect on the dollar you spend, because when prices are down you can buy a little more, and when they are up, well then you begin to feel the pressure. Food prices have been falling recently, therefore the inflation rate has not been anything like as crippling as one might otherwise have expected.

So, we are managing, Sir, to keep people at work, to provide more jobs, because we have been bringing the

rate of inflation down — it was something like 22 percent at the end of 1975, it is less than half of that now — we have been keeping the inflation rate fairly steady — not back into single digit, but I believe we are around 12 percent to 13 percent — and, in addition, we have now embarked on trying to cut back on the current revenues as a means of meeting the present problems which we are facing in Government revenues, and in the economy generally.

It has been emphasised, Sir, when the Estimates were being introduced in the Other Place, the Government rejects any monetarist theories. We do not feel we can pay the cost of unemployment, for one thing, which is implicit in the tight money supply arguments which people are making free with these days.

In keeping public expenditure down, Sir, expenditure on Current Account, we have gone for things which represent new programmes, generally, so that, it is a deferral of new programmes. The other thing we have done is to look at areas in which we have been rather liberal — some people might say lavish, but I prefer to use the term liberal — like in the areas of training and try to hold that back.

Another area in which we would hope to keep the current expenditure down, is where it comes to staff replacements — where people are out on leave, unless it is absolutely necessary, to try to make do with the staff which is left on the job. At least, that is something, Sir, that business houses normally do. It is something that we have to learn to do a little of in Government.

There are one or two examples where there has been, perhaps, a little cutbacks, an apparent cutback in services. I would give you an example. We have a rural library service where, I think, it probably does something like 25 book drops a day. The cost of operating that service is certainly not justifiable in terms of the results we are getting. It would be simpler, now that there are branch libraries all over the island, to look at the areas in which there are no branch libraries to see whether there is a demand in these areas — the fact that we are only lending them something like 25 books a day suggest that the demand in those areas is not very high — and to see whether the need is simple book-drop service in, perhaps, one area.

We have decided to take that rural library service out and the staff saving would then go, in this case, to man the new library at Scarborough where we would have had to be looking for additional staff in order to provide a service in this new facility. It also means that

we are able to save on the operating cost of the vehicle and the capital cost of a vehicle, because we took the opportunity to do it at the time when the vehicle, which did the run of that service, had been involved in an accident. Sir, we feel that when we take that service out, it does not prevent us from delivering an adequate service to the public, but simply that this is an area of wastage which has been eliminated.

Again, Sir, if you look at the branch libraries, and if you look at the hours of usage, you will see that they are used between 12 o'clock and 1 o'clock, and they are used again between 2 o'clock and 7 o'clock. So we have looked at them and decided that we will stop opening the libraries as early as we did previously and just open them during those periods of day 12 o'clock to 1 o'clock and from 2 o'clock until 7 o'clock. This enables a single person to man the service whereas, previously, we were manning that service with two people.

So instead of then asking for increase in staff in the rest of the library, as we deliver a greater service, what you do is to re-deploy that staff. Although it does not look like a saving the same way as when you pull out a service, there is a very long term saving involved in that. Also, and this is one of the things I like about it, it is a more useful deployment of the staff, and therefore it ought to have in it less implications of frustration and boredom for the person doing the job. In ways like that, we believe that we will be able to have some reorientation, in at least some parts of the Public Service.

One of the areas in which one would notice there is a substantial cut would be in supplies and materials to the Printery. We cannot talk of controlling expenditure on Current Account if, at the same time, instead of the Printer budgeting for his ordinary workload, he budgets as though every year is an extraordinary year. Last year, for example, we have had to spend some \$635 000 in supplies and materials. Then, we were getting rid of a backlog of Parliamentary debates — like two years in each Chamber, Gazettes and Bills.

A whole clean-up operation was done, and, in the middle of it all, it was discovered that people were screaming out for file jackets. They have not had any file jackets for a couple of years, so they produced file jackets to the tune of \$96 500. When we analyse that again even though we think we might require a little more, you reduce that down to \$420 000, and you will accept that unless there is an unusual call, then the Printer should be able to manage within that vote.

An aspect of it which I have not mentioned, which I should mention, is that certain kinds of printing are unusual, and, therefore, it would be better if they were done as commercial jobs. So you should not be sitting down here to provide money for unforeseen and unforeseeable areas of expenditure.

Another thing which I will mention, and this is likely to be coming on to my last point, is that in better years, I believe something like \$200 000 — certainly well over \$100 000 — I have been told it is near to \$200 000 — got spent on NIFCA, and certainly a very lavish approach to spending has been adopted where cultural festivals are concerned. A lot of that has served, indeed, to generate an interest in the arts, and therefore should not be condemned as necessarily a bad thing.

These are areas, again, where, once we are put to the test, we must be able to operate a cultural programme without incurring the kind of costs that have hitherto been incurred. One of the ways in which we expect to be able to do this is through the merger of Community Development with Culture, which takes place in a few days' time.

People who go around and do community work, are in areas in which some of the concentration is heavily on handicraft, some on folklore, and generally the kind of community development work that we do is straight cultural work.

There are attempts, of course, to see culture in terms only of the Performing Arts or Visual Arts. That is why, Mr. President, in the days when the community development was doing its festivals, like the School Festivals and so on, the work looked as though it would be capable of more positive achievement.

The people who have the contacts in the community, the people who are in touch with what is going on in the community, are the people who have been working in Community Development. And if, at all, we are going to be able to talk about festivals which are indigenous, then the base on which the organisation must be built must be the Community Development Agency. So there has been this fusion which has been necessary for a long time, and with this fusion of the two who are involved really in the same thing, one should have the basis on which cultural activity can be organised along truly Barbadian lines, and we should be able to do a little cheaper.

One of the things that has been happening is that fellows have been throwing around so much money that it has been developing an attitude that, in order to do the slightest bit of performance in any area, you had to be laying out money — and this is a bad thing.

It is not as though I am suggesting that people in the arts are not to be paid, I feel very strongly that they must be paid. People in the arts, like people in any other area, work, and they must be paid. That is not the point I am making. I am saying that in the same way that a number of us in different fields do not expect to get paid if we attend a seminar or something, when I see a budget for a seminar in which somebody has to go and talk for

15 minutes and he is down for \$50, I direct that that be cut out.

Sir, we are not dealing with the business of whether somebody who works is to be paid. We are dealing with the right of the artist to a living. Where we intend to put a lot of emphasis is that money which is allocated for the assistance of groups will be used to render genuine assistance to groups and to artistes within the community.

One thing, Sir, is that we may be able from time to time to make a limited number of purchases of works of art. But there is no reason Government offices, which have to be decorated in some way or the other, should not be the places to display works of local artists. It is simply a matter of monies that would be spent in one way or the other being spent in a particular direction. These are ways, therefore, in which you achieve economies and the local effort does not suffer.

I could talk at greater length in that area, but to do so would be to state one thing right at the outset and then, once I was on my feet, forget what I have said. I believe that it is not necessary, especially when debate will seek to elicit more and more information. It is not necessary for me at this stage then to say anything more than I have said. I have indicated the general lines of policy and in-so-far as specifics are going to be concerned, Wednesday is but a short time away.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I have not had the benefit of debating Estimates in the Upper Chamber before this occasion. I understand, however, that only one opportunity is presented for each Senator to make his or her contribution on the Estimates. I would therefore crave your indulgence if, in looking at these Estimates, I spend some time in what I consider to be an overall general review of the state of the economy in this country, as reflected by the evidence which there is in these Estimates, which we are discussing today. Later on, I will look in some detail at some of the areas contained under the various Heads.

The Estimates provide us with an opportunity and, indeed, with a factual background against which we can reflect on the economic and social conditions of the country. These Estimates today, in my view, reflect the failure of the present Government to match performance with promises. It is indeed, Mr. President, a tragic story.

I would therefore want to indicate areas in which I see this tragedy, indeed areas in which the Democratic Labour Party sees this tragedy, and the way in which the decisions which have been made by the Government have

placed this country in what the Democratic Labour Party has described as a perilous economic situation.

Mr. President, never in the history of this country have we been burdened with debt of the magnitude that we are burdened with today in terms of our revenue and our capacity to earn revenue. And the signs are fairly clear that Barbados, in the not too distant future, could find itself in the position where it is unable to meet its debt obligations.

Only recently, we heard that Guyana has had to call on international agencies for a rescheduling of the repayment of some of its debts. My observation, as far as Barbados is concerned, Mr. President, is based on the facts that are before us, and let us look, in terms of a review, at the situation over a time span which, I believe, would be a comfortable and reasonable period of time for us to make comparisons, and for us to pick up trends of what has been happening in this country.

Honourable Senators would probably recall in the 1975/76 period when the then Administration, the Democratic Labour Party, was accused of putting this country excessively in debt. At that time, Sir, the National Debt was approximately \$213 million — that was at March, 1976. By November 1981, the debt had reached the staggering figure of \$702 million. In other words, it increased by over 300 per cent in that period.

Let me put it another way, Mr. President. In 1976/77, Government revenue was \$216 million and the Public Debt, which was \$213 million, provided us with an opportunity that for every dollar of Public Debt we were earning revenue of approximately one dollar. In 1982/83, for every dollar of Public Debt which we have to meet, we are only earning 33¢ in revenue, or one-third of the amount which we were earning in 1976. These are stark facts and these are based, Mr. President, on the information which is contained in these Estimates where we are projected to earn revenue in the region of \$494 million with a Public Debt standing in November 1981 at \$702 million. And I daresay, it is in excess of that particular amount at the present time — I do not have the figures — and I am being charitable in using the November figure.

There is a third way — because I want to rub this point home, Mr. President — of looking at this debt situation, this massive problem of debt.

In 1976/77, we can very well recall — and this is a matter which I know personally, because I had reason to hear the charges which were levelled by the Barbados Labour Party against the then Administration — what was said about the extent of our debt commitment, about how the people in Barbados would be required to sell their houses, sheep, goats and animals in order to meet

this debt. This was the kind of argument that was being advanced in order to win the sympathies of people.

In that period, if you take the debt at that time and divide it by the population, including everybody in Barbados — children, old people, people in the institutions — you would find that each Barbadian would have been as it were carrying a debt of \$852. Today, in 1982, the average for each Barbadian is over \$2 800. At the moment we are spending one-fifth of Government revenues to meet the interest payments alone. So when I say we are in a very serious position, you would, Mr. President, understand, I hope, the way in which I speak — the concern I am expressing on this particular matter.

It is now taking in a single year, in this financial year 1982–83, almost \$100 million to service our debts, \$99 million point whatever it is. In short, it has taken as much as it took in the period of 1971–1977 to service our debts. In that six year period it cost us \$100 million, and in this year alone, 1982–83, it is costing us almost the same amount. What is coming through very clearly, Mr. President, is that today we are being saddled with three times as much debt burden as we were saddled with in 1976, without a single improvement in the standard of living of the people of Barbados, and I would deal with that later on.

I said that when I was dealing with the debt situation that the policies of the Government had placed this country in a perilous situation, in jeopardy. The second area in which the Estimates indicate that this Administration has run this country into very serious difficulties is in the area of fiscal policy.

We have had an opportunity to review the policies which have been pursued by this country. We have seen the impact of the sham approach which is adopted — of relieving direct taxes in Barbados. Let me say this, Sir, I am not at all indicating that I am against the relief of taxation for poor people, or any people for that matter, because it is clear there was a need for some relief in this area. But what we saw what I describe as the sham approach, was the shifting of the burden of taxation from direct taxes to indirect taxes, and this is again reflected in the Estimates under the first part dealing with revenue collection. I think everybody knows, Mr. President, that the system of indirect taxation, rather than progressive, has a regressive impact on the economy. So what has really happened, the outcome of all of this is that the balance which, presumably was being sought, has come out wrong.

What has to be recognized is that Barbados is mainly an importing economy and a service economy. Too heavy a burden of indirect taxes will not only be

reflected in higher prices, but will also have the effect of depressing economic activity and the proceeds from this kind of approach would naturally be reflected in the fall of taxation which we are seeing, if you look at the figures. That kind of approach, Mr. President, of indirect taxes, might very well be useful in a time when there is a lot of economic activity going on. But the weakness of it shows up at the very point when the economy starts to get into some kind of difficulty, and we are seeing the outcome of this kind of approach.

Let us look at the Government revenues position and you will see what will happen. If you look on page 4, Current Estimates of Revenues, you will find that on taxes on incomes and profits there have been a short fall in the region of \$18 million; on taxes on goods and services, a short fall of more than \$10 million; and probably the only significant area of growth, but a minimal area, was in taxes on property where there was a marginal increase of about \$.8 million. So this kind of approach which has been adopted has really put this country in a very serious problem, and, I suppose, we will learn our lesson on Wednesday.

As if this was the only problem, Mr. President, or if the problems which I indicated were the only ones, one would have to point to some other areas because it clearly demonstrates a level of mismanagement of our economic affairs, the likes of which have never been seen in this country before. To compound the problem, we found a cardinal error being made when there was an attempt to spend over \$200 million in Capital Works during the last financial year. The precise figure is about \$220 million.

I don't want anybody to get up and say that I am against Capital Projects. The point, which ought not to be missed, is that the clustering of these projects put tremendous strain on the economy at all sorts of levels, and all of this is compounded with the problems which I indicated earlier. So there was bad management — bad policy decisions which were taken. And there were projects which had been identified a long time ago, which could have been embarked on, and which, I dare say, could have been completed. But we had the spectacle of investigations of one sort or another, and all sorts of accusations being thrown around, rather than getting on with the job. They could have been completed and if they had been completed, as scheduled, there would not have been this bunching of projects. I think we understand one of the reasons why this was done — to make it look as if the Barbados Labour Party Administration was doing all these great things — there were more jobs going than people available, you had to bring in artisans from St. Vincent and St. Lucia and a whole set of arguments were advanced to make things look good. But little did they realise the difficulties which

this kind of mismanagement and this shortsighted approach would have placed this country into. And we are now reaping the effects of those bad decisions.

Interesting enough, Mr. President, the Estimates this year have probably shown that we have learnt a lesson because the 1982/83 projected Estimates are even less than the actual expenditure of 1980/81. We are projecting to spend, from what I can see, in Capital Works somewhere in the region of \$135.6 million as compared with \$138.8 million, which was actually spent in the 1980/81 period.

But what has been the further impact of these irrational approaches to our economic planning and our economic activity in this country? One other result is that a large fiscal gap has been created leading on the one hand to the increases in taxation which we have witnessed in this country over the last few months and more of which, I daresay, you can expect in the next couple of days.

Another factor is the enormous borrowing, which has been mentioned earlier, and this very borrowing, I am submitting, Mr. President, has forced the Government to, as it were, seize every investable penny that was available to the private sector to sustain its Capital Works Programme. And this, I suggest, played no smaller part in forcing the interest rates in this country up, which led, ultimately, to a decline in private investment and business activity, an increase in the number of bankruptcies and a rise in unemployment. And, of course, in addition to all of this, pressures were put on our Balance of Payments situation.

In short, it is clear that a lot of our current economic woes can be attributed to poor domestic planning and this can be clearly separated from the externally generated factors.

Two reasons were given at one time or another, Mr. President, for the rise in interest rates. None of those reasons, I would submit, can really square with hard and careful analysis. One reason which was given was that in order to attract funds for mortgage financing, it was necessary to raise the rates of interest.

Of course, what appears to have happened in that kind of situation was that rather than making the loans available for a long-term basis, the banking sector took the opportunity to make loans available on a short-term basis. I think one has only got to look at the situation which developed in this country, particularly in the area of mortgage loans over the last three or four years – the lack of availability of such, to see that that particular measure, which the policy-makers claim was designed to help this particular area, did not, at all help this area.

The result, of course, was that very little housing construction, of any particular size, went on, and the fact that there are fewer houses available – the National Housing Corporation is not even going any reasonable distance in meeting the needs of people who require houses in this country – it means that rents are going up – there is evidence of that all around.

I do not want to even go into details on this, because I know that many honourable Senators are aware of this particular area. I am sure that some of them are involved in the housing and rental business, so they know what is going on in this particular area. Rents are going up. I am not talking of any particular centre, but I believe that one is aware of these things. So we have to understand this very clearly.

The second reason, Mr. President, which was advanced about these interest rates, was to stop the outflow of funds from Barbados. I am saying, Mr. President, that a country like Barbados cannot hope by raising interests rates either to significantly stop the outflow of funds or, indeed, to increase, to any degree, the inflow of funds by the manipulation of interest rates.

You get what I consider to be rather lame reasons which have been advanced for a very serious problem because, Mr. President, as you are aware – I believe as all honourable Senators are aware and all Barbadians are aware – this question of interest rates in this country is a very serious one – one which is affecting this country in a very serious way, and one would hope that we will see some decisions made in this area which would relieve the situation in the not too distant future.

Now let me come on to the question of unemployment and inflation, points which were raised by the Leader of the Senate, and indeed which were canvassed in the Other Place. One continues to hear about how well Barbados is doing in terms of creating jobs for people, how unemployment continues to fall – but the real situation certainly does not reflect this.

Mr. President, when I get into the Estimates in detail and reach the Statistical Service, I will have some comments to make on that particular department because I believe that it is not functioning. I would not use any harsher words yet, but I will get a form of harsh words and strictures for that department when I reach it, because I cannot understand how any person in Barbados, and particularly people in the Government, in the face of what is clearly evident could advance any argument about unemployment falling. (*Asides*) That is the problem. Bring the statistics? We will deal with the Statistical Department later on and we will show you why we cannot bring the statistics.

My position on this question of unemployment is very simple: the Government has had to cut back its programme. We heard from the Leader of the Senate this morning about certain pruning activities which have been embarked on by the Government. As a matter of fact, there was some figure which I saw knocking around somewhere, that the total Government employment had not significantly fallen, that out of a figure, at one stage, of 25 250, it is now down to 25 000, so that only 250 people in sum total had been as it were, put out of jobs — that is a rather crude way to put it — had become unemployed as a result of Government pruning in the total service, both central administration and statutory corporations.

Of course, we were not favoured with a breakdown in this particular area, so I have my doubts as to the reliability of that particular statistic.

In an area where we look to see a lot of employment, we see the trends of a decline in that particular sector. We have in tourism, a decline; in manufacturing, a decline; and even in agriculture there is also an indication of decline in employment activities. So that when faced with these stark realities, I wonder, Mr. President, by what magic can we say that employment has risen.

I think I have an idea of the way in which the Government, I would not say falsely, erroneously and unwittingly go about getting at these employment figures, and I think they operate on a very false premise. I have heard the Prime Minister use this approach, and use this source on more than one occasion to demonstrate the growth in employment — that is by using National Insurance figures, people who have registered with the National Insurance, and follow that particular trend. If that is the source which is being used, it is a very dangerous source, because there are a lot of factors which have to be taken into consideration in that particular area.

What is even more important, Mr. President, is the whole impact of under-employment in this country — people who are put on to work week on, week off, who are sometimes given two days per week and three days per week. These are real factors, so for the Government to take the position that things are so rosy and there has been such an improvement in the employment situation in Barbados, I am saying that the stark reality of the situation certainly does not indicate this.

And, Mr. President, people are laughing and pouring scorn on the Government for the figures which they are putting out in these particular areas. They are the laughing stock of this country. People no longer, on this and a number of other factors which have occurred in

this country under the Barbados Labour Party Administration, have confidence in the figures and information which are put out. And it is a very serious crisis which we are facing in this country — when people do not, and cannot, believe the policy makers and the Government which they have elected to govern them.

We have had the idle boast that our inflation rate was at some time kept below the inflation rate in Great Britain, the United States of America and some countries with which we do a considerable amount of trade.

What baffles me, and people who are knowledgeable in this area, is how could we in a country which imports about 80 per cent of our goods, where, of course, it is clear that inflation is taking a toll of those countries, can come to a situation where our level of inflation, it can be boasted, is lower than some of those countries.

It just does not square, in my view, with a logical position. So when I talk about a crisis which exists in this country, in terms of the confidence which people have in the Government and in terms of the information which emanates from Government, you can very well understand the reason why there is this crisis.

Looking through the revenue Estimates, what we find is that the Government is placing some reliance on gambling revenues to assist it in meeting some of the gaps which it is experiencing. I would hope to hear some honourable Senators on this particular matter.

I am aware that I have on the Order Paper a Resolution on Gambling, which I would not want to debate or even refer to at this stage. But just in passing, Mr. President, I just want to say that it is a very serious price that we are paying in this country for the impact which gambling is having in this society and I would hope that the Government can take a very serious look at this whole question of gambling, particularly the one-armed bandits. But we are going to leave that until the Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am very glad that you say that you do not wish to anticipate your own motion. All right. Please bear it in mind.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. So, Sir, we have been made a lot of promises. What are the promises that we have been made? I think that it is important that we look at this total situation. That is why I am taking my time on this because, Mr. President, this really presents us with an opportunity as it were to say, "I told you so".

The Barbados Labour Party promised the people of Barbados a relief from debt — the Democratic Labour

Party had been squandering money, had been borrowing money left, right and centre in this country — we will relieve this situation. And what have you got? — More debt.

We have been promised — and certainly the people looked forward, Mr. President, to it — an improvement in the standard of living. We have witnessed an absolute decline. We have been promised a relief from taxation. Instead, we have got more taxation and we have even got a tax for walking in the road, jocularly referred to as the "barefoot tax" in other places.

We have been promised a relief from inflation. Mr. President, you have only got to ask the people who go to the supermarkets and who do shopping in this country about the trend of prices in this country.

We have been promised more houses. As a matter of fact, if you were to read the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party you would see where they promised the large number of houses which were to be built every year. What do we find? The National Housing Corporation cannot deliver the goods, and the housing situation has gotten worse.

We have been promised a better Health Service. What do we find, Mr. President? Only last week we heard about polyclinics closing down. Three polyclinics are now not serving the people in the way that they were — you want me to name them? The Maurice Byer, the one in Black Rock and the one in Warrens, not serving the people in the way..... *(Laughter)*

Mr. PRESIDENT: Choose your words carefully.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Oh yes, Sir. Oh, yes. You know I can do that, Mr. President. Have no fear about that.

We heard they were closing down some of the services which they were offering because, let me just put it straight. If you take the Maurice Byer Clinic, before it was renamed the Maurice Byer Clinic, it used to operate in Speightstown as the Speightstown Health Clinic. It used to basically perform pre-natal and ante-natal care, it used to do various blood tests, etc. and other pressure tests and what have you, so that it was providing a service.

It was a good decision, of course developed by the Democratic Labour Party, to extend the services which were offered at these clinics — and we are not going to get into any row over the names — whether there are polyclinics or multi-purpose clinics, that has been canvassed already and I think we understand — what is in a name?

A programme was developed to build more clinics — Warrens came into operation.... *(Laughter) (Asides)*. Whether it was a crematorium or not, we still had the foresight to shift it after. *(Laughter)*. After all what's wrong with that? Are you telling me that the DLP was infallible? Are you telling me that the Barbados Labour Party is infallible? After all we are human beings, but nevertheless it was put to good use rather than letting it stay there. We put it to good use so that was foresight, you understand. But the point is that it was developed for that purpose.

So the idea was to relieve the pressure on the services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. But we have, now, a situation where what can be considered as rudimentary — that might be a bad word — some of the basic things which could be dealt with outside the hospital were being dealt with — additional things were put on the polyclinics. So we were promised we would have a better Health Service, and the result, now, today is that we are hearing an announcement that these services will no longer be available at the polyclinics.

I would have thought, Mr. President, that the Leader of the House, when he introduced these Estimates, would have referred to some of these serious matters of national concern. But you know what he talked about? He talked about the Community Services, merging of Community Services with Culture — imagine that! A vehicle in the Public Library breaking down or getting into an accident, and the fact that it was only delivering 25 books per day, these are serious matters of concern that the Minister, the Leader of the House, was dealing with — and you have polyclinics all over the country not being able to deliver the goods to the people.

You have a transport system which, far from getting better, is getting worse — and not a word from the Minister. You have a situation where the National Housing Corporation has fallen down badly in not being able to deliver in a vital area of national concern — hardly a word from the Minister. We are spending \$200,000, according to him, on NIFCA. Not a word, Mr. President, on the over \$20 million that have been wasted, to a large extent, on CARIFESTA. *(Asides)* I will deal with that later on.

The Minister is talking about Government pruning and all this kind of thing, and I cannot understand how these small matters could exercise his mind. I credit the Minister with a lot more intelligence than that. I have known him for a long time and certainly I cannot apply the adage about small things occupying small minds. But the length of time that he spent on such small and inconsequential matters, when we have such important matters, burdening the people of this country, leaves me to wonder what manner of man is this? *(Laughter)*

But, Sir, I understand. I have described the Hon. Minister and Leader of the House, I have said I knew him for a long time. I was at his feet for a couple of terms — he was at the point of leaving, but we never had any problem.....you threw me off. *(Laughter)*

Yes, Sir, I was saying that I have had reason in this Chamber to describe our Minister as the second most important person in Cabinet. I would say this, Mr. President, every day I am seeing this unfolding more and more — just look at what the Hon. Minister started off with as his portfolio, and look at what he has today.

But his arguments are very sweet and reasonable when he was talking about Community Development merging with Culture, I was saying, Mr. President, he might have heard me say sweet reason. He convinced me, and if he convinces me, you know he has done a job that they should be merged. I agree with him entirely. The arguments he puts up are beautiful arguments, but look at the time he spent on them. This is my concern when I say that the Government is completely out of tune with what is going on in this country, completely out of tune with the feeling of the people in this country. This is what I am talking about.

We will get back to Community Services, I hope, later on — if I can find the stamina to reach down there because that is in the back, and I am going from page to page.

I said that the Estimates provide us with an opportunity of looking at the economic and social developments in this country. Mr. President, I refer to what can be described as the crisis of confidence which is existing in this country and it is no small wonder that some time ago one honourable Senator — Senator Canon Jones, summed it up in a very interesting way, and I could almost feel the anguish with which he was expressing this point of view — how come we were told that things were so good, we never had it so good, and what has happened all of a sudden?

On another occasion, the same Senator, Senator Canon Jones, said that people must be told the truth if you want people to go along with you and support your national reconstruction efforts. And I am saying, Mr. President, people no longer believe — I will repeat that — people no longer believe anything the Government says. There is a feeling of uncertainty running throughout this country in the Public Service. People do not know when the axe falls again if it is going to fall on them. There is uncertainty in the business community.

Young people are dropping out. Have you not seen, Mr. President, and are you not concerned with the rapid spread of the Rastafarian cult in this country? Is this not

symptomatic of something grievously wrong with the body politic? These comments, Mr. President, are expressed out of concern for this country, out of concern about the direction and the trend which I see developing in Barbados.

I have said previously that what is needed at this time is leadership of a quality which I would suggest, Mr. President, the Barbados Labour Party is not capable of offering. You get, for example, a Minister in the Lower House indicating that, come hell or high water, he has to get a salary increase — and the Prime Minister supporting this particular position by saying that if the senior civil servants get an increase, he also has to get an increase and his ministers must get an increase.

On the other hand, you hear this talk about wage restraint, and if the Barbados Workers' Union did not fight off an even earlier call where the Prime Minister and the Governor of the Central Bank were stating that in 1982 there should be no wage increases, and have yet to fight that off, and if the people who are lower paid or who are certainly less well off than ministers who are getting — not a comfortable life, who get for a travelling allowance in excess of what some people earn.....*(ASIDE: Oh yes?) Oh yes...* and at the same time, of course, have access to motor cars attached to ministries, which they use — I see one coming up here for the Minister of Labour. I went through the Estimates with a fine toothed comb — \$40 000, I think, to buy a car for the Ministry of Labour. You know, when these cars — I remember \$25 000 — when this talk about cars first came up, I remember distinctly they were to be placed at the disposal of the Ministry. But I think that everybody in Barbados now see what that meant because the Ministers drive the cars around, and yet, I believe — if this is not so maybe this can be disputed — get a tax free travelling allowance.

These are matters of some serious concern, very, very serious concern and in that kind of situation where people are flaunting authority and power in that kind of way, and then expect people who are in a much worse position to hold strain and take it easy this, I submit, Mr. President, also adds to the frustration and the cynicism and the lack of confidence which is rampant throughout the length and breadth of Barbados today. It is a very, very serious matter.

So, I believe, Mr. President, that we have to look at these Estimates in the light of what I have said and to now see, if we can turn to the Estimates, page by page, the kind of situation that we are up against and what the Government is purporting to do, or not to do, to solve these particular problems.

My colleague, Senator Hall, will be dealing with some aspects, I am not going to touch all but I will give

the lead in some area and he will pick up...(ASIDE: He cannot handle this.) (Laughter) I will not be as long as you think.

On page 3, Sir.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Which 3?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: We are now into Expenditure. I will call — Services Commission. My only comment on the Services Commission really, Mr. President, was made just a couple of minutes ago — about the approach which Government is adopting to the Civil Service in terms of what the Leader of the Senate has called pruning.

I would say it is affecting the morale of the Civil Service very much, it is. It is affecting the morale where people look....(Aside).....adversely affecting the morale, the new policy of not appointing people, acting appointments and this kind of approach.

People are concerned about their future and about what appears to be a situation that we could reach where there might even be a greater cutback in employment in some of these areas. Maybe, the Minister can enlighten me, for example, as to whether or not there will be a cutback in the School Meals Service or whether people at the National Insurance are going to be laid off at the end of this month. These are matters which concern people and on which, I believe that some indication ought to be coming from the Minister. We ought to be concerned with the kind of attitude which will develop in the Public Service because, after all, this is a service which is crucial for our national life.

If we can move on to page 6, — Cabinet Office — Executive Direction and Central Administration and Conferences and Delegations. I would want to address my mind to the section dealing with Conferences and Delegations.

I see, Mr. President, that there is a cut back here of \$630,000. Presumably this will mean that this year the Government intends to attend less conferences or host less conferences. In short, it is an attempt to bring about some savings in this particular area. To some extent, this may be a prudent practice, but let me say this. One has to be careful when you are instituting cuts to look very dispassionately, and I use that word for a particular reason, at conferences to which this country sends delegations.

The Government, it would seem has taken a decision either not to send a delegation this year to the

International Labour Organisation. (Asides). I will deal with that. I do not mind that comment about looking out for yourself or anything like that. You don't worry about that, I can handle that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Don't pay too much attention to that. Just address the Chair.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am sorry, Sir. You did not make that remark. Or from the correspondence, the Government is indicating that the other partners in this tripartite arrangement, if they want any person from the organisation to go to this conference, the Government would have no objection to their paying for their attendance at the conference.

Let me explain something in this particular area. I think it is very important because I do not want honourable Senators to get the feeling that this is a matter in which I have any personal interest. Far from that. But there is a very important principle which is involved.

The International Labour Organisation, Mr. President, is the only tripartite body in the world made up of Governments, employers and workers; where the workers sit and have a voice equal to employers, a voice equal to Government in matters relating to the setting of labour standards and in matters relating to technical assistance for member countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, Barbados has benefitted considerably from the work of the International Labour Organisation. In terms of our National Insurance, they were the people who provided the technical advice and who ensured that our National Insurance got off to a very good start, to the extent that inspite of the little problems that they have — like not getting people's benefits when they claim them in time, and making people wait for a long time in some instances — those are things which I believe can be ironed out administratively, the fact is that our National Insurance Scheme is used as a model for other schemes throughout the Caribbean.

When, for instance, they were setting up the scheme in Belize, people came from Belize and observed how we were doing it here and went back to set up their scheme. St. Lucia did the same thing and Dominica did the same. I think this is a very clear example of the kind of work which is done in this particular area. And in the area of technical assistance they provide a lot, and Barbados has benefitted tremendously from this.

Now beginning 1981 — 82, for the first time Barbados took a seat on the governing body of the ILO. Now when I say that I should explain that it goes on a rotation basis and I think from 1981 — 82 up to 1984 is Barbados' turn. We have just taken over I think from Guyana.

But you have this kind of situation where the Government has taken a seat on the governing body and the Government making a decision which will clearly not lead to full participation in the work of the ILO, because the rules of the ILO stipulate very clearly that delegations have to be paid for by the Government. The employers could not pick up and go to the ILO if the Barbados Government decides it is not sending a delegation. The workers cannot pick up and go to the ILO if the Government decides it is not sending a delegation.

So I believe that this is one area — do not mind the cuts — where in view of the benefits which we have gained and which we are likely to gain from the work of the International Labour Organisation, I am urging the Government to re-think this situation — look at it again and do not go down the kind of path that you are going down in terms of trying to save in this particular area.

Tomorrow there is a gentleman who is coming into Barbados to discuss a very important area, the whole question of occupational safety and health and setting up programmes for Barbados and for the Caribbean in this area. These are important matters which I daresay have some important bearing, Mr. President, on our productivity and, generally speaking, on the quality of our working life which, after all, keeps the country going.

I believe it is sufficiently important for me to ventilate it here and for me to urge the Government to have a change in this area. I would hate to think that the Government is adopting that particular position for other reasons which I would not want to go into.

If we can move to Page 7 to the Electoral Office, Mr. President, the Democratic Labour Party has a number of grievances about the electoral process in this country.

I would not like anybody to think that we are crying sour grapes, but facts have to be faced. We have fought two elections and we have lost them. I, myself, have fought three and lost one, will fight another one and win it, but be that as it may. There are a number of genuine grievances that have got to be ventilated about the Electoral Office and the electoral process in this country.

I well remember in 1978 with a bye-election coming up, the Government hurriedly came down to Parliament to make some changes in the Electoral Laws. One, they said, was to curb what they called the excessive amount of spending at election time and, (2), was to abolish the monthly publication list which they claimed was a waste of time.

What have we found? Let us look at spending. In spite of the amendments to the Act to control spending,

the 1981 campaign conducted by the Barbados Labour Party had all the evidence of massive spending, so that this amendment was of no consequence, massive spending and what this raises, Mr. President? (Asides).... You will be surprised what I could tell you but I will leave that until another time.

What this raises is a very serious question. I think it is a question which is occupying the minds of people in the light of all this. Can a man of moderate means, or poor man for that matter, who feels that he has something to offer, or who, for one reason or another, wants to become a candidate in the election, can he really withstand this kind of obvious pressure, based on what we saw in the 1981 Election Campaign conducted by the Barbados Labour Party? And can the poor man, or man of moderate or average means, contest an election in Barbados?

I would say "No." This is the trend which we see developing so that to come to the question, I do not even know, being a poor man, whether I will be able to contest an election again, if this trend continues.

It is a very, very serious question which has to be raised. I think that this, in my view, presents a very serious challenge to the democratic process when we have a situation where the expenditure of large sums of money will determine whether or not a person will be able to enter an election campaign. It is a challenge to the democratic process.

I know that an Electoral Commission — at least there is legislation relating to an Electoral Commission in existence. One hopes that when it comes into operation that it would not only perform the function of regulating constituency boundaries, but will pay very serious attention, and indeed will actually come up with some measures, to ensure maximum participation of ordinary people, if they so desire, as candidates in elections in this country. A new and honest approach is needed in this matter.

Sir, let me get into another area. I talked about the monthly list and the publication of this. This was a system which was introduced, one of the innovations introduced by the Democratic Labour Party in our electoral processes, and which provided an opportunity for information on whom had been registered to be made known on a monthly basis. What did the Barbados Labour Party Administration do? They abolished that and introduced a law which said that a list would be published once a year, on January 31, and in the time of election the completed list would be published, I think it is three days before the election. The point is that it was a very short time.

I do not know what was the thinking at the time, but certainly subsequent events indicated very clearly

what could possibly happen in that situation, because candidates did not have enough time, when the final list became available to them, to do the kind of checking which they ought to be able to do in a very serious and important area of national life.

I believe, Sir, that every effort ought to be made by the Government to make sure that all candidates in an election campaign have access to the lists in an adequate time so that they can check and find out, and that the people, the electors, can find out at an early stage where they have to go to vote, and to have a complete idea of the number of people who would be involved in the electoral process.

So when you introduce that kind of change, about the publication of the list, I am saying that it was a retrograde step. I am happy to hear — I see Senator Williams writing — that the Prime Minister said in the House, he took the point, admitted, that it was probably an error on their part to have discontinued the publication of the monthly list. And I got the impression, Sir,....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Sir, I just want you to be a little careful as to how you criticise what action the legislature itself has taken, except on a substantive motion. Keep it general. I don't want it to appear to be saying that the legislature in its wisdom did something that it should not have done and just leave it at that. Just be careful.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Thank you, Mr. President, I understand that sometimes you would have to pull me back off the rails. I do get on the rails sometimes and I appreciate being pulled back on the track.

I take your point that what I am saying could be very well be interpreted as a criticism of legislation which has passed this House, but I hope that the point has been made, that these changes, from a point of view of observation, ought to be looked at again — let me put it that way — and I am glad to hear the Prime Minister indicated that something will be done in this area. And certainly, I want to repeat the Democratic Labour Party's call for a return to the publication of the monthly list in our electoral process. This is the position we took when the amended legislation came down, and which we have steadfastly held to, and I hope this will be done as soon as possible.

The 1981 election campaign gave us an opportunity to look at a number of things which happened and to ventilate a number of grievances. I believe, Sir, that when one goes in to a contest that every effort should be made to ensure that everybody has an opportunity to operate on an equal footing, and the attitude which was displayed by some people, at the level of a number of constituencies in Barbados, left a lot to be desired. Let me give you some concrete examples.

On Election Day, Sir, I was called to a polling booth in the old Vestry Room in St. Lucy where an elector went to vote, and rather than giving the lady the normal ballot paper, the presiding officer gave the lady a blue ballot paper, which I think is called a tendered ballot paper, and when she made her "X", of course under protest, he took the ballot paper and put it in his bag.

I was called and I went down and challenged the presiding officer and he took out the paper from his bag and told me that is what he was told to do with it.

I got on the telephone and I spoke to the Chief Electoral Officer. I had great difficulty to get through, and as a matter of fact I could not even get through. I had to call my office and get one of the people in the office to go down to tell the Chief Electoral Officer to call me at a particular number, which he did, and the Returning Officer was instructed to put this matter right.

But he is — can I call him a joker — is it Parliamentary to...no, no I am talking about Lawrence Kennedy, the Returning Officer for St. Lucy,...a joker, a fool. I will deal with him without any mercy, because when a man like that can say that as long as he is Returning Officer for St. Lucy "Evelyn Greaves can never win a seat in St. Lucy." When he can say that publicly, I believe that kind of person should never hold any kind of position in this country.

When, Mr. President, I spoke to him and told him the Chief Electoral Officer said that what the presiding officer had done was wrong, what was his attitude?.... "Man if you say so, well, whatsoever you say that he says, do it." The man did not even have the commonsense to check with the Chief Electoral Officer to find out whether I was misleading him or not.

The matter was subsequently corrected and the lady was able to vote in the proper manner. But the point is, Mr. President, that this almost caused an uproar and it has left a very, very bitter taste in the people's mouth. And when you get that kind of incompetence on that level being displayed at that level — and I could talk about a number of areas — one has got to wonder, and must question what went on in 1981.

I complained, on another occasion, about the way in which registration was done and the people who were selected to do with registration.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Don't you think that there is provision for representation in regard to matters like these to be made in certain places and not here? Where do we get by shouting it out here?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I made representation already and I would like to repeat them.

here, for the record. Where a Returning Officer was able to select seven out of 12 enumerators, who are all relatives of a candidate, I think that is bad and does not lead to the confidence which one would expect in this particular area. I believe, Mr. President, that every opportunity ought to be provided for every candidate in an election campaign to have a fair deal, and to feel that he has had a fair deal.

I know that there have been some statement to the effect that a very small number of people, according to the official statement, were unable to vote, or could not find the names, or something like that. I am saying that this is not true, in spite of the official explanation or the official statement.

I mean, after a campaign and a Party has won, and then you ask people to come and indicate what has happened and all this kind of thing, you know Barbadians are not known for that kind of activity. And certainly, I think that people would have a genuine fear about the possibilities of victimisation, a genuine fear about that, and so they would keep away from that.

But I am saying, Mr. President, that hundreds of people were deprived of exercising their right to vote in the 1981 General Elections. (Aside) People had to be running from polling station to polling station to find out where their names were. This should not be the case and when you get that kind of situation developing in a country it poses some very serious questions about our electoral process, and I am suggesting that we had better sit up, Mr. President, and take note of that and try to correct that kind of situation.

People should not have to be running all over the place trying to find where they could vote, going to three and four polling stations and still not find their names and then they discover that their names are registered, as has happened in one or two cases that I know, somewhere about in St. Peter, when people live in St. Lucy and never lived in St. Peter. And this situation was repeated in all of the constituencies.

I think that these are matters of genuine concern, not only to candidates, but also to people who were effectively denied the right to exercise their democratic right. I would hope, Mr. President, that we will see some improvement in this area and certainly that the Electoral Commission would look at this.

In Josey Hill, which has had a polling booth for years, Senator Rouse would know about this, Sir, because he lost his deposit down there some years ago. (Asides) (Laughter) (SENATOR K. A. ROUSE: To who?) You lost your deposit down there some years ago to the Democratic Labour Party. (Asides) The blows were too hot for your head, I won't expect you to remember.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, please. If you let yourself get distracted like this, we would never finish, you know. We have a certain legal limitation on this debate.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir, and I think, Sir, I have a privilege.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Oh yes.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Fair enough.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am sure you would not want me to guillotine the rest of the people at the end of the.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No, I would not want that, that is why I spoke early, Sir.

The polling station was removed from Josey Hill and then you had the situation where people had to go down to Pie Corner to vote and if you know the way in which those two districts are situated — I believe, Sir, that you have fairly good knowledge of that because I think you are well acquainted with the area, I will leave it at that, I now realise that you are well acquainted with the area — if you look at the two districts really there is not much of a distance between them.

But to get from one to the other coming in this direction, you have to go through a lot of hill and bush and what have you so that it is almost impassable from Josey Hill to Pie Corner. And if you use the public road, you have to travel for about two and a half miles to get from Josey Hill to Pie Corner. So what was effectively done, of course, and I think the results show that very clearly in that area, was that a number of people became frustrated and did not particularly bother to go and vote. (Laughter)

I think, Mr. President, that these are matters which are of concern. I believe that, as I said, every effort should be made to make it possible for elections to be conducted in as fair a manner as possible.

You know another very silly thing which took place on election day? Polling clerks..... What do you call the people in charge? Anyhow the polling clerks, the person who is in charge of a particular polling area. (SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The Presiding Officer.) The Presiding Officer? Alright, whomsoever he is, told people that they could not vote with a pen or with a pencil which they took into a polling station.

Again, I had to intervene in that stupidity, that utter stupidity, where the man argued with me that if those people wanted to vote — and people were actually turned back because they said they were not using the pencil which was provided by the Government but they

were going to vote with their own pen or the pencil which they brought. And then, I had to..... (Aside).... No, no, no, that is a fact. Do you want me to call the man's name? I then had to go and take the people back into the station to let the presiding officer know that he cannot do this to people who want to come and vote.

When you get that level of people, that level of incompetence operating in the electoral system, all sorts of things could go wrong. And I believe that a lot of things went wrong in the 1981 Elections. (Aside).

What I am pleading for, Mr. President, is that..... (Aside) that is why we lost — we will see a tremendous amount of improvement in these areas in the future.

Independence Day Celebrations, Page 8. There is a note here to Subhead 1 which says *inter alia* "This subhead provides for the salaries and allowances of those staff and the general office expenses for Independence Day Celebrations".

The 30th November, Sir, is a very important day in this country — it is our Independence Day. And whereas I do not believe that we should be squandering money, and whereas I do not believe that one of the few activities which should take place should be a party at Ilaro Court, where, for example, the Barbados Labour Party candidates can boast that they have been asked to bring along 25 people to an Independence Day party at Ilaro Court, I do not think that this is the way in which, or rather the only way in which our independence should be celebrated.

Independence is a time for national unity, where you will try to continue in our efforts to build a nation, but this present Administration has never really seemed too happy about Independence.

I well recall during the Independence debate, and the Leader of the Senate will remember this one in 1965–66 — it started off, of course, with the publication of the White Paper which indicated that Barbados was going independent — the Barbados Labour Party opposed independence alone for Barbados. So we know that they have never been happy with independence.

And we can well recall the positions taken by the Leader of the House, for instance, on our joining the OAS. All of these are things that are documented. History is a very funny thing. I like to read and check back. You used to write a column called something like "From a Political Point of View". Anyhow you know the column I am talking about. If I had the time I would have been able to bring the documents in to read them back, but we know the position of the Barbados Labour Party on independence. (Asides) Yes, "From a Democratic Point

Of View". You used to write that, and then there was another one you started to write. That is when he was Personal Aide to the former Prime Minister Errol Barrow. "From a Democratic Point of View" by one Nigel Barrow. I do not know if it is the same person, but I believe so.

They took a very strong position against us having independence alone. They wanted independence within the context of the Caribbean. You said you would not mind independence, but that we should try to get independence as a group, when it was evident that Britain did not want to be carrying the burden of the colonies hanging on. Britain was getting rid of the colonies, whether we wanted it or not, and we would have had to go in any case.

The Democratic Labour Party chose another route for Caribbean integration through the route of CARIFTA, then on to CARICOM, the economic area. It was recognised that at the political level there were, and still are, a number of difficulties in the way of a very close kind of integration. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the House, only last week I think, was making this very point when Senator Hall raised the question about a meeting of the Heads of Government, and he said it is working. So what do you need a Heads of Government meeting for? I read you good.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, that was not what I said. I had pointed out that the institutions of CARICOM are working, but that we would be nearer now to a Heads of Government meeting since certain people like the former Prime Minister of Barbados are no longer in that kind of position, and that people therefore now seem able to work together a little closer.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I wonder if he is suggesting that the open quarrel between the present Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Grenada is all settled now, and there is no more hurling of abuse across the Caribbean waters at one another.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Try and get on with the point.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The point is that we know they have never been happy with that, so they have not really done anything in this particular area.

What I would like to see happen this year, and I have made this point repeatedly ever since the Barbados Labour Party came to power and it was clear about their attitude towards independence, is that we aim for a wider participation of the community in the area of Independence Celebrations. Maybe, Sir, now that Community Development has fallen into the hands of the Leader of the House, we will probably see some move in this direc-

tion. They ought to be wider community participation. There should be, in my view, activities in the rural areas which are designed, for example, to focus on the youths, both at the community and village levels. Let us get some kind of activity in that direction.

There should be some kind of activity, I am suggesting, which would foster a sense of excellence where young people can aim at something and get them involved — and not, as it were, dropping out as seems to be coming to the fore more and more — activities aimed at fostering and, of course, stimulating national achievement.

These are the kinds of activities which I believe would go a far way in making our Independence Celebrations and our Independence Day more meaningful, not just a parade showing off our guns and our armoury, the gun boat and aeroplane. You know, all these are trappings which are, to a large extent, unnecessary. I will deal with the Defence Force later on when I come to that.

I think that we should try to get into the area where people would begin to feel committed and involved in our national development. I am suggesting, Sir, that this is one of the ways in which the Government can demonstrate its interest in developing the kind of activities that I have been talking about. But, at present, as I said, there is no particular thinking or leadership in that direction.

Sir, we can move on to the Capital Estimates on Page 11, let me deal with that one time. Mr. President, could I just crave your indulgence for one minute. When are we going to break for lunch? Can I get an indication from you on that, Sir?

MR. PRESIDENT: You had better give me an indication first as to how long you propose to speak.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Oh, well, maybe another two hours, Sir.

MR. PRESIDENT: If you really intend to speak for that long we will stop at 1.00 o'clock.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: There is a provision in here under the Capital Estimates for \$500 000 for structures, plant, equipment and furniture. The Note says, "provides for the purchase of furniture and equipment for the Prime Minister's Official residence. Provision is also made to continue renovation work."

Mr. President, there are some very serious questions, which must be answered, in this particular area. For a long time the Democratic Labour Party has been trying to find out what it is costing the taxpayers of this country to provide an extravagant residence for the Prime Minister of this country. (Aside).

Senator Rouse asks, who bought it. Ilaro Court was bought by the Democratic Labour Party, not for a residence of a Prime Minister, but for a cultural centre in co-operation with the Government of Venezuela.

The present Administration decided that they would convert into a residence for the Prime Minister of this country, when there was, already in existence, an official residence for the Prime Minister, Culloden Farm, which the present Prime Minister refused to go and live in, which I would imagine, Sir, with some renovations, could have made a decent and comfortable residence for the Prime Minister.

But what do we have? We have this extravagance where, as I recall, the Prime Minister, when questioned about this some time ago in the Lower House, started talking about what would be provided at Ilaro Court, I seem to recall him stating that it will have the benefit of, I think, two swimming pools — oh yes, the records will show that — I think there were about five car parks.

We, on the Opposition really, questioned whether we were not, as it were, over-reaching ourselves and really being extravagant, too extravagant in this area. And I think that this has come home more and more, and I think it is more stark now, particularly at the time of this very serious economic crisis that we find ourselves in. How can we, when faced with the kind of problems that we are faced with, be spending that kind of money on a residence for the Prime Minister?

I would like the Minister, therefore, Mr. President, to treat the Senate with the courtesy, of which I know he is quite capable of doing and which he does, of providing us with some information as to the exact cost of the renovations and the developments which are going on at Ilaro Court.

I am told, Sir, that the final bill will be in excess of \$2 million and maybe he can tell us that that is not so — it might probably be \$3 million, but let him give us the figure. Government must know what it is costing to get that residence into the shape that they want to get it in and I think that people in Barbados must be given this kind of information. That is why we have opportunities like these, Mr. President, to ask questions and the Government is under an obligation to provide this kind of information.

The renovations, as I can recall, have been going on now for, I believe, almost three years. I really do not know what they are building up there or what they are renovating, but I think it is a lot of money which is being spent in this area that could be spent, I am suggesting, more productively in other areas.

MR. PRESIDENT: Are you finished with that item?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. I am finished with that Item.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting will be suspended for 45 minutes.

On resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed. Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, when we took the break for lunch I was just about to go into Defence and Security, on page 12 under Head 17. Defence and Security has sometimes been subjected to warm debate as to where the country is going in terms of the kind of expenditure which is being directed in the area of defence and security. There are a number of concerns — genuine concerns, I daresay — which the Democratic Labour Party has about the Defence Force and which has been ventilated from time to time.

But more specifically to the broad heading of Defence and Security under General Administration, if you look at the functions of this particular department — there is a function there under the Note on page 12, which, when I looked at it both last year and again this year, caused me to raise my eyebrow and to a little concerned about the way in which it sounds and the way in which it comes across to me and, I believe the way in which it would come across to a number of persons, where it has been described that one of the functions of Defence and Security is, "the screening of applicants seeking employment in the Civil Service."

Now I said it sounds ominous. Can you envisage a situation where a person applies for a job then to hear that an investigation, as it were, is being carried out on him. Now, I know if you are going to be employing a person you would want to know something about their background, but it is the kind of feeling which I get when one sees it in writing, particularly when one has this kind of feeling overall about the role of defence and security in Barbados and, generally speaking, the kind of role which is taken on, particularly by defence units in developing countries.

It is a bit scary, and I was wondering if the Minister could give some indication as to the extent to which screening is done. I say this is something which gets to me, and when I show this Note to a number of people, they express concern about this particular activity on the part of Defence and Security. I would hope that the kind of feeling I have, which developed from reading this, is not the case, and that nothing is done,

for example, to exclude people from employment in Government because of their political affiliation or because of their speaking out on issues in a manner which might not be consistent with the views of the Government from time to time.

Sir, one can very well remember a famous speech which was made in the Lower House, a famous starvation speech by a Cabinet Minister in the present Administration, where he indicated that as far as he was concerned, if anybody came to him for a job, even if the initials of their names came out to DLP, if the person had the name Douglas Leopold Phillips, he could not get a job with him. This is the kind of thing which, when you get such an attitude being displayed and those statements being openly said, not even in a conversation in a bar or in a dining room, but on the floor of the House, when you get that kind of statement being made, then you must realise, Sir, that it was said with all seriousness which we have put on that particular matter.

That is why this particular Note does raise some considerable concern to me. I hope that we can get some reassurances from the Minister that this is not the kind of screening which is done by Defence and Security on the question of recruitment for jobs in the public sector.

To move on to page 13, Immigration, I would like to say that there is enough public adverse comment on the way in which immigration matters are handled in this country — for some attention to be given, and indeed for some investigation should be made.

Charges were made in the Lower House about the way in which people have been getting work permits and what have you. The Prime Minister in reply stated that he was against any form of corruption — very good words, I would like to hear him commit himself and certainly commit the Government to that kind of sentiment — but I believe that public fears should be allayed, once and for all in this matter, by a proper and thorough investigation into the charges which have been made.

It is a serious matter. People are talking about these things — about people having to pay \$5,000 to get a permit and such things. I don't know about them but I think it would be useful if these things should be properly investigated. You see we come back to the cynicism and the disillusionment and disquiet which we have in this society, and I believe that a Government which is responsive to the feelings of the people in the society it ought to pay some serious attention to this. And I would want to re-emphasise that if there is a racket involved it should be exposed and that Government will do itself and the community good by having

the matter properly investigated and ventilated and cleared once and for all.

If we can move on to page 14 under Capital Estimates, we see very interesting things in terms of Defence and Security and the kind of expenditure which is being directed in the area of the Defence Force.

What I would like to say on the Defence Force is that more and more, Mr. President, the Defence Force is taking on a higher and a higher profile in this community and I believe it is a very dangerous trend. The Defence Force is, as it were, eating its way into the consciousness of the Barbadian population. Nowadays, whenever you have a particular problem in the society you hear people talking about, "Get the Defence Force to do it".

This is the kind of thing that gets me worried — cane fires, "Get the Defence Force", a fire in Bridgetown, "Get the Defence Force", fiasco in the CARIFESTA, "Get the Defence Force" — and yet \$25 million down. We even now have the changing of the guards at Government Headquarters — trappings of royalty? — weekly broadcast on the radio.

All of these are things which you know, as I say, are raising the profile of the Defence Force. And I believe, Mr. President, that this is a dangerous trend, particularly in view of experiences in some neighbouring countries in the Caribbean, because the experiences in some areas might very well suggest that the usefulness of that kind of Defence Force could be outweighed by its dangers. And I would venture to suggest, Sir, that one could look at what happened in Dominica where the Defence Force had to be disbanded.

In 1970, I think it was, in Trinidad and Tobago where the Defence Force attempted to take over the Government of that country. If my memory serves me correctly, I think in 1980 there was an attempt by the Defence Force in Jamaica to subvert the democratic process there, I think there was an attempt uncovered to overthrow the Manley Administration. In Surinam, quite recently, we have had an indication about the kind of activities that a Defence Force could be involved in. (Aside) My colleague has reminded me about further afield in Africa and Latin America. Look at what the armies are doing.

There is a litany of incidences that one can quote, and I am saying that we have to be very careful and concerned about these things. You know, I believe, Sir, that the internal threat created by the Defence Force may be greater than any perceived external one, if I could sum up what I am saying in those few words.

But could we just analyse, Sir, briefly, the kind of expenditure which has gone into the Defence Force over

a period of time, let us say between 1980–83. But before that, what happened? What was the expenditure like in the period 1976–77? In 1976/77, this country was spending about \$1.46 million in this area, in 1982/83, it has jumped to \$18.8 million.

Over the period 1980–81, 1981–82 and 1982–83 what do we find? In 1980–81 this country spent \$20.37 million, in 1981–82, \$20.43 million, 1982–83 we are going to be spending \$18.8 million. And if my notes serve me correctly, I think we have some amendments to the Estimates that would suggest that there is an additional \$2 million for Defence and Security which are not included in here, what we will find is that over this period between 1980 and 1983, over a three year period, this country would have spent in the region of \$60 million on Defence.

Now, Sir, when we look at that and look, for example, at the money which has been allocated to Housing over the same period, or to a more productive area of economic activity, one must question the wisdom of this kind of expenditure and this kind of direction.

I believe, Sir, that there are some areas in Housing and in Health which are crying out for attention in the way that attention is being paid to the Defence Force. I throw these questions out, Sir, because I think it must show the lack of proper direction and in having proper objectives for our national development. And I say that it is a very dangerous direction and a very dangerous thing for us to be concentrating in this kind of way, this kind of money, on our Defence Force. This money could be usefully put into more productive areas of our national life.

Under page 20, Head 19, I believe, Sir, that just in passing I would again draw the attention of the Senate to the problems which were experienced by those policy holders at First Federation Life including Senator Trotman, who, I understand — I saw his name on the list as one of the people who suffered — I understand he got his money through.

But there are a number of poor people who have lost their investment in this particular area and I have been calling for, I believe over two years now, for some kind of enlightenment on this and some kind of position and I do not know if the matter has been clarified yet.

I understand that the company had property up there below Purity Bakeries and there was some undertaking given that the property would be sold and as many of the debts satisfied as possible. I do not know what has been happening in this particular area, but the policy holders, some of whom I meet from time to time, are

still asking questions about it and I hope that the Government could give some indication as to what they are doing in this particular area.

Let us move to page 21, Sir, under Customs Department. Sometimes, you have to wonder how the Government determines policy. Now we have in Barbados a number of garment manufacturers, some people argue that we have too many. I have not done a study of the industry, so I do not know.

But the point is that recently the Government bought uniforms for people in the Customs Department. Sir, you would have thought that the Government, in its supposedly declared policy to help local enterprise, and what have you, would have undertaken to give this work to the local manufacturer, but what happened? They were sent off either to Canada or the United States of America to be made, and I believe that there is need for some clear direction in this particular area. It is like, you know,.....(SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is like the printing of the DLP Manifesto). That is confidential, that is a different thing.

This is quite a serious matter and I am concerned about it. I believe that if we are talking about developing the garment industry, that every encouragement ought to be given to local manufacturers; and every opportunity for them to get work, to show the quality of their work, ought to be encouraged. Certainly, this policy on the part of the Barbados Labour Party Administration does not indicate this, and it is a bad policy. I would hope that in future, where there might be other opportunities for uniforms and other things required by Government, that encouragement could be given to people operating in Barbados to assist in this particular effort, because, after all, the question of employment plays an important role, and if the Government is serious about employment, then certainly it would look at this particular area.

I would think, Sir, that rather than having the situation where sometimes people in those areas are put on a short week, such things should be done because all these things would go to help stimulate activity. And this is a point which I think is a fundamental one, and one which ought to be drawn to the attention of the Government, because after all, it is a question of national policy in this very important area.

On page 22 under Rates and Taxes, I read a release in the newspapers that there is a move to change up the system of tax collection and to close down some of the offices(SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: No release). I would like to think, Sir, that the Government would take the opportunity to clear the air on the information which has appeared, and which has not been denied, that the Tax Collection Offices in the rural

areas are going to be closed down and centralised, and that everything is coming into town under the Income Tax Department.

I am very glad to hear that this is not so, because I very well remember when the Local Government went out of operation the kind of fight which was put up to get these services continued and extended in some of the rural areas, because it is a real help and of assistance to people who live in certain parts of the rural areas.

Since the Leader of the House has given the assurance that it is not the intention of Government to close down, and never was the intention of Government to close down these tax collection offices in the rural areas, I think this is welcome news. I would hope that this would allay some of the fears which members of the public have expressed about this particular rumour, if you want to say that.

Under Statistical Services, page 23, I made some comments, generally speaking, on the unemployment figures and the information which is put out on price movements and cost of living movements, etc., and I want to repeat them by simply saying that there is an increasing lack of public credibility in the Statistical Department and the information which is put out from this Department.

I am not sure if it is a question of the methodology which is used for the collection of information — whether these are inappropriate to our particular situation, but when you can get the kind of information coming out on unemployment and the level of inflation that you are getting, when the actual situation speaks of a different situation, then as I say, one must question what really is the role and function of the Statistical Department.

I believe, Sir, that this department must undergo some very serious introspection, beefing up its staff and the kind of work, the quality of the work which it does, because it is not a question of providing information for a Government *per se*, but it is information for national use, and I know that some members of the Government would say it is not them who say that, it is the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank say this, they put out these figures.

But I understand how it is done, because when they come here they get the information which is given to them by the Government, and so they write their report, to a large extent, on the information which is given to them by the Government, so that if you start off wrong in the beginning everything else after that would be wrong.

Do not let us get carried away by what appears to be sometimes glowing reports about economic activity in Barbados and the quality of life as would come out in reports from these institutions, because it is based, as I said,

on information provided by the Government. I would hope, Sir, that some serious attention is paid in this area.

In the area of labour statistics, I think it is a shame that we are still unable to provide proper labour statistics in Barbados. I recall an occasion where I attended a meeting with the Minister, Senator Trotman, and he, himself, was surprised that that section was not functioning. He even indicated that he thought a particular officer had been sent abroad to do studies in this area, and he said he would investigate what was happening in that particular area.

It is a very serious matter because after all, Sir, I think that proper information is needed for planning. If you are going to be able to plan correctly, if you are going to be able to know and to pick up trends early in our economic activity, then we have to have reliable statistical information. It is clear that that information is not reliable.

As I said, I cannot exactly identify where the problem is, but certainly the problem is in the department, and maybe the problem could very well be to do with the methods which are used in order to arrive at the information which is eventually put out. I would like to suggest, Sir, that the Government pay some close attention to that area.

On page 27 under Capital Estimates, there are a number of projects mentioned. It says, "Provides for a contribution to the establishment of a Cement Plant as well as contributions to Caribbean Food Crop Corporation, a Broiler Breeder Project, the West Indies Shipping Corporation, Barbados Mortgage Finance Company, Caribbean Airways and Caricargo."

I believe that the Cement Plant is, as it were, on stream now — work has started. But I wonder if the Minister could give some information about the stage which has been reached in compensating those persons whose properties have been taken over to make way for the Cement Plant, and what alternative arrangements have been made for resettling some of these people who will not be able to find areas in which to settle on their own.

I think it is more than just the payment of compensation. I believe that the Government has a duty to these people to assist wherever possible in helping them to find an area to re-settle. I know that a number of property owners who are affected are dissatisfied with the way in which they are being treated, particularly not being able to hear anything definite as to (a) when they will get their compensation and (b) the level of compensation that they will be given for the inconvenience to which they have been put by the siting of the Cement Plant.

I would just like to hope, and I have expressed this in the other Chamber on more than one occasion, that particular care would be taken to protect the environment from the fallout of dust from the plant, and also in the movement to and from the plant. I would not want to delay the House by pointing to the very grave and serious dangers which can arise to people's health from dust, and, as I said, I really would hope that the Government would pay some attention to this area.

We know that development brings its own problems, and sometimes you embark on a project to, as it were, bring about improvements in a particular area, but then these improvements or developments bring new problems, and I certainly would like to exhort the Government to think ahead and to look at this problem, which can be a dangerous one.

As regards the Broiler Breeder Project, from what I can recall during the election campaign — and I think it was contained in the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto of 1981 — there was an indication that the Broiler Breeder Project would have been put at the Hope Dairy Farm in St. Lucy. The Hope Dairy Farm would have been closed down and it would have been replaced by a Broiler Breeder Project. I believe that we ought to be given some information on this for a number of reasons. There was some indication that the cost of the project had reached an astronomical figure, something like \$25 million, which I saw quoted somewhere, and it might not be possible any longer for the Government to become involved in it — but yet I see that provision is made here for getting into this kind of activity.

I think we would need to get some clarification on this matter and also at another level, if there is going to be an attempt to go through with this project, the result might very well be that the dairy farm will be closed. I think Senator Hall will be dealing with other aspects of that at a later stage, if he gets an opportunity to speak on these Estimates today. So it will be a question of those people who are at present employed at the Hope Dairy Farm and what will become of them, and what provisions are being made for them. In short, their welfare ought to be taken into consideration in terms of letting them know early what is happening in this area.

From what I gather, the dairy farm will be closed down in any case, because under the Spring Hall Land Lease Project there is provision made for a dairy farm there, and I understand that a lease has already been signed for that particular project. I am therefore asking the Government for some information on this particular project.

Under the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation there is provision for a sum of money. In the Lower House, it was indicated that the BMFC would be getting somewhere in the region of \$1 million each year over the next three year period, so that over the period \$3 million will be allocated to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company.

I believe, Sir, that this a mere drop in the bucket for what is required to satisfy the housing needs, and indeed to satisfy those people who have applied, or who would like to apply, to the Barbados Mortgage Finance for loans to assist them in owning a house in Barbados.

Even the provision of \$1 million this year cannot go very far, because if I could be ridiculous, Mr. President, and take the figure of \$40,000 for the construction of a house — I am being ridiculous, really ridiculous — that would only provide about 25 houses, at that figure. That is what we are talking about. I think that we ought to get serious about this, and there cannot be any doubt that a proper amount of money directed in this particular area can have very important consequences for the improvement of housing and making people feel more comfortable. And certainly, it would also assist with the developmental efforts, because after all, artisans would continue to have a steady flow of work.

I am concerned about that particular area and I would hope that the Government would be able to see its way, in the not too distant future, to provide a greater allocation to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company.

Laker Airways, well, that has collapsed and Caledonian has taken over. I wonder if the Minister can give us some definite position as to the role of Caledonian Airways and how long will they be in, what kind of arrangement has been made with Caledonian for continuing the services which were provided by Caribbean Airways under the Laker arrangement. Will they be in this for one year, two years, three months, six months, whatever? I think we ought to know, because it is a question of reliability and looking down the road and planning as to what is going to be happening in that particular area.

There is no doubt, Sir, that Caribbean Airways played a significant role in reducing fares between Europe and Barbados and it enabled a number of people in Europe, particularly Barbadians in England, to come and visit their families, and for the traffic in the other direction. And one would hope that there will be a significant role which this particular airline under a new arrangement will continue to play in terms of making air travel cheaper — it is by no means cheap now — and I

would hope that the Government would be doing something in this particular direction.

Sir, I would skip Agriculture — maybe not entirely — I think I have a note somewhere around since Senator Hall will be dealing with Agriculture. I will pass Agriculture. I think I will pass the Attorney General, too. I do not have any notes there.

Education (Asides — “I think you should pass that too”). No, No. (Laughter) We cannot pass that. We should not. It is too important to all of us, to pass it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The time is passing.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Right, Sir, under Education, on the Page before 57 — it is not marked. Under the Summary of Heads of Estimates and Programmes, under (E) Universities and Colleges, I see there is a decrease of \$2.1 million. Now, I wonder, Sir, if the Minister could give us some reason for this decrease. I think it ought to be explained and particularly if one turns to Page 60 under (E) Universities and Colleges one see that there is a decrease of \$752 000, and that Section has to do, as I said, with the grant to the University of the West Indies.

In these times, Sir, when there are all sorts of talk going around about the University and the future of the University, and where there is some concern about the future direction of the University, I believe that a country like Barbados should come out very early and state a very clear and unequivocal position on the University of the West Indies, indicating our commitment to regionalism, recognising the very important role which the University of the West Indies has played in the development of the Caribbean and, of course, re-affirming the commitment of the Government to the independence of the University.

Now, we do not want to have the University in a situation where politicians, whether they are from one camp, or another, one party or another, would want to be able to decide what goes on in the university, as it is done in some other countries in the world and in one of the countries not too far from here in the Caribbean — it is not the University of the West Indies I am talking about.

We have to be very careful about this and I believe that in this particular area we should be really getting in to a situation where we would be encouraging the development of this institution to get into other areas of national development.

For example, Sir, in the area of technology, I do not think that this is an area where the University has

gotten in to in any wide way. And there is no doubt, as I have said in this Chamber when last we touched on the question of education, when we were discussing the Education Regulations, that technology is going to play such an important role in our total life in the future, as indeed it is already beginning to play in our lives, that we have to be prepared to meet the challenge and to deal with some of the important developments which will take place in this area. And therefore, at every level, we should be encouraging the training and the development of people in this particular area.

You would have noticed that the Barbados Workers' Union has been calling, and the call has been repeated over the weekend, for the establishment of a chain of Industrial Relations at the University of the West Indies.

We believe that this is an important area. It is an area in which the university ought to get in a very serious way, because, again as I have pointed out, we need to have a very, very clear understanding and appreciation for what is a fairly complicated area of national life, the area of industrial relation. We believe the University of the West Indies can play an important role in this area.

There is a reduction in the money which has been allocated for grants to individuals, a reduction in excess of \$767,000 in higher education awards. I am wondering if it really was necessary to prune in this particular area because we have to think in terms of the future, who will be able to assist in the future in our national development efforts.

On page 61, I think, Sir, last year you heard speak on this. I will pass over that because the point has been raised. When I looked in the Estimates some provision has been made under the IDC for management training. I believe the other side of industrial relations is not necessarily treated in the same manner — at least it is a little better. I believe the Barbados Labour Party increased and doubled the allocation but still there is a need for further improvements and we should look at that more seriously.

On page 62, Adult Education, this is in the same vein as the previous statement I was making just a minute ago. I believe there is a very important role for adult education in this country, in any country. If you examine this area, you will see that there are people who have come to prominence as a result of adult education programmes. And when you are going to have a reduction of \$260 000 out of an allocation — in 1981–82 where the pro-Estimates were \$310,000 we are now planning to have, in 1982, \$50,000 under Adult Education — I believe this points in a very serious direction and probably to the Government's lack of appreciation for the contribution people make to this country.

A number of people, Sir, who missed out on opportunities at the secondary or primary level and came to this particular avenue, made use of the opportunities in this area so they could move on, and, today, they make a contribution to our national life. I think it is a disgrace to be witnessing, in this country, this tremendous slashing which has taken place in the adult education programme. What really can \$50 000 do in terms of commercial classes, home economic classes etc., when the actual expenditure in 1980–81 was \$200,000. In the face of that we are now being asked to provide a mere \$50,000. I again want to impress upon the Government that there ought to be a change in this direction and that some urgent consideration should be given to improving the allocation in this particular area.

I am glad to see on page 63 that there is some provision — Note 4 — for television programmes involving new secondary schools. I have been pushing the idea that we ought to pay attention to a second language in this country and I am glad to see that some attention is being paid to this. A decision was taken some time ago that Spanish should be developed as a second language and I hope we get some serious attention paid to that area.

There is provision under the Capital Estimates on page 67 — Construction and Improvement of Secondary Schools, for the construction of a new school at Wotton and improvements to existing schools. May I just ask a question? Is this development at Wotton designed to serve people in the Christ Church area, or St. Philip area, possibly? What I would need to be convinced about is the population growth of schools in that area is such that there is a need for that. One has to watch this trend very carefully, because if the population level does not merit a school we might have excess capacity in some years to come. (Asides) It is not a question of being critical on every little point, but I am wondering if careful attention is being paid to the population bulge at the school level and whether we are not, as it were, being over provided with schools, if we cannot find ourselves, sometime in the next five or ten years, with over capacity.

Under school uniforms, free school uniforms, on page 70, Sir, the question which is being asked is really, what is a uniform? Under page 14 of the Barbados Labour Party Administration Manifesto, in bold type, "The provision of free uniforms." It has "unifroms" though, but anyhow, "uniforms" — that is a typographical error. You would find that other Manifestoes would have typographical errors too, but I mean.....(Laughter) but, I mean there are typographical errors in this too. "The provision of free uniforms for school....." but I believe they mean "free uniforms for school children." And what is a uniform?

I understand that the Government is giving a grant — I do not know if they have increased it — of \$100 for uniforms, for these so-called free uniforms.

It is clear that there has been a change in policy in this particular matter. I mean having promised that school children would be given free uniforms, what is the performance what has been the performance? You have a promise, but performance is sadly lacking. It did not say, the commitment did not say, Sir, free uniforms to children at the secondary level only, but to school children, to all school children. (ASIDE: Said all?) — In the absence, Sir, of not discriminating, one must conclude and assume that it means all, otherwise there would be a distinction — the provision of free uniforms for school children.

So, we have now the situation where people have been misled and are now getting a mere \$100 as a grant to assist them. And how much can \$100 buy when you made a commitment to provide free uniforms. I believe that to get a pair of shoes for a school kid must be in the region of \$50 or \$60, and when you add the other components of the uniform, I am sure it is well in excess of \$100. But, Sir, promise and performance.

If we can move on, under the Ministry of Health. Sir, in initiating a debate on Health, I would like to read from the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto for the 1981 General Elections on page 20: "A Healthier Barbados"

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you going to provide us with that?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Oh sure, Sir. Yes, Sir. We have lots of these as documents of the House but I mean this.... (Asides) (SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Let us have a copy.) (Laughter)....Anyhow, 'A Healthier Barbados':

"The Democratic Labour Party commits itself to the fundamental objective of enabling all Barbadians, as a fundamental right, to enjoy the highest attainable standards of health so that they may lead socially and economically productive lives." —

(You have to read it carefully) —

"The Party is fully aware that several countries have been burdened by sharp increases in expenditures for health and health services, and they have accordingly been searching for means by which such expenditures may be reduced in order to help restore a measure of economic stability. So-called National Health Services have contributed greatly to the sharp increases referred to. Barbados will be no exception to that trend." —

("Barbados will be no exception to that trend." Prophetic words, Sir.) —

"Already considerable doubts surround the proposed National Health Plan which have not been fully explained to the people" —

(We are still waiting to hear more about it) —

"The Party believes that the cost of the plan will be far in excess of what has been revealed so far and that the burden will fall squarely on the shoulders of the population through increased prices, increased National Insurance payments" —

(This is the edited version:)—

"and increased taxation, generally."

That was the observation of the Democratic Labour Party for the 1981 Elections campaign. That was in the face of a commitment and a promise to the people of this country by the Barbados Labour Party at page 11 of their Manifesto:

"A BLP Government will establish a free National Health Service." —

(In bold type) —

"for all Barbadians. The Party believes that no further time should be lost in bringing Barbados in line with those countries, for example in Europe where free medical schemes exists."

Would you believe, Sir, that by September, one heard that Barbadians could not expect to have a free Health Service, that nothing is free — which we recognise — that they would have to pay a health levy in order to assist with keeping this health service going, in addition to taxes which people pay on a weekly basis. And as I have said in here, under the debate on the Transport Levy, and I think the same Health Levy, it is burdensome.

And it is really double payment, because people are paying taxes. A Health Service and Transport Service, which are provided by the Government, are supposed to be met out of taxes. Do not worry to come and make people believe now that by paying this levy that you are assisting. Of course, you are assisting, but the point is that you are worse off because you are taxed doubly, because the whole purpose of taxation is to provide money to keep services like health and transport and education going.

On top of the promise which was made about the provision of a free National Health Service, we find that people have to pay a portion of their income as a tax towards this so-called free National Health Service that they were led to believe they were going to have in this country. That is why I am saying, Mr. President, that there is this growing credibility gap existing between the Government and the people. It is a very serious trend, a very serious development.

So having taken money, and Government continues to take money out of people's wages by way of levy for the provision of a better Health Service, what do you find? Generally speaking, the services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are run down and are getting worse. Added to that, Sir, this morning I talked about the polyclinics which were providing various services for people and which, for one reason or another which has not been explained, they cannot offer now. A number of the services which they have been offering have been considerably reduced and people have been told that they have to go back and re-register at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

What happened was that when these new polyclinics were opened and took on the new functions, a number of patients were transferred from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital into some of these polyclinics, and now they are faced with this situation. I saw a lady yesterday who has a problem with her foot, and she was all agonising about the fact that she has been told she could no longer go to the Maurice Byer Polyclinic, but that she will either have to go back to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or go and see a private doctor.

I think that it is unfair when people pay taxes, which should be used in providing an adequate and proper Health Service, and on top of that, they are called upon to pay a levy — one of the most direct forms of taxation from which you cannot escape, pay a levy for health, and we are provided not with an improved Health Service, but with a deteriorating Health Service.

I understand that doctors are complaining about the unavailability of basic things for the operating theatres. There are complaints about the Casualty and general services which are being offered at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the decision of the Government to close these areas of the polyclinics, which were relieving some of the pressures from the hospital, will make the Casualty worse, and would even create greater problems for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

I believe, Sir, that any right thinking Barbadian must be very concerned about this deterioration in the Health Service, because, after all, if the quality of the services which are being offered is deteriorating, then it means that the entire population is going to be affected.

Doctors are complaining about the drugs which are available under the Drug Formulary, and the way in which, sometimes, they have to be able to deal with some of these problems. I believe that the Government must recognise that it owes a very serious responsibility to the people of this country in the area of health, and if there is one area where there should not be cut backs — I am

not talking in terms of squandering or wasting money — but certainly in the area of health Government should be very careful about reducing services in this particular area.

We are therefore concerned about this matter, and I think that the Government owes it as a very serious responsibility to the people of this country to explain its policy in this matter, in light of what has been happening — the deterioration in the health services, and the fact that people not only have to pay taxes, but have to pay a levy which is taken directly out of the people's money and put into a fund, supposedly for the improvement of the health services in this country. It is a disgrace, Sir, and I hope that one would see an immediate improvement in this area.

Under Public Health — I read the Notes to Public Health very carefully I was looking for some specific indication from the Government in the area of industrial health or occupational health. This I believe is an important matter. It is true that the note talks about carrying out the provisions of the Health Services Act relating to the enforcement of regulations on environmental sanitation, food sampling, food quality control, but I do not see any clear indication from the notes here, and I looked very carefully through the Estimates, in this particular area, so that I will address my mind to it for a couple of minutes.

More and more we see the industrialisation programme in Barbados going on, we see new industries coming in providing jobs, but at the same time in their way providing the possibility for industrial hazards and occupational diseases. It is not too late, Sir, or maybe it is already too late, because little or no attention seems to have been paid to this particular matter. How much damage has been done to workers in this country by having to deal with substances which are dangerous to their health?

We have factories here which uses a substance, take for example the factory producing foam, which has a long chemical name, but when shortened the name is TDI. A mere whiff of that can do very serious damage to people who work with it, and indeed there were complaints, when that factory was sited on the Grazettes Industrial Estate, that people who were living in Grazettes used to feel dizzy every time a can of TDI was opened at that Factory.

What I am saying, Sir, is that a programme ought to be developed to deal with this because we are industrialising, factories have been established where dust is the problem and the question of noise pollution is a very serious problem.

Do we know the damage which has been caused to a person's health in terms of their hearing, and also in terms of their blood pressure? A recent discovery in the United States of America indicates that exposure to noise has a very serious effect on people's blood pressure, and I am saying that we ought to recognise this as a very serious problem.

Indeed, the legislation on the notification of accidents and occupational diseases places a responsibility on the medical profession in this country to report to the Chief Labour Officer cases where they suspect that workers have been exposed, and could very well have been suffering from a disease associated with their work. I think that if you were to check with the Department of Labour, I doubt very much you would find one report made by a member of the medical profession in a 15 year period. It might not be the fault of the medical profession. They might not be aware of the provisions of this Act.

I think it is fairly common knowledge that until recently, very little attention was paid to this aspect of our training. But it is a fact of life now, and it is a specialised area, and I would like, therefore, to see the Government develop a policy to the point of getting doctors who would be able to go and specialise in this area so that they can give of their knowledge to this area, and we can therefore, hopefully, continue to provide a working environment which would ensure the health and safety of workers in this area.

Under the Sanitation Service Authority, I should just like to raise a matter, although I think I can raise it under Parks and Beaches. I will raise it under Sanitation, since that has to do with sanitation and cemeteries.

I remember last year when we were discussing the Estimates in the Lower House, I made a point about the role being played in the community by the churches, and about the burial grounds of some of the Anglican Churches in Barbados, and I said then that I thought some attention ought to be paid to assisting those churches which could not keep the burial grounds in a proper state.

I was glad when we looked at the legislation last week to amalgamate the Parks and Beaches and the Caves. There is a provision made in there, if I remember correctly, for that authority to assist in that area. I think it is an important area.

If you take the St. Peter's Parish Church, just to give an example, I passed there yesterday and discovered that they were doing some work — I am not too sure whether it is the Sanitation Authority or the Parks and Beaches which is doing the work — but certainly they are cleaning up that cemetery.

I think it is a question of national pride, and if we are talking about people wanting to identify their roots and what have you, there ought to be some kind of pride in this area. I would like to think that some assistance could be given to the churches to help them keep their burial grounds in a decent manner.

On page 85 under Derelict Vehicles, this provision is to allow for the continued collection and disposal of derelict vehicles, old cars, disused refrigerators, etc. Sir, have you passed down the Harbour Road recently? That is a rhetorical question. If you drive down past the entrance to the Westbury Cemetery — President Kennedy Drive, I think it is — you would be presented with an eye sore which has been evident for a long time — some old car museum or something like that — it is right on a major highway leading into and out of Bridgetown.

Sometimes problems are created with traffic, but I think, more importantly, it is the kind of sore which has been allowed to continue. It has been drawn to the attention of the Government for a long time, and maybe now that there is a new Minister of Environment, I hope something will be done, and that he will address his mind to that — brighten up that area, and find some place for the person who operates that business other than at that point. I think it is a question of our national pride and we ought to pay some attention to that.

Under the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment, the Capital allocation in this year's Estimates is \$6 million. The purpose of the allocation is to continue the construction of rental units at Bonnetts, Ivy and St. Cecelia, completion of rental units at Rosemount, sites and services programme, renovation of the National Housing Corporation.

I seem to recall, Sir, that two projects were started just before the Elections, one at Lammings in St. Joseph and the other at Maynards in St. Peter and they have reached, at least they have got off the ground, but after, I suppose, the purpose for which they were designed at that particular time was satisfied, it would seem as if they have been abandoned.

Now, I believe that money has been spent, or probably wasted, in these areas and the Government ought to give some account to the taxpayers of this country about what is happening in this particular area — if they have completely abandoned the Lammings Project and the Maynards Project, or when they propose to get back to these areas. Certainly, it is clear that in this year 1982/83 they have not been able, as it were, to get on the list.

But I am suggesting that a mere \$6 million cannot do much meaningful work in the area of housing, particularly when one takes into consideration the

commitments for this \$6 million already, because, I believe that if you were to analyse it, you will find, Sir, that the Government out of this \$6 million probably owes away about \$4.5 million.

So when this money is voted and they pay out the \$4.5 million that they owe on existing projects, you will only have about \$1.5 million available to carry through the National Housing Programme for the year 1982/83. And if a further allocation is not given to the National Housing Corporation you will run into the same problems as we ran into last year where projects will have to come to a standstill. I think that the National Housing Corporation has not lived up to the expectations of making a significant dent in the housing needs of the people of this country.

We would want to hear something on the development at St. Cecilia in Passage Road. That project has come to a standstill, for what reason, I do not know. There was also talk about a swimming pool being incorporated in that project. Are we still pursuing the construction of a swimming pool in that project or was it just the figment of somebody's imagination? Will the Government continue with it or will this be scrapped? These are matters which, I believe, Sir, ought to be answered because they are matters of national interest.

The West Terrace Development, the baby of Senator Simmons, West Terrace. I think, Sir, that has been so, in my view, badly planned that I believe that it has created an embarrassment for the Government and the National Housing Corporation. When one first heard of the price which was expected that these houses would have been sold for, it was in the region, of I think, \$60 000, and now they have, for practical purposes, doubled, because the price range one is hearing for a house is now from \$103 000 to \$120 000.

Now, I think, Sir that this is no longer any, or it could hardly be so described, as middle income housing, because to be able to service a mortgage on this kind of price, one would have to be in the salary range of between \$2 500 a month to \$3 000. And it would be interesting, I suggest, Sir, if one were to take a look at the kind of people who will qualify for these houses. I dare suggest, Sir, that the people who they were originally intended for can no longer qualify for these houses.

I think it is a matter which, if we had planned the project properly and taken all of the factors into consideration that certainly they would not have gotten into this kind of mess, in my view, that we have found ourselves in, in this country, in this particular matter. (Asides) Sir, I will not be diverted.

Under National Parks Survey, Page 92 — I like I will have to call for a rest period, Sir. With respect, Sir.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not tired. You proceed. (Laughter).

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I did not hear the comment. You said you are not glad?

Mr. PRESIDENT: No. No. Go ahead.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Oh, you are not tired? Well, Sir, you would appreciate, as a medical man, that you are sitting and I am active and....I would like to be refreshed.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am the only person in here who has to listen to every thing you say. (Laughter)

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: That is a good one, no problem, Sir, as I was saying, I would crave your indulgence, Sir, to get a 15 minute break.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If the Chair is not tired and you have been speaking for 3½ hours, I am prepared to listen. I have no intention of suspending the Sitting before dinner time.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Before dinner time?

Mr. PRESIDENT: No.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Oh, well, Sir, I will speak until dinner time. Is 7.30 dinner time, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Will you proceed Senator, you are making fun out of this now.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No, no, Sir. I just thought that this.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I remember telling you that we do have legal limitations on the length of this debate. It has to be signed at a certain time and if only for consideration of your colleague, evidently you don't wish him to speak in this debate and other people might temper your speech a bit.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, there are other matters which I have to deal with.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Go right on.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Under National Parks Surveys, the description says that the main function of this subhead is to finance a study of those areas suitably for the development of national parks.

The Government had about three years ago, through a Ministerial statement by the Prime Minister in the Lower House, designated a wide area from Archer's

Bay, St. Lucy to, I think, East Point in St. Philip, as an area for national development. As I understood it, they indicated that before any further development could take place in this area, a survey would have to be carried out to give directions as to what kind of development could take place in these particular areas.

Now, I think that we have to recognise that there is a lot of potential in that area. I have identified a number of areas, which come into that span, on the northeastern part of St. Lucy — Archer's Bay for example, River Bay, Cove Bay, and right up on the East Coast Road, right through St. John and on to St. Philip.

I wonder if there can be any indication as to when the survey will be completed, because I know there are a number of property owners who get the feeling that they cannot do anything until the results of this survey are known.

I am glad to see that a survey is being done and I would like, Sir, to commend, in my usual way, the Government on this worthwhile step. The only problem is that in the circumstances in which the statement was made, would lead me to believe that it was being done to blunt an approach which I was using, calling for the development of Archer's Bay which is incorporated in this particular area. I think that we ought to be able to know something and to have some clear direction in this particular area. I would hope that we could be enlightened by the Minister on that particular point.

We can move on to the Ministry of Information. First I would like to say that on page 95, under the Government Information Service, one of the objectives which has been described here is the sale of government publications.

I think this is an area where very serious criticisms can be levelled at the government. Legislation is passed which is of importance to a whole number of people in Barbados and there is hardly any place where people can get hold of these papers of legislation.

The Sales Booth in Independence Square does not really serve that particular function adequately at all. I believe that we need something more than that little hut in Independence Square. I believe the government should set up an office somewhere centrally, in Bridgetown, where Government publications can be obtained, reports of various commissions; legislation, copies of which people would want to get hold of, like the Severance Payment legislation — the one about holidays with pay and maternity leave, so that people can be properly informed about the provisions of the legislation so as when people begin to talk on these vital matters, they will talk from a position of knowing from the law, and not what people hear.

I think there is some important role that this kind of development could play and I am sure that a Minister of Information has taken note of that. I am sure that, with his influence in the Cabinet, he would be able to get this type of development to take place. Senator Rouse has just returned from England and I think Senator Linton last week, or the week before, was telling me when he went to England on the CPA visit of how he could get hold of publications from the British Government, Her Majesty's Stationery Office. So it is an important point which I know that the Minister of Information will have implemented in the not too distant future.

Sir, I was looking for an area under which I could make some comments on the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, but it seems to be so cleverly hidden away in the Estimates that I cannot identify any area. But just generally speaking on the overall area of Information, since I see there is a grant for the Broadcasting Authority, and since the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation falls under the Broadcasting Authority, I think I can make this particular point: one still wonders about the way in which CBC is operating in terms of getting unbiased information to the public, particularly in the area coverage in terms of comments which are made by sources other than the Government source or the Barbados Labour Party source.

There is a feeling in Barbados, Sir, that CBC is fast becoming a station where non Barbadians seem to be finding a haven. And yes, we are committed to regionalism and all of that, but I believe that there is hardly any country in the Caribbean which has adopted so liberal a policy on the employment of non nationals in such a key and sensitive area. I do not know if it is because you are so sensitive that one finds that particular development — I shifted my tact a bit. I just throw that out, Sir, as an area for consideration and as an expression of concern which have been expressed by people in this country about that particular development.

If we can move on, Sir, to page 99, Cultural Affairs. (SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Coming home.) The people of this country are yet to be told how much it has cost the taxpayers to stage CARIFESTA. At one stage the Prime Minister admitted that he was not even sure how much the staging of CARIFESTA cost. By now, I believe, Sir, that the Government should be in a position to give some indication about the total cost of CARIFESTA.

When it was originally decided that Barbados would stage CARIFESTA and a vote was sought in the House to assist with the preparations for that event, I seem to recall that we were told that it would cost in the region of \$8 million and now indications are that the cost is probably three times as much as that original estimate. I believe that the Minister of Information owes it to this

country to give, and, indeed to make, a very clear statement on the financial cost of CARIFESTA.

The Central Bank, Sir, in one of its reports, I think it is the report on the review of the economy in 1981, indicated that one of the factors which was responsible for our economic plight was the tremendous amount of over spending which took place in CARIFESTA, and which we did not bargain for.

This is a very serious indictment on the management of our financial affairs, a very serious indictment, the cavalierish manner in which money was wasted in CARIFESTA. I believe, Sir, that this, again, is another area where the Government can allay the fears of the people of Barbados by looking into this particular area.

The Government obviously has had some bad advice on some of the preparations for CARIFESTA, for example, the construction of these tents that you have at West Terrace and down at St. James Secondary School — one put down in the middle of a playing field so that you can neither use the tent nor the playing field. I mean, these are very serious matters.

And I got the impression that it was indicated that they could have been moved, and now we are hearing that in order for the tents to be moved, they have to be dynamited. (SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Who told you these things?) Is it true? They have to be dynamited so, presumably they would not be of any more use and the cost of these tents, you know, has been astronomical.

There has been a lot of electronic equipment and linens and beds, and various items which were ordered for CARIFESTA. I would hope that the Government has an inventory of them and they can be accounted for. I leave that there, at that point.

What I would say, Sir, is that there are a lot of questions, Sir, which remain unanswered about CARIFESTA, lots and lots of questions. And I think that it is an area where we in this country have been made to pay through our noses for something which, I daresay, could have been put on at a much lower cost, if proper controls had been implemented from the beginning, and if political interference were not the order of the day as far as this particular CARIFESTA was concerned.

We can move on, Sir, to page 101 under the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport. The Labour Department is charged with the responsibility of:

- (a) the enforcement of labour legislation;
- (b) the provision of conciliation services in trade disputes;

- (c) administration of an employment exchange and provision of a vocational guidance service; and

- (d) the preparation of labour statistics.

Sir, I have always contended that the Department of Labour is a very important department in our national life but when you look and you see how the department is treated, in terms of the Civil Service, you would find that not enough attention, and not the kind of attention is paid to that department that ought to be paid, because the whole question of the resolution of industrial conflict, being able to conciliate in these matters, is important and where both employers and workers have confidence in the ability of the department to deal with problems which come before the department.

These are matters which are of fundamental importance to our industrial life and to stability in this country. And for that reason, Sir, I believe that the Government ought to show a new approach towards upgrading and uplifting the Department of Labour so that it can play the kind of role which it ought to play in our industrial situation in Barbados.

There is need for an improvement in the staff, both in terms of quantity and quality, there is need for continuous training programmes. If one were to, for example, look at the kind of legislation which they have to oversee and enforce, if you take just one bit of legislation, the new Factories Bill, you will find that there is a tremendous amount of work which has to be done by the Labour Department in this area. But I dare say that the Department does not have the staff, it is not equipped to deal even with that one piece of legislation.

Can you imagine then the situation which applies in the area of the shops legislation and other bits of legislation that they have to enforce? — the visiting of factories, going to various areas of occupation to ensure that employers and business people are complying with the requirements of the legislation — and a lot of them do not comply with the requirements of the legislation — and the Labour Department cannot really enforce it because they do not have the people to man the various areas and to carry out the visits on a regular basis or as the legislation stipulates.

What you are finding then, Mr. President, is that there is a tremendous amount of neglect in this area. I would certainly like to see the Labour Department strengthened where, as I said, there will be an improvement in the quality and the quantity of the staff at the department. Where, for example, rather than having to refer any particular case which comes up to the Director of Public Prosecutions, they can institute, directly, prosecutions for any infringement of legislation that they have to supervise.

At the present moment, if they are going to bring up a case against any employer for breaking any of the regulations or laws, they have to send it to the Attorney General for an opinion, and a lot of these cases sometimes do not even see the light of day, because, of course, that department is involved in so many other bits of legislation, and I suppose other matters would take a back row, and by the time they get around to dealing with that, what you find is that a year or two would have passed, and maybe the officer who did the investigations and who made the reports might have been transferred to another department.

What I am saying, Sir, is that there is need to build up in that area a specialist department. In the same way you would seek to build up a specialist department in the Customs, or a specialist department in Income Tax, I believe that we ought to build up the Labour Department to a specialist department, where there are people who can enforce the legislation, who can interpret the legislation, and who can give guidance and, indeed, confidence to people who have to use the services.

It is no sport having a situation where people are in trouble and are looking for advice, and looking for some way of getting the particular problems that they have settled, and they go to a department and do not get that kind of feeling of confidence — the department does not inspire confidence or you do not get the kind of advice which can be useful in the particular area.

I think that we ought to, in our planning, pay some attention towards uplifting the quality and the quantity of personnel in that vital area of our national life.

Sir, I do not think that I should allow myself to sit down without commenting on the Industrial Development Corporation. For years, under the former Administration and under this Administration, the Barbados Workers' Union has been critical of the way in which the Industrial Development Corporation has been functioning in terms of attracting investors to our shores. We have expressed, and will continue to express, concern about this, because those of us who go into the field and who talk with people who are employed in a number of areas, and indeed with some investors — because some of them have come, within recent years, to the Barbados Workers' Union to touch base with us to find out our approach to unionisation and what have you — have found that some of the investors have told us openly that they had been assured by the IDC that the question of unionisation is something which they do not have to bother too much about.

And we have expressed our concern about that, because we have argued over and over again that no investor should be led to believe that he can come into Barbados and set up a factory, use funds from the IDC, or from

the Government for that matter, and then prevent people from being unionised.

One very interesting example of this was at Sam Lords Castle where the company there, an American company, Marriotts, is remarkable. In the United States of America Marriotts is anti-union. There is no union shop, no workers are organised in any of the Marriotts hotels in the United States of America — I suppose this comes from big organisations — but when they came into Barbados and they bought Sam Lords Castle, they accepted, without any problems, the fact that the workers there were unionised, and indeed we have had very little trouble with them from that particular area.

But you have a lot of these small fellows who come around, who seem to be out for making a quick buck, and would want to try to prevent the workers from being unionised. So I think that we ought, in terms of promoting industrialisation in Barbados overseas, to be very firm in letting investors know that our Constitution guarantees, and our legislation, the right to individuals to join a trade union. So I would hope that we would see a new approach in this area.

I would hope, too, that the factories, which are being constructed by the IDC, would show some concern for the safety and welfare of workers employed with the provision of proper facilities. There are some factories which do not have this provision, and this therefore makes life difficult in terms — if, let us say, employers agree — of providing a particular facility for workers.

Then, they will tell you the factory does not belong to them, it belongs to the IDC and this is the way how they built it, and I would be glad to provide these facilities, but I cannot. I think there should be enough thought going into the construction of factories on the industrial estates which would take care of these particular matters.

I would hope, Sir, that we can be given some indication about industrial development, not necessarily the Cement Plant, but, generally speaking, the establishment of an industrial area for the north other than the small one we have, Atlantic Manufacturing, — a bigger complex to take care of the northern area.

Sir, I think I have spoken on the Heywoods Holiday Project already, some time ago, and I do not think that I have any further point to make on that other than that there seems to be a tremendous amount of wastage going on. It has been admitted by Senator Griffith. I do not know for what reason, but he called it a white elephant. (Asides) Senator Griffith said it was a white elephant in here, and I will get the records and show you. I was shocked, too, when he said so.

I think, Sir, when the idea was conceived, it was considered to be a useful area for the development of the north. Government, however, in its wisdom, or otherwise, delayed the start of it, and now we have gotten into a situation where the cost to complete the project has skyrocketed, and I wonder what is going to be the final position on that. I wish it well, and I hope that it will satisfy, and certainly bring further development to the northern parts of Barbados, as was projected when it was originally conceived.

Under Transport and Works, there is a lot that I can say, but I must confess that I am rocking. It would take me another two hours to speak on this subject and I recognise that I have touched a number of Heads. But Transport and Works is a very important Ministry and I would be failing in my duty if I did not pay some attention to it.

The question of drainage in Barbados is a very serious one, and this is reflected any time you have a downpour of rain, because there is flooding in a number of areas. I do not know if it is to do with the way in which roads are constructed, with the fact that gutters are not properly cleaned or with the fact that wells which have been dug to take off the water have become blocked. I think it is a matter of annoyance to people to be subjected to this kind of flooding, in the way they have been over the years. I believe, Sir, that we ought to pay some attention to dealing with this particular problem. When the heavy rains come in, we see how people are affected.

Roads are still in a bad shape. People pay a transport levy, but the Government is not responding in this particular area of potholes in the road. It is embarrassing if you are driving a motor car — sometimes after a shower of rain you might, in all innocence, believe that you are driving on a level surface, then to hit into a pothole and water goes on people who are using the road.

I believe Sir, that for one reason or another, which I cannot find, the Government has allowed the roads to deteriorate to a state where it is going to be a long time before they are brought back to a proper condition. If attention had been paid to these, and if a continuous programme had been instituted of maintaining the roads by the Barbados Labour Party Administration, as was done under the Democratic Labour Party, our roads would not be in the very bad state they are in at the present time.

I think it is a very serious indictment on Government, recalling, Sir, that one Minister, when having to reply to the very serious criticisms which were made by the Democratic Labour Party on this matter, explained that the Government was not a Government of potholes, but a Government which was concerned about very

serious matters like foreign policy matters and that kind of thing. It is not that they are not important, but the people in Barbados are concerned about the things which they can see and which affect them.

And, therefore, I am saying it is a very serious indictment on the Government to have allowed the roads to deteriorate in the way they have done, now they have got a Transport Levy and people pay taxes and what have you.

I do not agree with the levy and both Senator Hall and myself have expressed our position on this already. And, certainly, the Democratic Labour Party took a position against this particular levy and the illegal way in which it was instituted, and in which money is coming out of people's earnings.

Nevertheless, there is money there, and I hope that a very swift programme will be initiated to improve the quality of our road system.

Mr. President, there is a question of parking in Bridgetown. Parking systems are parks and bus-stands — on page 120. Sir, we are being faced with a very serious problem of parking, particularly in Bridgetown.

I think that a lot of time is wasted by people getting into Bridgetown and wanting to park, and maybe, Sir, some policy ought to be adopted. I do not know exactly what the Government will do about it, but it must be cause for concern.

There is even some difficulty which people experience from time to time in getting a park inside the Public Buildings Yard, so I think some strategy has to be adopted to deal with this particular problem.

The last item I would just like to make a comment on is the question of the Children's Homes on Page 126. You see, I have to highlight these things and bring these things to the fore, because I believe that the Government has a serious responsibility to people, — certainly, its decisions ought to be explained from time to time in this chamber, and in this particular regard I would raise the question of a proposal which has been floating about the closing of Children's Homes in Barbados.

I think the Minister of Welfare or Community Services, the present one, did indicate that the Government was seriously considering the closing of the Homes, for economic purposes, I gather, and also the argument has been advanced that the children would be in a better environment, in a home situation, that is, in the home of an individual rather than in the Children's Home as at present exist. I really wonder how much study has gone into this particular area and I would just like to advise some caution in this particular area.

It is true that I have not had the benefit of the experts in this particular area but I can see that it has some very good and powerful reasons. At the same time, I wonder how possible it would be to implement it and I have some doubts, and some very serious reservations, about how effective such a programme will be. But I would believe, Sir, that some explanations ought to be given in this particular matter and I would certainly want to be able to benefit from the explanations which, hopefully, will be given on these areas.

All in all, Sir, I would just like to say that this year's Estimates are revealing in terms of the trends which we, from the Democratic Labour Party, have been able to pick up. The trends have fitted in with the predictions which we made about the economy in 1981, which we continued to make, and which indicate that the road ahead will be a very difficult one for Barbados because the present Administration has mismanaged the economy in a number of vital areas, has made bad decisions in a number of areas, and when these two things are put together, Sir, one finds the reason why this country is in the very difficult area that we find ourselves in today. Thank you.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, the opportunity to talk on the Estimates in the Senate is one of the very few opportunities to give what might be called a bird's eye view of the state of the nation, from this vantage point, that is the vantage point of a non partisan and independent attitude.

I cannot pretend that I would, even if I could, attack the Estimates with the kind of gimlet eye with which Senator Greaves has done. But I do want, in fact, to make a few general observations, and so far as I can, illustrate those observations by reference to particular details in the Estimates and this, I expect, is the way to proceed most speedily.

The first thing, of course, to my point of view, is to look at Page 72 and look at Foreign Affairs, and the point I want to make there is the point I will be making more generally in a number of other Heads. The first is that in the Note, at Subhead 7, you see that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is responsible for paying contributions to a number of international organizations. Those organizations are listed, but there is no mention of the amounts which are paid.

On the last Estimates, I, in fact, mentioned this — that it is absolutely necessary, in my view, for Senators, and other Parliamentarians, to know how much money is spent. We do need to know how much money, in fact, CARDI gets, the World Meteorological Organization gets and so on.

We need to know how much money we are spending, and in the realm of Foreign Affairs it becomes increasingly important, because Barbados, for all that some people say, and for all the way in which they behave, is, in fact, a member of the World community. They do sit and are represented in the forums of international organizations, and therefore they have something to say about the world.

And in this connection, I want to stress once again, my own conviction — that it is very sad that in the whole area of the annual Parliamentary life, there is no single opportunity for a comprehensive debate on foreign policy. I know that this was mooted on one occasion, and for some reason or another it faded out, but I do think that some effort should be made to institute once a year, somewhere, a debate on the Barbados' foreign policy.

I really want to know what is the Barbados view on the Israeli/Arab conflict. I want to know what Barbados, thinks, for example, about Bangladesh. I do, in fact, think it is important. I do not want to read in an overseas newspaper that the Barbados delegate abstained, without knowing whether it is part of a general pattern. I do, in fact, want to know that.

I want to ask you then, after that, Sir, to look at Page 57. Under Education, and note that the organizations to which subscriptions and contributions are made are also listed under Subhead 2, but, again, there is no mention of the amount of money. But if you look at Page 74, under Health, you will see, in a similar context, that not only are the institutions and organizations mentioned, but the amounts are given. So you see that there does not seem to be a total and agreed policy about the presentation of these figures. Some ministries mention the figures, others do not, and I really do think that there should be more consistency in this.

In the same way Education, on Page 61, has made mention of the figure, under Subhead 13, so you see there is inconsistency. My point merely is to suggest that we try to introduce some consistency in the presentation of this particular aspect of our budgeting.

I want to digress from my notes for a short while to make a comment on Senator Greaves' point about industrial health. This is extremely important.

I did not intend to say anything about this but recently, in reading several English newspapers, I find that I am always coming across a particular substance identified as toxic which has been banned abroad, but the overseas representatives of that firm here continue to use. I do not want to call any trade names but I came across this recently, a few months ago, and called the local

representative of the firm who said, blandly, that he did not even know that it is toxic. I didn't find that this was a satisfactory answer.

We are members of FAO and every month the FAO publishes a list of a set of constituents which are banned, or which are toxic to some degree. And that material is here in the library of the Ministry and it is carelessness, it is demeaning of ourselves if we do not pay regard to these things. I think that Senator Greaves should be congratulated, if for nothing else, for raising that point.

I want to continue my contribution with a comment on agriculture. Agriculture, so far as my computation goes, is attracting 3 per cent of our budget. In our circumstances that may be as much as we think it necessary to afford. But I want to make some comments on agriculture in Barbados in 1982.

As far as the contribution to international and other organizations are concerned, these are not listed and we do, in fact, want to know. It may become very important, because I suspect that there are a number of research organisations to which we pay contributions whose work overlap. There is CARDI, our own Research Department, Tropical Plant Diseases, there are a number of them if you look at page 29, and yet there are not listed. I suspect there are substantial economies to be achieved by merely looking carefully at the overlapping possibilities in our affiliations with these international and regional organizations.

Then, of course, there is sugar. I am quite sure that later in this debate we will hear a good bit more from the expert on sugar. But every Barbadian ought to be concerned about the future of sugar. For nearly 400 years that has been the backbone of our economy. It is clear to me that that is no longer going to be so. The days of sugar are drawing slowly and remorselessly to an end. The plantations can no longer, so my information goes, sustain that industry, that is very clear to me.

Every year we see more and more fires and it looks to me as if our whole society is unconsciously moving towards a fulfilment of a death wish — that we do want, in fact, want to get rid of this, some cancer that we have, something about sugar that we want to get rid of, and, we are reacting unconsciously to this there can be no other reason. And, therefore, it seems to me that those of us who take decisions have to look at the future of sugar and they have to say, 'After sugar, what?'

More than 200 years ago, the possibilities of beet root replacing sugar were discovered. Our membership with the British Empire, and so far the British Commonwealth of Nations, does, in fact, provide an artificial assistance. But if we stop growing sugar it would make no difference, at all, to the breakfast tables of the world,

absolutely no difference, and that is a reality which we have to face. We cannot go on thinking that sugar is important — it is important to no one but ourselves, and we are busy destroying it.

And, therefore, we have to look carefully and answer the question, 'After sugar, what?' There must be an answer to that. To do this we have to mobilize, far from a party basis, far from the divisive nature of a political business, all the best minds in Barbados wherever they can be found, the best minds, the best expertise, to sit down quietly, without the Press, without the headlines and without any fanfare, and answer that question, "After sugar, what?" What are we going to do with the land which will be released, with the techniques which will no longer be used, with the managerial skills which sugar employs. What are we going to do? That has to be answered.

It seems to me that radical decisions ought to be taken, radical departures from our present system of land holding, for example, have to be taken, and not taken in the name any ism, or in the name of any doctrine, but taken in the name of sheer commonsense. If we wait until the rain comes down we will be soaked to the skin and there will be nobody to help us. I think that some kind of super think-tank of Barbadians — I must stress Barbadians — because the wits are here, the skills are here and the intelligence is here, and we must not be allowed to think that we have to run and get a report from somebody, from somewhere else. We must be the best judge of our future.

From agriculture to culture. Senator Greaves made some remarks about CARIFESTA and I, who had some very slight association with that event, must confess it was a whole area of mismanagement. Let us not pretend that it was not, because no future lies in pretending that all is well. It was badly mismanaged.

It was badly mismanaged, basically, from the very beginning, because the concept of the festival of the nature of CARIFESTA ought not have been political. That it was political was no fault of Barbados entirely, because it has always been political, from the very first it has been political.

But the lesson here for Barbadians, and for the moment I don't care particularly about anybody else, is that festivals and cultural manifestations cannot be seen in political terms — that is the death of them. Government departments and Ministries and civil servants simply do not have the kind of minds to deal with festivals. They don't have the minds to deal with artists and there was part of the problem with CARIFESTA.

Because it was political, because it seem to be political, something that Barbados was doing, we were

taken advantage of. Our guests did not behave like guests, and they took what Barbadians call "mean advantage" of out sense of hospitality. And I am not speaking by guess, I know, for certain, the kinds of advantages which were taken.

But having said that, I must say that CARIFESTA was not an entire lost, that in fact, it had some very valuable spin-offs. In the last month we have seen a number of cultural presentations — Chinese dancing at Combermere, rehearsals at Queen's Park, jazz concerts in the park — a number of them, more than we would have seen in any similar kind of period in any previous year. And that is because the spaces are available — CARIFESTA made them available, and they will be available for a long time, providing the management is good.

Now, we would not be able to quantify that. When Senator Greaves gets his figures, he will get a dead set of figures on the page, but five years from now, when the results are forthcoming from that infrastructure, he would not be able to quantify it, he would not be able to put a figure to it. I hope I would be around to remind him that this is a spin-off of CARIFESTA 1981.

So far as the development of culture in Barbados is concerned — and I am delighted that the Minister of Culture is present, I am not in the habit of talking behind people's backs but I am very glad that he is now able to confirm that I am talking to his face — the message of CARIFESTA which ought to be translated into action in Barbados is that the Ministry of Culture must divorce itself from any connection with festivals.

The Ministry of Culture must see itself as the adviser, the background there to give groups and artists the kind of support they need. One example — if a little group wants to have a show or to develop a costume for a play, there is no place in Barbados, including the Public Library, where they can go to get an encyclopaedia of costumes, which gives them accurate depictions of what the costume was like, let us say in the 16th century. It seems to me that is the kind of thing that the Ministry of Culture should be providing, a comprehensive library of dance and music and costumes and design made available to the total population of Barbados.

It should be publishing in my view some kind of calendar of cultural events all over the world, not only for artists but for people who are going abroad. We ought to know, if we are going away, that there is a jazz concert, wherever it is happening, and there should be information there. It is not expensive, all you have to do is subscribe to a number of magazines. I, myself, without subscribing, have a number of them around. That is the kind of information needed.

They must have the expertise available for consultation, but not attempt to go and put on a show — that is the business of the artistes, that is the business of the people. But that Ministry must be there to respond to what they see outside. If they see a little group which is doing well, and using imagination and energy, it must be there to respond and encourage, but it must never think that they have to put on a show — that way lies danger.

In that context therefore, I must ask the Minister if there is any serious explanation to the fact that the Barbados Dance Theatre no longer figures among the groups which get subventions. The Barbados Dance Theatre has been, for several years, the backbone of the development of dance, which is very young in Barbados as a cultural manifestation, and I know, up to recently, they used to get a subvention. I do not see their name mentioned in the list on page 97 and therefore, I wondered whether there was any particular reason for that omission.

My remarks about the involvement of the Ministry in festivals does not extend quite so completely — nothing you say can be totally accurate — so far as, NIFCA is concerned. I think NIFCA is a special case because NIFCA has an educational element in it and although it did not set out to be like this, one saw, as the years went on, that it became more and more an educational thing, and a school thing, and I think that is where it must be.

I think that the Erdiston Teachers' Training College and the schools must be, in fact, the repository of the kind of training which will equip young Barbadians to go out and do their particular form of art. Now, all the schools have departments, the Community College has an art department and current, now, there are about three or four exhibitions of the work of those students on. It is very good indeed, it is really surprisingly good, and there it was lying all the time because we did not know. It seems to me that there is where it must start.

Ministry, please do not get involved, because you will have CARIFESTAS on your hands every morning, if you do not remove yourself from that quarrelsome, niggling, temperamental thing artists go through, but just be there to give the support. You would save yourself a lot of headaches and you would be making a much more substantial contribution to the strength of the artistic and cultural movement in Barbados.

Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Seale.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. President, like the honourable Senator Wickham, I just have a few comments to make on these Estimates, both in the area of revenue and the area of expenditure.

Sir, I have chosen revenue first because that is in the early pages. I am a bit disappointed to note that there is going to be no contribution, by way of dividend, from the Pine Hill Dairy this year, Sir. I also noted that there was no dividend last year.

Sir, I think that the Government has been rather unfair to the dairy industry in Barbados. Sir, the Pine Hill Dairy has been forced into a lost position for a number of years simply because the Government has decreed that it sells its products below the cost of production. This decree is also making the dairy farmers face bankruptcy because the Pine Hill Dairy has been unable to pay a fair price for their milk.

Sir, agriculture is most important in this country and I do not think that we should squeeze any one sector of agriculture. If a price increase in the control price of which we sell our evaporated milk and our fresh milk is required in order that the dairy puts it house in order, I think we should go ahead. We have a budget coming up on Wednesday and I believe the Government will have no fear in raising Consumption Taxes and duties, and I do not think it should have any fear, Sir, in raising the controlled price of milk in order that the dairy could become viable again.

Sir, also on revenue, I notice that the Barbados Mills will contribute something like \$500 000 in dividend, or approximately 14 per cent on the cost of the shares. I want to state here, Sir, and congratulate this company because Barbados Mills has come into Barbados, has produced a high standard of flour, has been accepted by all consumers and has given its product at a reasonable price.

I think, Sir, a lot of the reasons for its acceptance has been the manner in which it has marketed its product. It has just set quantity discounts and all and sundry can come and buy from it and therefore, it has no distribution cost whatsoever. And in this itself, I believe the Pine Hill Dairy could take a leaf from their book, because I do believe that although the Dairy has been losing money, a lot of its problems is the expensive manner in which it distributes its products.

We now come to the Instant Money Game, Sir. I notice that the Government is expected to receive something like \$250 000 in revenue from this game in these Estimates. This means that they are expecting a sale of about \$2.5 million in tickets, because I think the duty on the Instant Money Game is about 10 percent on the sale of the tickets.

However, I do not think that a lot of Barbadians really realise the foreign exchange lost to the island because of this game – it is carefully camouflaged in the accounts as printing costs. But I can assure you that

\$2.5 million in sales in Instant Money games will mean that something like \$750 000 in foreign exchange would be lost to this country.

So while the Instant Money Game might be providing considerable revenue in the area of cricket, which is required, I think we are selling ourselves short in that we are giving up a large share of scarce reserves in order to make money. I believe the Government could very well make a grant to the BCA and it would be cheaper than having to lose the foreign exchange that the Instant Money Game costs.

Also, I may assure you, Sir, that the Instant Money Game is a big rip off. At no time has the BCA been able to tell us when a game starts or when a game finishes, or when the first prize has been won. If they ever slipped and told us when the first prize had been won, all the other tickets after that would be duds, and there would not be any sales. I think the time has come when the Instant Money Game should be closed.

On the side of Expenditure, Sir, I note that there is going to be a small increase of about \$800 000 in the subvention to the Barbados Board of Tourism. I think we are going to spend about \$8 million this year.

I did a few little calculations, and if we use a tourist arrival figure of 370 000, we will find that the Government is spending about \$21 a head on the promotion of tourism in this country. Barbados has to rely this year, and in the years to come on tourism, and \$21 is much too little. We should start to talk of at least \$20 million for tourism promotion.

I believe, also, that our Tourist Board, while it has been doing a good job, has been going on the wrong marketing strategy. I think the days of the band wagons going across the world have come to an end.

I think we should see some consumer advertising, I think we should see advertising on television and advertising in the media where the consumer is wooed to come to Barbados. Right now, we go and give the wholesaler, but as you know, he only works for a commission, and you get the same commission to send the tourists to Jamaica as you get to send them to Barbados. Of course media advertising is very expensive, and therefore we will obviously have to send a lot more money.

In the area of school meals, Sir, I notice that the School Meals Service is going to cost us \$9 million.

I did a little analysing of this and I found out that we provide meals for about 30 000 children a day, and if we say that a child goes to school for about 37 weeks a year, he would have about 185 meals. If we multiply the 185 meals by the 30 000, we come to about 5.5 million

meals a year, and then if we take the 5.5 million and divide it into the \$9 million, we will find that the meal is costing about \$1.65.

In the service, \$1.65 a meal is not bad, but then when we look at the raw material cost of the meal, we will see that that is about \$3.6 million, which is approximately 65 cents, so that we have a situation whereby the meal cost is 65 cents but the administration and the labour to prepare it is \$1.00. This is phenomenal.

Anybody involved in the catering business will know that the administration and labour do not cost more than the meal itself. There is roughly 35 cents in there that school meals are costing us more, and if you multiply 35 by the 5 500 000 meals we are providing a year, we will find that the School Meals Service is costing us about \$2 million more than it should.

I think the Government should consider appointing at least a three man private sector commission who could go in and have a look at the School Meals Service, and who could advise the Government in the areas in which it is losing.

I do not say we should have a three man private sector commission coming from overseas, because I think that we fall into a trap here in Barbados in that whenever we have anybody to investigate anything we think he must come from away. I think that there are many Barbadians with the capabilities who could have a look into this and probably save our country the two to three million dollars that we are now wasting.

In another area of expenditure, Sir, I note, with dismay, that we are going to spend only \$16 500 on maintenance of markets. If you look at the Fairchild Street Market and you think it needs painting, which I think you will agree, I do not believe that \$16 500 would be enough to do that. It would probably only paint the front. What about the Eagle Hall and the Cheapside markets, Sir? (SENATOR H. R. LINTON: St. Philip too). And the St. Philip market?

Now that I am in the area of Eagle Hall, Sir, I wonder, for the life of me, why we have a wall around the market. What are we keeping out, really? Do you realise that if that wall was down the company sales of those people would go up? I notice that the Barbadians are brighter, they sit outside the wall. So I would just make a plea for common sense, Sir, remove the wall from around the market so that the people can see what is inside, and then the sales would triple.

I also notice, with a bit of dismay again, that Cullo-den Farm is going to be turned into offices. Now, Cullo-den Farm is a building of architectural and historical interest, and I do not think that we should desecrate it

by turning it into offices. The National Union of Public Workers has desecrated a building in Dalkeith, and I am amazed that that union, made up of town planning experts, would allow it to build on two wings with ordinary concrete blocks and keep it in such a disgraceful looking manner, from the road.

When we come to Government buildings, I come to a joke now, because Senator Greaves has ensured that I sit here and look all afternoon, and I looked at a broken window here in this Senate, a broken jalousie that I have been seeing since I have been in here in September. This is the highest chamber in the country and we have a broken window and we have blistered paint coming off. I do not want to talk about the lights that hang with galvanise pipe. I do not know in any Chamber in any part of the world that we would have that type of lighting fixture. It is amazing, Sir, — we have carpet on the floor and galvanise pipe.

When we come to the dining room — and I noticed it today — do you realise that Sir Grantley Adams' painting, a man who could be called the father of democracy in Barbados, is hanging on a galvanise water pipe in the dining room? I know there is talk about improvements, but there is also a lot of talk about when the Post Office moves. We do not need the Post Office to move to repair the window here.

I look around here on a day when you have to find something to do, when there are long speeches from the left, and I notice that we have windows with crests of various Speakers and various Presidents, and all of a sudden this Senate had no more Presidents after 1955. I do not see anything more. What happened? Our moral standards are going down.

This country has had three Governor-Generals and there are no paintings in here of any Governor-General. They should be here. Where is the painting of Sir John Stow, the first Governor-General, and Sir Winston Scott? There is nothing. We have even Her Majesty the Queen and HRH Prince Philip in ordinary photographs. We should have a local artist commissioned to have these done in painting and hung here. (*Asides*) I do not have to go on to the seats.

Sir, I am going to step a little lower down into Trafalgar Square, because if you go down there you will see the bus stand and there are about four sheets of everite missing for about four years, and nobody has done anything. Coming in here today, for instance, I noticed that Lord Nelson's statue has been desecrated with bills and is written up, and this has not seen a coat of paint, probably in five years. These are things that are sending down our country — these little things that we see. I see things in the Estimates for repairs and all sorts of things,

but I do not know where they are repairing them, but they certainly are not being repaired in Bridgetown.

Sir, I come to another area, the Barbados Development Bank. I notice that we are going to get the same \$500 000 contribution to equity that we have been now getting since 1969. Sir, we presently have a credit squeeze, we have the Central Bank drawing in all the liquidity from the commercial banks and that means that the pressure is on the Development Bank to lend, and I think it is time that the Government reconsider and probably make a massive contribution to equity.

I note, Sir, that the Shadow Minister of Finance said he would welcome an injection of equity into the Barbados Development Bank. Of course, Sir, I take that to be a compliment on the management because if he was willing to put more equity in there, obviously we are doing a good job. But I do make a plea, because the Government now has a chance to guide the development in this country, in the next year, through the Development Bank, because if the commercial banks are making no loans really and the Development Bank is the only one doing so, the Government can ensure where the money goes, and I would like to think that that subvention or that equity contribution could be at least increased to \$2 million.

Sir, I have left Senator Greaves for the last, and I notice he is not here. I have left him for the last because I have listened to a long talk about how badly off we are, that we are going to get Corporation Tax, our companies are in bankruptcy, how people are working one day on and one day off, how people are working one week on and one week off.

However, Sir, apparently he only knows about the economy when he is in here. Apparently he does not discuss this with his colleagues at the Union, because if he did, then the type of requests for wage proposals coming from the Union would not be the type of demands that are made. I would wish now, and I send a message for him, that he would inform his colleagues, his National Executive, to temper their wage demands to the conditions being experienced in the country at the moment.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am going to entertain a contribution from the right of the Table, seeing that all of the contributions, so far, have come from my left. If there is nobody willing, then I will listen to somebody else on the left.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, there was a time, this Hon. House, when the Estimates were debated for two full days. I remember the Hon. Attorney General speaking for a record five hours, and next to him was no less a person than the Deputy Prime Minister. One would not be so rude as to suggest that the Attorney General

was talking long because he did not think that the Deputy Prime Minister, who, himself, has had a good record for the length of his speeches in this Senate, was not capable. This was between 1971 and 1976.

I know the strategy is not to say anything, but I would have thought that the independent Senators, after having listened for such a long time would have been glad not to have to sit down and listen for another three hours. I would have thought that members would have got their bearings right and got up, but it is quite obvious that they are good listeners. Perhaps the message is clear and good, or not they would have left and gone home, or perhaps they would have got up so that I could not speak.

Sir, I would just like to say that I am not going to be very long. This is one day that Senator Trotman is not going to upset me in any way. If I want to talk for three hours, I will talk for three hours.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not let him distract you. You go ahead.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Don't worry, Mr. President, we have got a long time.

Sir, I was going to start with agriculture, but I think I will start on the home wicket, and I am going to start with sports. In the last elections it was said "don't make sport — you vote for yours truly". It is paradoxical my opponent is now Minister of Sport, but it only goes to show that at election time people say things they do not mean.

Sir, I am worried, and a little perplexed, that the Government of Barbados has not cleared the air on the vexed question of the South African apartheid policy. In case you want to know where I am coming from, it is under the Ministry of Sport on page 102.

Sir, there has been a lot of controversy, a lot of debate, phone-in programmes, and people are writing in the papers and having their own say about this question.

People are saying that when the professionals — doctors, lawyers and engineers refuse to go to South Africa, then we should do something about cricketers who go there. Sir, they say that when countries with whom we fraternise stop trading with South Africa, then the time will be right to clamp down. That is what I have been saying.

In the meantime, in other sports, for instance, in football, we have seen that FIFA has been able to haul teams out of South Africa. The Athletic Federation has done likewise and one then has to ask the question, Sir, why can it not be done with cricket.

Now, Sir, I did not particularly wish to begin but since Senator Seale produced a magnificent yorker in the Instant Money Game, the lifeblood of cricket in this country — of which, Sir, I know very little, I mean the Instant Money Game, Sir, but I know it produces a lot of money — I feel I should start with cricket and get it over with.

There is a trend of thought in the West Indies, Sir, that we would be removed from the international scene if we were to try and insist that our players must not go to South Africa and play cricket. People feel so.

Now, the real facts are — and I wanted to talk about this in another debate, but I knew the time would come in the not too distant future — that the English, New Zealanders and Australian cricketers all want to play in South Africa, that is a fact. So it might be inevitable that we will end up playing against Pakistan, India and now Ceylon. It might be on the cards, Sir.

You see, Sir, people are saying these things because they do not realize that as far back as 1976, when the West Indies were playing Australia in Australia — I went there to cover the tournament for a couple of newspapers — it was then mooted, Sir, that the Australian cricketers would go to South Africa. The Chappells particularly, those were the ones who wanted to go. There is little wonder that Greg Chappell, the captain of Australia only two weeks ago said that he would go to South Africa now, if the Australian Board would give him the approval. Of course, Sir, the Australian Board would never do that, not at this stage, so he has not gone.

Sir, I wrote an article in the newspaper advising the Chappells what would be the position in Third World countries, Sir, telling them that it was my belief — because I could not speak — I was in Parliament at the time, I suppose — yes, 1976 — it was 1975 then, Sir — and advising them that Third World countries would take a very serious view if the Australians went to South Africa that winter, and that there would be grave ramifications if they went, and that we did not take kindly to being handed a card and being declared honorary white individuals. That is a fact, Sir.

I pointed out to them that as far as I am concerned, you may call me a super black but you cannot call me, Sir, an honorary white man. Nothing so fresh, Sir. It cannot work out. It could not work out at all.

Do you know, Sir, that those people are so wicked that they once wanted Rohan Kanhai, who was married to a lovely Lancaster lass, to declare that she was black, Sir. And yet people get down here, knowing absolutely nothing about the situation and talking about

people should go and play for blood money and all of that sort of thing. But, Sir, we will get to that. We will probably get to that about 7.00 o'clock.

Sir, Geoff Boycott told the Indian authorities, about two months ago, that he would never go to South Africa again because they had told him, and they also told Geoff Cooke, who had gone to South Africa and played, that they will not allow him to come to India if they admitted they would go again to South Africa.

Having gone to India, Sir, and having been sent back home, he has now proceeded to join the "Dirty Dozen", as they are called — the Press say so, Sir, not me, the Press called them that, maybe that is their name, they called them that — and he was dishonoured by the town of Barnsley, the city or town of his birth because they feel, Sir, — and no lesser person than the Mayor of the town said that, Sir — that this cannot be right and as far as they are concerned, great man as he is, or was, they are not prepared to be associated with him.

You compare that, Sir, with the case of Basil D'Oliveira, who would pass for white in any West Indian Island. As a matter of fact, Sir, as Senator Simmons will tell you, when I first met the gentleman it was at Lords cricket ground, Sir, and I had unwittingly said to the guys, "I want to meet this guy D'Oliveira, this black guy from South Africa causing all of this trouble, I want to meet him." And this chap came to me and said "I am Basil." Sir, I nearly dropped dead. Down here he would have been pretty, Sir, he would have been all right.

I saw him in Rhodesia — I went to Rhodesia in 1962 — I saw him in Rhodesia upstairs in a hotel, and he could not get a drink because he had a South African passport and he was considered coloured there. Of course, I asked the man, "What about me? If you cannot give him a drink what about me, 19 shades darker, perhaps 30?" He said, "If you have a British Commonwealth passport, you are okay. I said "What about D'Ollie?" No chance, Sir. No chance whatsoever.

The next very day, Sir, we left going down to Singapore en route to Karachi, down the road, Sir. And when we got to the airport, this time, Sir, D'Oliveira, South African passport and looking very white, Sir, and he was apprehended, he cannot come in here at all. So you see, one day the man is in trouble and the next day, in a different country, he is in more trouble. So when people talk about these things, they must understand that there are people who have been mixed up in it and know a lot more about it, and when they talk, Sir, it is not that they have anything against anybody, but they know the facts.

It is true that he had some measure of compensation. He was made an O.B.E., Sir — I suppose that is all right,

there are many West Indian cricketers that have been made O.B.E.'s — and he finished playing for England, a gentlemen. I may say, Sir. But it all started with him.

But all is not lost, Sir, because in New Zealand, only last year, the Captain and the Vice-Captain, on a matter of conscience, decided that they were not going to play against the South African Rugby Team in the forthcoming tour of New Zealand.

Now, Sir, the New Zealanders have always been of the opinion that they were badly done by, because some of the other countries had sent teams to South Africa and there were no boycotts against them. What they could not recognize, Sir, was the fact that it was not a matter of people sending teams to South Africa, but it was the fact that South Africa was sending a team to them. That is what is lot of the Third World countries and the African Territories really got hot under the collar about.

But Sir, would you believe that the same South African team was smuggled into the mighty United States and played games there behind closed doors? And nobody at all would tell America that that was abominable it was not good at all, we can't condone it Sir — these are facts — but then Afghanistan was invaded by Russia, and America told the world that they are not going to any Olympics and that we should not go there either.

So the Olympics became a farce, and people like Johnny Walker, with tears in his eyes, in a speech — of course, he did not make the major speech, I did — came on and said that they were not aware of the facts of how it feels to a man to train his body for four consecutive years and then, the day before, be told that he just cannot go.

Barbados did not go, Sir, I don't know if it was a directive and to be honest, Sir, I was a member of the Sports Council and I can honestly say that at no time that I was there did I ever hear a hint that we should not go to the Olympics for one reason or another. So, I can only conclude that we were not told that we could not go. But Trinidad and Tobago went and Hansley Crawford won a gold medal too, Sir. Do you know what they did? They named a plane after him.

It is the same thing I was talking about the other day, Sir, that somehow, as a people, we don't understand what is really going on. That is why I called the other day for the appropriate Prime Ministers to meet, because I felt that there were issues to be discussed. I am very proud to say that subsequent to that I noticed that Mr. Shearer was here, and the Prime Minister of Barbados would shortly be going to Jamaica, the Prime Minister of St. Lucia has been to Trinidad and then his Government

was represented by the Jamaican diplomat at another conference. So they have been some interaction and I think this is good. I am not saying, Sir, that it is not because of anything I said, but it is good that they are talking.

What I am talking about, Sir, Senator Linton obviously would not understand. Kallicharran, he is the centre of the controversy now. He refused to join the Packer troupe, but he had the honour of captaining the West Indian team in the process. The West Indian cricketers who joined the Packer troupe were only doing it because they felt that their earnings should be commensurate with their abilities. In so doing they were kicked off the team. Let's face it, that is a fact. Now Lloyd, the captain of the West Indian team, has been offered this blood money from South Africa, because South Africa has agents in the Caribbean who are offering the West Indians a lot of money to go to South Africa. That is a fact, Sir, and we see a complete turn around now where Lloyd who was a villain a few years ago when he played for the Packer Team, now becomes a favourite because he is not taking the blood money, and Kallicharran, who did not join Packer, has now gone to South Africa.

To be fair to him, Sir, I believe that if he knew he was a reserve and still highly thought of, he might have stayed on. But when a man feels that all is lost, and that his country does not need him, he might be inclined to do the thing that he thinks is right in his mind, and that is to go and play for some money for his family.

Well, Sir, my view about this is simply that if a man wants to play in South Africa when he understands the repercussions, and then he still wants to go, then I say, let him go. That is the reason Sir, why I would like the Government to make a clear statement on what they believe is right in this issue. While this controversy was going on, the Minister said he was not worried, that the Gleneagles Agreement was there, and that sort of thing. Subsequent events have proven that the Gleneagles Agreement is weak, very weak.

I do not think that we could sit down any longer and say we do not know whether to bring in a fellow who has gone to South Africa to play because we have the Gleneagles Agreement, because its interpretation does seem to make people solve the problem.

The Government must come out clear and say exactly what is the situation. We must never forget that if we ban a player because he does something contrary to what we believe is right, it will not be the first time at all that cricketers from the West Indies have not been able to play for their countries. One only has to remember that prior to 1968 no West Indian cricketer who played county cricket in England could play for his country.

That is a fact, Sir, that is the only reason why Roy Marshall never played for the West Indies after having gone to Hampshire.

It is a fact, too, that in 1968, in the winter, Lance Gibbs signed a contract to play with Warwickshire, fully knowing that he would never play for the West Indies again. The fact is that they changed the law that winter, and Gibbs has gone to take 309 test wickets and become, until recently, Sir, the greatest wicket taker of all times, that is history. But few people knew that he would have been lost to West Indian cricket. So, it is not the first time that one would be lost.

Danny Livingstone of Antigua is such a case. He could never play for the West Indies while he was playing for Hampshire, simply because of the rule which stated that anyone who played for a county could not play for the West Indies. It is little wonder, Sir, that the son of the great George Headley, Ron Headley is his name, never played for the West Indies after that law was passed in 1968. So he played in 1969 or 1973. (Asides) I am sorry Sir, somebody just congratulated me on the broadcast yesterday. I will talk about that later on, Sir. (Laughter)

Sir, again this agreement in the world; India — from the Leader of the House I did not recognize his writing. Sir, the 'Dirty Dozen' have been banned by the Board in England for three years, and do you know, Sir, that in India they are pleased about that. But not so in the West Indies — Allen Ray the President of the West Indian Board of Control is disillusioned, he is sad — he thought that the sentence would have been more severe. So you see, Sir, we have it that some of us, even though we completely agree that we should not play cricket in South Africa, when the sentence is handed down, you see that there is still disagreement among us.

But some African nations, too, Sir, they have to get their socks pulled up too, Sir. In the Jaycees Convention they had a few years ago, the next one was to be held in South Africa, and do you know, Sir, that while some of the West Indian guys were a bit reluctant and they were apprehensive as to how to get around that, some of the African fellows were telling them they had their visas already.

It is a very serious thing and nobody seems to be in agreement on it and I feel, Sir, that we in Barbados, the Government of Barbados, should state, and make it abundantly clear, what the position is. I do not think that is asking too much, Sir, I do not really think it is asking too much.

After all, you have just had discussions with Guyana, the Prime Minister went there, Deputy Prime Minister went there. You have just had discussions with Jamaica — Mr. Shearer was here and the Rt. Hon. Prime

Minister is reported to go to Jamaica soon. Do you know, Sir, that both Jamaica and Guyana are very clear on their stand, very clear. I do not see, Sir, why we cannot be very clear on it, Sir.

I think that this is a very serious thing and I think that if the Government comes out and states, unequivocally, what the situation is, it means that people coming here will know what to expect.

Sir, you could hardly talk about sport unless you talk about the Sports Council. The Sports Council has only been attacked in Parliament once, as far as I can remember, and that is many years ago when it was done by the MP for the City, Mr. Elliott Mottley, in the Other Place. As far as, I can recall, Sir, it has never been done in this Honourable Chamber.

I am a member of the Sports Council. I have said so and I like to repeat it, Sir, because, between the last time I said so and now, it only means that they have not done anything yet, and I did not particularly want to speak unless the Chairman of the National Sports Council was here because there are a few things that I would have to say that I am quite sure that he can easily defend, I am sure he can do it, Sir, but then again, he might not wish to touch a few others.

Sir, as far as I am concerned, and being interested in all sports, I think we have the question where we now have to reorganise sports. We need some measure of reorganisation.

One of the problems, Sir, is simply that sporting bodies have not yet come to the conclusion, whether it is in ignorance or whether they really do not feel so, that the Sports Council is the supreme body.

And what is more, Sir, is that it must be seen as such. Of course, we have some bodies that are affiliated to international bodies, for instance, Sir, the Olympic Association. We understand this, but it is my view, Sir, that by and large, they have done a pretty good job.

I was talking to Senator Simmons earlier on, Sir, he did not ask me to say that, he knows he could not come that way, Sir, but I think that what has happened, especially in the independence programmes, you might have noticed, Sir, that they have done a remarkable job, in my opinion.

The coaching programmes are quite good. I do not believe that there are employing coaches with the idea that they are being pensioned off, as, perhaps, could be the case. I do feel, Sir, that they are expected to work and with a little motivation and, at times, not too much interference in some places, I think that we will see it through.

Now, sports is subsidised, Sir. I mean, one only has to see the subvention list. People, in most areas, when they are going to international sports, they would sometimes wait until the very week before the sports — it could be the Olympic Games, it does not matter — and they will come and tell you that we have one foot on the grave and the other on a banana. In other words, Sir, if you do not help them out right now, they will never go — and they have told everybody already that they are going so therefore, the Sports Council is in real trouble, money wise.

But, Sir, I have noticed that the indications are that there will be cutbacks, like any of the other Government departments, Sir, if you look through these Estimates. The Prime Minister, if he was a cricketer, Sir, he would play the cut shot very well — the late cut, square cut, agricultural cut, all sorts of cuts he would make. So there will be cutbacks in this department. I regret this, simply because I feel that like anywhere else, with these reductions in the emoluments, it seems to me that redundancies may be rather inevitable and maybe Senator Simmons could tell me what he aims to do about it, Sir. (Aside) Have you done it already?

Why I say this, Sir, is that the Sports Council will now have additional fields to look after. We get in here, over there, Sir, down there, Sir, and pass Bills, acquisition of land for recreation facilities — a favorite pastime, Sir — but I regret to say that I do not think that there is the money available to develop those grounds and that is a fact, Sir. Senator Simmons will have to concede that. He would have to say, "yes — you are right."

Montgomery, Sir, you know that I have referred to that monstrosity again and again, so I am not going to worry about that. I notice that the Minister, in a speech the other day followed suit. Perhaps, he has come around to the fact that what I said is true. That is exactly the apt description for it. Orange Hill, Spring Garden, what about Murphy's Pasture and Sion Hill? Sir, all of these are recreational facilities that have been recently handed over. (Aside) Well, Haggatt Hall. We have passed Bills in here for Haggatt Hall and I did not really wish to get into Waterford, not to mention Belfield, Sir. (Aside) Did you say something, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not be distracted.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: They are distracting me, Sir, but I(Laughter).....shall prevail. Sir, I wrote a note this morning and it says, "I have a feeling that the Instant Money Game will soon go Government's way." Sir, I have more than a feeling now after listening to Senator Seale. That is no longer a feeling, an illusion, it seems to me to be a reality, and I will tell you why.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: National lottery). National lottery? You could do worse.

The Estimates state that the Government collected \$200 000 last year and will probably collect \$250 000 this year. Senator Seale says it is a rip off. I know that Senator Seale knows more about that than me. (Aside). No, I did not mean that, that is ambiguous, Sir. I mean that Senator Seale knows more about the ripping off of the Instant Money Game than I do. I must confess that I never looked into the logistics of it, I have never done that.

I know that the people connected with it are reputable people; hence my reason not to sort of look into it. We have been as far as the east is from the west in cricketing circles, Sir, you humble servant and the hierarchy. If I had said that, there would be no end of controversy, but Senator Seale has said it and I am not going to say anything about that. I think the Cricket Board of Control would have to answer Senator Seale on that.

The only conversation I have had with Senator Seale in the last day is that he wants to book a friend of mine to ride one of his horses next week. We have had no other conversation about any Instant Money, Sir, if Senator Seale says it is a rip off, it must be a rip off.

I had hoped to say that I wanted the Government to channel that money — it is a lot of money \$250,000, a quarter of a million dollars — perhaps into Senator Simmons' National Sports Council so that he could utilise that money. But now, I do not know if I could be so presumptuous as to ask the Minister or the other honourable Senator over there if he will ever do that. I do not know if they would want blood money, rip off money, I do not know.

Personally, I rather thought the BCA had done a good job. When I was a member of the Board of Management of the Barbados Cricket Association — until they thought I wanted to take it over — the Board was in dire trouble, seven years ago. You would know, Sir, you have been down there to watch cricket and you noticed the conditions that a man of your stature had to encounter, and believe you me, Sir, since the Instant Money Game there has been a massive transformation.

Thank God they have paid for the Three W's stand. I would not wish the names of the Three W's to be discredited, so if it is paid for, thank God for that, but they seem to have done quite well. Now I am dubious, I am a little concerned. (Aside). Senator Linton is not going to lure me into anything I do not want to say.

We will move to Belfield, Sir. The Minister must have noticed that the former Minister had done things to Blenheim. I would not call that community centre in Blenheim a monstrosity, not that one. The recreational facilities at Blenheim were used for many years by the Barbados Cricket League. Then came the erudite Senator, the erudite Minister. He came along, and now, out of a clear blue sky, you find that the BCL players are in danger of losing that lovely ground at Blenheim.

I think it is the Minister's constituency, so he must have an interest, but as the old people would say, his navel string is buried up there in the Ivy, and therefore the lovely conditions at Blenheim apparently will soon be the preserve of the people in the surrounding districts. We know for a fact that the Prison Officers have long gone from Blenheim back down to the Transport Board ground, and because of that, apparently you find that the now Minister of Sport has decided that in Belfield, down there will be the Mecca of all sport.

You may well recall, Sir, in this very Chamber, when we were debating the Waterford acquisition, the honourable Member of Parliament for that area, Mr. Sisnett, made it his business to come into the Gallery that day. He wanted to hear for himself, he wanted to know that it was being passed, he could not wait, and I alluded to the fact that Belfield, Black Rock was the Mecca of all sport in Barbados. I even called many names that came from that area, and I remember Senator Trotman, at that point, told me that the true representative would soon get down there. He knew what was in the offing.

I am saying it is not what you do, it is how you do it that is important, and I will tell you why, in this case. I have been on the National Sports Council from its inception, and having said that this evening — and I am not on it again, it does not matter to me — I am still going to say this: At no time has the National Sports Council — the Chairman is here — had the opportunity — not that we do not need it, I myself have plugged for it for many years — to provide recreational facilities in the depressed areas of Black Rock and the Housing Areas around Grazettes and Bush Hall. Look at the files, Sir, you can get them, look at the files and you will see that Wes Hall said that — that we need better facilities down there.

Do you know, Sir, out of a clear blue sky, without reference, without reference, I repeat, to the appropriate committees or Sports Council authorities, as far as I am aware.....(SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: As far as you are aware; good words). You might be aware, so get up and tell them. As far as I am aware, Sir, we have never discussed that, the Minister sent down a directive straight to Belfield.

I really do not like that, it is political. The true representative had been there six years before, from 1976 he was the true representative, so I do not see the point of telling me the true representative would do something about that. I smell a rat, Sir, and that is the reason why I say it this afternoon.

If Senator Simmons wants to scratch out my name from the National Sports Council he could pass me a note and I will tell him it is all right.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just be careful, if you make a speech now you are not going to be able to make another one.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was rising on a point of order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us have the point.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is just to tell the honourable member that he is mistaken about there being no communication between the Minister and the Sports Council about the plans for Belfield. That is not a speech, Sir.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I rise to say that I might be mistaken that he had conversation, but I am still right in saying it has not come through the proper channel, the one that we are accustomed to. I do not expect it to be a big issue and we are not going to cross swords over that.

Sir, about three or four years ago, a White Paper was laid in Parliament and in it were proposals for an auditorium. I think it was the Chinese, when they came here, who had decided to make a gift of money towards this auditorium. I just wonder if the Minister could give any indication as to what is the latest situation on this.

What I really think is required, and it is there in black and white, is that we should have an auditorium in a site somewhere around Bridgetown, because one of the things we find that has happened with the stadium is the fact that somehow people do not like the idea of going up to Waterford. I do not know why, but they seem not to be in a mood to catch two buses to get home, and whatever sport is going on up there and it terminates at a late hour, it seems to me that people would rather not go.

I think this is quite evident when you recognise that in the older days when a football match was played at Kensington Oval, it was customary for hundreds and

perhaps thousands of people to go straight from work, walk down Fontabelle and be there in about ten minutes to watch the game. It was easy to get back home.

It is amazing that with the better facilities at the stadium it is rather difficult to attract a crowd, even if a very good game is going on, or even if you are playing international games.

I believe what has happened is that the Football Association has now come around to the idea that it would be better to play the old-fashioned type of football, that is around the surrounding areas of Bridgetown where most of the clubs are, and you now find that football is being played quite easily and to good crowds up by the Globe where Police now play, at Barclays grounds, Cable and Wireless, Black Spurs, down at Texaco, at Carlton, at Wanderers and at the Park.

It can safely be said that these areas are within a radius of three or four miles, and it means that people are ever conscious of the fact that they do not wish to spend a lot of time travelling to and from games.

Sir, it is for this reason that I have always believed that there should be an auditorium where games like basketball can be played. Mind you, Sir, basketball is one of the fastest growing sports in Barbados, and indeed the teams that play basketball are so evenly matched that with three games a week it would be common to see crowds of 2 000 and 3 000, twice and three times a week, going to basketball.

As I said, it is a fast growing game, but what is bad about it, Sir, is the fact that when you pack 3 000 or even 2 000 people in the Y.M.C.A. Stadium, as it stands now, you run the risk of a repeat of the fiasco we had when the Mexican Tennis stars were playing here at the Garrison — there was a collapse of the stands and a lot of people were hurt.

Now, Sir, we never liked that sort of thing because it causes a lot of worry and a lot of pain to organisers when they have to be worried about liability for loss of life or even of limb. As a consequence, we find that there is always a bit of a problem at the Y.M.C.A. for basketball games.

Now I feel, Sir, that if we could get an auditorium with elongated ends where you could have a stage-like situation at one end and perhaps some equipment rooms at the other, with retractable seats, this would be ideal, because when you are not playing you could sort of bring them in for a situation where you might have, maybe, a world title fight which is being relayed by Cable and Wireless. Senator Williams would be the engineer in charge relaying this great spectacle to Barbadians.

As it stands now, we are very disadvantaged because such a spectacle would have to be staged at Kensington Oval, and everyone knows that the weather could well play a very serious part in the proceedings. So an auditorium is to my mind a must. I think that most people will concede that it is necessary to have an auditorium.

There has been a lot of talk, Sir, about the location of an auditorium. Some people believe that Passage Road might be a good area. There is some land down there and most people feel that it would be a good area since it is central.

About three years ago I was not aware of that spot, and I was of the opinion that the present Y.M.C.A. location would have been a marvellous position because of the fact that it is central and people can get to and from the game very easily, and perhaps if it was not too inconvenient, there could have been a situation where the Y.M.C.A. could be resited.

Subsequent events have proven that the removal of the Y.M.C.A. is a very sensitive area, because there are now delegations and the like over this same vexed question of the Y.M.C.A. being for sale.

I know that in these times, Sir, it would be rather difficult now to buy that land, so what I want to find out from the Minister is whether the land at Passage Road is still available, and if it is, whether there are moves afoot to having the auditorium in that position. I think, Sir, it would be a good thing.

There are many other areas of sport, Sir. I notice that Senator Seale did not touch racing, at all, and I do not know, Sir. They have run a sweepstake for many years. I hope it was legal. I am not aware of what the situation is there but there are many other sports that one could get involved.

I think that the Government should really pay some attention to sports that are indigenous to Barbados, like road tennis. I do not think you would find it anywhere else in the world, and if you found it anywhere else in the world you can guarantee that there would be two Bajans playing it. I think that you should put some money into it, because road tennis, Sir, is played in the depressed areas. You will probably find it is played where there are a lot of housing areas and in areas that are thickly populated, and I am sure, Sir, that the game road tennis has kept many young people off the streets. *(Asides).*

When I say that, Senator Trotman does not understand, Sir. Senator Trotman does not understand that the Barbados Road Tennis Championships are not held in the road. They have never yet been held in the road for the

last 7 years. I know. I sponsor them. Sir, they were held in the Farm, off the road, and now in the complex. *(Asides)* Yes. I am only saying that, Sir. Do not jump at me for the first time in an hour.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I thought you said you would not let them distract you.

SENATOR W. HALL: Sir, I am not being distracted. I am only saying that Senator Trotman is telling me that the road tennis is played in the road. One would know, Sir, that if you are playing in a game, which I am now contending is a serious game and it deserves a lot of concentration — and anyone with a modicum of common-sense would understand — that you would not be able to play it if you are constantly interrupted by passing traffic. That is easy, Sir, so do not jump at me. The road tennis that I am talking about that I would like the Government to be involved in, the one I said would keep them off the street, I am talking about competitive road tennis — the one that is played at a competitive level and the one that I would like to see played throughout the length and breadth of Barbados. That is what I am talking about, Sir, so I would like the Senator to ease me.

I am reminded that the President has recognised that there are some very bad behaved Senators, Sir, and he is telling me not to let them distract me, Sir, but perhaps, Sir, you could tell them sometimes that they should not be so rude, and interfere with Senators, Sir, when they are speaking. And to be quite serious, Sir, honourable Senators over there, year after year, day after day, get up to announce a Bill and give no information whatsoever, and as you get up to talk, Sir, they want to heckle and get on in a manner that is not in consonance with good Parliamentary procedure and manners.

Anyway, Sir, I was saying that there are some other sports in this country that I would like to see the Government getting involved in and I would also like to refer to the sport of softball cricket. Now, Sir, anyone that had boy days would know that the game of softball cricket is the forerunner of greater things because most people who have played at a decent level — and even those who have not played at a decent level but who themselves enjoy playing — would tell you that they have had their quota of softball cricket, be it on the beach or on the playing fields of many a park, Sir.

What I am saying, Sir, is that the game has now become very big. It has now become rather big, Sir. The organization is one that calls for great expertise because there are no fewer than 120 teams playing on Sunday mornings. And these people have now reached the stage where there are so well organized that they are now able to make tours to Canada and further afield.

Sir, I feel that even in a country like England where they claim that they taught us how to play, even though we have taught them how to win, you will find that they do not know, or have not known, what the game of softball cricket is. Since they have come to Barbados, Sir, and they have taken that game, nearly away from us, Sir, in much the same way as they have taken the steel band from Trinidad and Tobago because, Sir, as you know there are schools. While we in the West Indies feel that it is infra dig to play steelband music in our schools, or in our homes or in our clubs, you will find that in England steelband is taught to thousands of English kids, and so it is with the softball cricket, Sir.

Whereas you find that only a few youngsters have been accustomed to playing the game in Queen's Park and on the school fields that we have in Barbados, even though there were only a few of them playing up to five years ago, the game has got so big and so recognised now, Sir, that the English have adopted our game. They even want to tell us now not to play with a tennis ball but that we should play with a sponge-like ball and they also want to make willow bats, as in the case of what you call conventional cricket, and as you know, Sir, our fellows down here are playing with home-made bats. So you see, Sir, this game has become a very big thing and I do hope that the Government will think very seriously of getting involved in the game of softball.

Sir, I know for a fact that the ex-Minister of Sport was very interested in the game of dominoes. He always felt that any game that was for the masses was something that was good. I know that many times the subventions of other games would have to take the knife so as to inflate the subvention for dominoes, and to be honest, Sir, I have always thought it to be a good thing.

It is a good thing because I think we need more competition in this sport, because whereas you will find that many middle and upperclass people would play dominoes in the privacy of their homes on Friday nights, that is a fact, Sir, you will probably find that you do not get that support that the game deserves from the people of this country.

I believe that a little injection from Government would go a long way towards helping this game to reach the height that I believe it can reach. So you see there are lots of other sports that I would like to touch on, but I am not going to because I feel there might now be some other Senators, even at this late stage, Sir, who would be quite willing to say their piece now.

On the same page, because I do not know if I go away from this page whether I can come back to it, you will notice that we have Youth Development. Sir, I believe

that we have to be very careful with how we tackle the youth of this country. Somehow, Sir, they have come up in a different kind of world. You find that even though you educate your children to the best of your ability, even though you would like to see them in the best type of company, and you try your best to do what you can, the stark reality is that you may do all these things, but you suddenly cannot make them do the things you want them to do. You can take a cow to the water, but you certainly cannot make it drink.

Sir, in these days, you find that youngsters go around very easily and they are more inclined to follow the crowd which would get involved in petty crime at the beginning, and even drug taking, I think, Sir, you must understand that it is a very serious area in which to get involved.

There are some youngsters in our society that have dropped out, suddenly so, — the best of upbringing and they have dropped out. Some of them believe that it is fashionable to wear their hair in locks and to do the type of things, Sir, that one would not associate them with, judging from the upbringing they have had. Some believe that it is a spiritual awakening, and some of them believe it is an escape route.

It is a matter of frustration — they see themselves, most times, as jobless with the rising cost of living, and they become frustrated by the standards put on them by people who do not understand them. What is sad, Sir, is the fact that these kids were brought up in Christian homes they did not come down here from Sodom and Gomorrah, they were brought up in Christian homes. They, no doubt, have read a lot, and they see themselves as outcasts in society.

The outcome is that they only listen to their own. In other words, it would seem to me that if you would bring the Bishop of the Anglican Church to talk to them they would rather listen to the people that they believe are their own. Therefore, if we are ever going to get near to them, and I do not mean in the courts or anything like that, it would seem to me you would have to approach them through some of their brethren, that is more amenable to reason.

I was listening to a call-in programme the other night, and I could not believe my ears. Some Rastafarians, in the Pineland area, were given some land by the Government through the intercession of an officer and they have cultivated that land. They sell their produce and they apparently are trying to get more land so as to make a decent living, and to develop it, as it were, Sir. And one of those callers said they have seen the Rastas there all the time and he really believe they were playing tricks. He could not believe that they were working honestly and

keeping out of trouble — but they were playing tricks. So you see that it is that mentality that give rise to most of the trouble that we see around us.

Maybe, what we need to do is to motivate these youngsters and allow them to express themselves. If agriculture is really what they love to do, or rather if it is art or sports — only yesterday the Barbados team went to Dominica our youth team, Sir, and they were detained at the airport because one of the Barbados footballers of the team wore a Rastafarian hair style. Sir, it is a fact. But if Bob Marley had gone to Dominica, the whole country, including those officers, would want to kneel down and worship him.

The youngster is going to represent his country, he is wearing a dreadlock style and because of that, Sir, without doing anything else, he is detained at the airport for two hours. I am saying this to make the point that if you are wearing that hairstyle, whether it is my son or your son, he starts off with a disadvantage. Bear that in mind, Sir, and give some measure of assistance to people whose ideas might not be the same as ours.

It might be a good thing, Sir, if we could give the display of these chaps some prominence. I know you will tell me since they have moved from Rockers Alley that they are down in some other alley, Cats Alley or some other. But I believe in Port-of-Spain the streets are somewhat broader, and it is a common thing to see the artists displaying their crafts on the sidewalks in Frederick Street, anyone of those there would know that. Perhaps, if we have to block off a street on a Saturday morning for our people to display their articles, it might not be a bad thing.

It is also very important as far as youth development is concerned, Sir, that we utilize our community development centres. People have to understand that the community centres are there, not to break up, not to vandalise, but simply for their recreational purposes and for drama, if they want to have plays — the same thing that Senator Wickham was talking about — and if they want to have singing competitions.

Yes, singing, Sir. The Best Village Competition in Trinidad is something that has been going on for many, many years and all they really do, from village to village, is to sing some parang songs and have their little skits here and there. But they get exposure, Sir, because to win the Best Village Competition is something worthy, it is something of value.

What is more, Sir, you would probably find that firms, commercial houses in the area will understand what is their corporate interest. They will understand that a community that buys the product that they produce

might well do a lot better in their favour if they understand that the company has got the interest of the average person at heart, and that is, spend some of the money that they make into these ventures.

People in the areas, Sir, have got to become motivated and they have to act, as it were, as talent scouts and try and help these youngsters to show their talent. And you would probably find that if this is done and you can get villages, housing areas and people from different areas to compete in different areas, not necessarily in cricket and football, but I mean in the folklore, Sir, and in debates, pertinent issues.

If you do this, you would probably find that the finals could be held on TV. It would be a lot more interesting than some of the things that I see sometimes, and it would give them the road to stardom. It would give them some star exposure, Sir, because if this is not done, they then become star criminals and this is a fact, Sir.

So you see, when one talks about youth development, I think that you have to understand, seriously, that we have to look at the situation whereby the youth of the country are given the opportunity to express themselves. I know that you will always get those who will make it bad for others, and I am quite aware that they might have bad people among the Rastafarian sect, but they also have bad people, I would not even say in Parliament, but in every walk of life, Sir. That is a fact. So I believe that we have got to look at this situation very seriously and, having done so, I think that we will be in a better position to evaluate the situation.

Now, I was not going to touch on CBC, because I know that is the portfolio of the Minister of Information and he is not here. But I am sure Senator Trotman would tell him.....(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Go ahead, man.).....or he, perhaps, could answer the situation. Now when it comes to the media, television, I feel that Oh, he is coming, Sir, I think that Senator Barrow, as Minister of Information, under whose.....(Aside) No, I am not going to destroy CBC, I am just saying that I believe I have some input here which would, I am sure, engage the attention of the honourable Leader of the Senate.

Sir, at CBC, I think you would have to pay a little attention to their outside broadcasts so that they become comparable with those that we might see from elsewhere. Why I am saying this, Sir, is that some people would not know the difficulties experienced by the staff at CBC in things like outside broadcasts. One is always inclined, Sir, to criticise when you see what perhaps could be a shoddy performance or something that is rather inept, you take yesterday for instance, Sir.

CBC have been asking me, for a long time, to do some TV commentaries and I have never really been inclined to do them because I have found that one should always strive for brilliance and not mediocrity. I find that you have to operate under some very, I do not even want to say antiquated, Sir, but I would be close to that.

Do you imagine, Sir, that when you are doing the broadcast for CBC, and let us for argument say that you are going to broadcast cricket, Sir, the cricket is playing out there and you are on top of the Challenor stand with a bird's eye view, a beautiful view of the cricket, and if you are going to do the commentary for CBC, Sir, you have to back the cricket and look into a monitor. It is the most despicable thing, Sir, that I have ever come across. I could not believe my eyes.

It is only for fear, Sir, that the honourable Senator would have come in here today and told me that I backed out and therefore they had nobody to do it, that I went on to do it. (Aside) Of course, in the circumstances that were not ideal, to say the least. Senator Barrow must understand, Sir, that he would have to pay some attention. I know he will, Sir, I know he does, at all times. I know he would listen to sound advice.

But, Sir, this is how it operates. If international cricket is going on and you have a viewing audience of maybe 100 000 people, and what is more tourists, to this country listening, Sir, watching — well since I was the commentator I would say listening. (Laughter) That is only an aside, Sir, but to be serious, Sir, normally you would find that we are not aspiring to be in Australia, where money is no problem in that field, and you have ten cameras, and you have instant replays, and you can go through your earphones to the director of the show and you can say to him, "Well, after this is over, would you zoom in on the slip cordon so that I can discuss the reason why they are only at arm's length apart." Or perhaps, you can look at Lawrence Rowe's stance and you could obviously tell the young enthusiast why he is so comfortable and why he is so elegant. One could easily you know, Sir, become quite professional.

Lo and behold, Sir, what happens with one camera you now have to be a victim up there, you have to be a victim of what he sees, and it means that he is fixed on the pitch and a man snips the ball and you can only say that he has snipped it but you cannot say that someone has caught it. Rather belatedly, you would then say that someone has got it, and then someone would say that the commentary is poor.

Sir, I am only saying that rather than allow the public to criticise his directors and his commentators, and things like that, it would be a good thing if Senator Barrow would go up there, Sir, and understand that there are very trying circumstances which the commentators

have to work under. And for the quality of this broadcast, Sir, it would be advisable that he pays some attention in that area. I just thought, Sir, that I should mention that to Senator Barrow because I know that he would know a good thing when he sees it.

Sir, like Senator Greaves, I have a lot here. I am just wondering if you were inclined to take a break at any time or if you think I should go right through.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am quite sure you will not be too long. You said so in the beginning. Proceed.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I said very long. The operative word there is "very". But we will move into another area, let us go to Agriculture then, it is pretty early. Mr. President has shaken his head like the umpire saying not out. The light is still very good, Sir, so I shall continue.

Agriculture. Every major country depends largely on agriculture. I think we have been reminded in this Hon. Chamber, and, indeed, in the Other Place, that it has been the backbone of our economy since slavery. The Bible is replete with stories of the earth providing for mankind. We often have to ask ourselves in Barbados why is there such a stigma attached to working in agriculture. It is difficult to understand how you cannot get man, woman or child interested in agriculture. There seems to be a distaste for something that has done us proud for hundreds of years, but sometimes we have to admit that the powers that be make some mistakes that make the average man move further and further away from agriculture.

Sir, if you were to look at the sugar industry you will notice that it can only be described as a total lack of foresight to close down two factories in the north when the replacement, that is Portvale, is not ready when the crop starts. Today, March 29, 1982, I am saying to you, with all respect, that my information is that Portvale might very well not be ready at all for this year. I think that is a sad commentary.

The facts are that they contracted an overseas firm — I am informed that it was an American firm — to put down a certain section — I have reason to believe that they were the boilers — of this factory, and they did not have a penalty clause in the contract. So you see where there is no penalty clause, the people are not legally bound to finish in any particular time. I hasten to add that I am not a lawyer, but I think that if there is no penalty clause you can do nothing about it. (SENATOR H. R. LINTON: On a matter of law, you are wrong). If Senator Linton says that on a matter of law I am wrong, then I know I am right, so there is no problem. (Laughter)

Do you know that in a very poor year, when small farmers are hit by reaping costs, transportation costs, increase in the cost of manure, they complain that they must repay money that they were allegedly overpaid? This is true. Senator Rouse complained to me in the dining room — I am sorry he is not here — but you may send for him, Sir, he told me that it is unfair, he said that it was reprehensible. That is what he said.

SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE: Mr. President,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Deane, let me give you warning again.

SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE: I just wanted to clear something he said.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think it is safer to leave it until you make your speech, because I am not going to allow all these interruptions and then more Second Reading speeches.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: That is what I mean, Sir, because I got up reluctantly, because I thought no other Senator was going to speak. I cannot believe the honourable Senator is going to speak, but if he does speak, it will have to be tomorrow. That is for sure.

I said that Senator Rouse told me that he has — the honourable Senator might not have got me right the first time — to pay some money. There is some measure of hardship, and what is more, some of the small cane producing farmers are saying they are going out of cane production. I do not know if they were using that as an excuse, but it was in the newspaper. That is no rumour, that is what they said at the time. All of this at a time when there is so much talk about increasing the level of production in the sugar industry. It is little wonder that the honourable Senator wanted to make a point, because I am hoping that what Senator Rouse told me is not true, so you would be able to make your point.

I really feel that there is a need for an effective Cane Farmers Association which would be charged with the responsibility of looking after their interests.

I know that the Government has purchased some shares in Sugar Producers' Limited. I am speaking under correction and maybe the goodly Senator can correct me. (A VOICE: Sugar Factories Limited.) I know I was near the mark. There have been some shares in Sugar Factories Limited, but up to now Government has not said how these shares will be allocated to the small sugar producers. Perhaps Senator Deane could enlighten us on this very important matter. What we seek is a little information.

What I would like to see happen in the sugar industry is a restoration of the extension services to the small farmer, and if the Government has done that, I would be very happy. I must record, Sir, that I am a little unhappy about the closure of the research centres at Sayes Court and Graeme Hall. I have a note here to speak on Graeme Hall afterwards. There is also the one at Bullens in St. James and Jerusalem in St. Peter.

I say this because I believe that you cannot grow crops in 1982 on 1970 technology, and I believe that your research stations are of paramount importance to the development of agriculture in this country. I know the Minister will have a counter for that, and I would be glad to listen to him. I only seek information. I have told him what is bothering me, so the Minister will be in a position to let us know the true picture.

Speaking about Graeme Hall, now that I am at page 40, Subhead 1, I notice in the Estimates that you had for 1980-81 \$486 656, for 1981-82 \$570 000, and for 1982-83 \$550 000. My arithmetic may be faulty, but that looks to me like \$1.6 million, and perhaps the Minister in reply could just explain. It looks like a tidy sum to me, and perhaps he could explain that. If he feels there is nothing to explain, then he can stay mum.

If we turn to Fisheries, I know there has been a question in the Other Place by the representative for St. Michael North West about facilities in that constituency. I am just wondering if the Minister is aware of it, and if anything has been done about it, and if the answer is in the affirmative, what has been done?

Sir, on Fisheries, by now we would have thought that the Government would have paid a little more attention to fisheries, particularly by the provision of cold storage facilities for fishermen.

While I do not envy consumers for getting some cheap fish periodically, I feel that fishermen should have a guaranteed price for their catch which would provide them with a steady income. I know people will say that there are few fishermen who can take everything that is caught from their boats with their private facilities and then they are able to maintain a reasonable price throughout the year.

The simple facts are that if a man eats 20 fish today, he will still be hungry tomorrow and he must eat again. It would seem to me that when there is a glut like that, and people are at Oistins by the side of the road trying to get rid of them, by all means, adequate storage facilities would enable these people not to have to sell them at a price that would be uneconomical to them. If they were stored, they would not only get a

good price, but we would be able to get fish all the year round. That is my contention. It is debatable, and those who wish to debate it afterwards may well do so.

Sir, we have to modernise our fishing fleets and our fishing methods. Only a few weeks ago, if the story is right — and I can only report what I have read in the papers — a citizen of this country through a bet with some other man from Senator Linton's constituency.... (A VOICE: No, mine.) Well a very enlightened citizen indeed — I could not believe he was being advised by Senator Linton. Now I know why that gentleman has had the foresight.. Sir, we are argumentative at times, and out of most arguments can come some good ideas, or death. In this case happily it has been a good idea.

This boat is a model. It is the latest and it can go out to sea, I understand, for three weeks and they are able to fish in more lucrative waters. What is more, Sir, it has cold storage facilities to accommodate its staying at sea for that period of time.

We have to remember, Sir, that the Japanese have been the scourge of the Caribbean waters. They have plundered these waters with their trawlers, they have taken most of our fish, and, what is more, at times they have sold them back to us at exorbitant prices.

I would like to believe that ventures such as this by that gentleman from Warrick Franklin's constituency — I nearly said Senator Simmons' constituency — could become the order of the day.

I have had a lot of fishermen friends and family as the goodly Senator on my left would know, and I just wonder, what type of insurance have fishermen got? We have to look at this sort of thing. We need safety out there as much as possible. If they lose their lives out there, what sort of compensation would there be?

This is part of the modernisation process that I am projecting. I feel that we have to modernise, and, as a result, I think our fishing fleets will bring us better catches. And what is more, Sir, if we have cold storage facilities, then we would be able to make sure that the fishermen are able to have regular emoluments, and indeed will have emoluments throughout the year, because as you know, Sir, there is the old adage, every day is fishing day but every day is not catching day, and that is so true.

Sir, I think we could have a look under Head 74, Page 43, at the ADC. The question I would like to ask, Sir, what can the ADC say that they have done for agriculture in the last five years. I know that some goodly Senator, Sir, would get up and tell me — I would be very

happy, I would be delighted if they would tell me. What they have done other than add to the many problems of agriculture in this country. I would like to know that.

Sir, there is evidence, and evidence abound that agricultural production has lagged in almost every area in the last five years. That is true. I would hope, Sir, that by now the Agricultural Development Corporation would have been convinced, like we are, that Barbados, in the present circumstances, would not produce cotton on a commercial basis. In the other place when the MP for St. Philip was questioning the Government on cotton, the Deputy Prime Minister in an aside said that you cannot get anybody to pick them.

I hear comments of truth, Sir. I seem to remember — standing up is a problem though (laughter) — Sir, I am not going to appeal to you for a glass of water like my colleague. I think you would probably have to give me some salt tablets. I seem to have cramps, Sir.

But anyway, I just wonder if the cotton reapers or pickers, or whatever — the machines that were here some time ago, are still in the island, and perhaps the Minister can let us know about that.

It is obvious that we will have to look towards other beneficial areas, and make an all out attempt to further diversify our agricultural production. I think, Sir, that leadership in this area is paramount. In leadership, Sir, you would obviously have to have decision-makers who have been successful in agriculture — successful agriculturists and not successful failures. That is what is important, Sir.

I would also like to know, Sir, what is the latest situation with the Pilot Mechanisation Scheme. I note, with amusement, temporary amusement, Sir, that it is around the area that the Minister represents, up there in Christ Church, Sir. I know that very well. I would like the Minister, Sir, to give us some details on that. I would also like him to tell us, Sir, while he is at it, when will it reach the other areas. After all, Sir, there are small farmers all over Barbados and I wish the Minister, Sir, in his customary erudite fashion, would let us know.

I believe that the Minister in that case then would have been the Leader of the House, but now that I know it is Senator Trotman, I would say that — (Asides) Sir, Senator Simmons is very suggestive, Sir — I know that Senator Trotman in his usual way will enlighten us on these proceedings.

Sir, we will move now to Page 44, the Springhall Land Lease, Subhead 9. It is interesting to note, Sir, that the Springhall Land Lease Scheme was conceived, I repeat, was conceived by the Democratic Labour Party. (Aside) (Laughter) I said conceived, Sir. (Laughter).

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, order. Let us get on.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I am not troubled.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You go ahead.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am hearing an aside, Sir, that they are putting me off, to say the least, Sir. I wonder why every time I am speaking in this Honourable Chamber, Sir, that they.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: You address the Chair.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am very sorry, Sir. I hope they would see, Sir, so that there would be some sort of.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: We must have order. I cannot follow the debate if I get these interruptions as often as I am getting them. It is necessary for me to follow what is being said. Somebody will say I said this or I said that and I would not know what it is.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, the funding was arranged through the Caribbean Development Bank and I say that it should have been off the ground years ago. But for reason best known to themselves, I would not say that it was stillborn, Sir. I would say it was delayed, and have been struggling, Sir — that is what I would say.

There has been some fanfare about the signing of the few leases for the prospective farmers, but one cannot really be sure about how soon this project will really get off the ground. Sir, I would like to call on the Minister to give us some indication as to the state of this project, bearing in mind that the Democratic Labour Party have conceived this project which would have had a tremendous impact on the island's diversification programme and food import bill. Now, I want him to tell us something about it.

Sir, because of this, it would allow agriculture then to form a fundamental basis for our sectoral interlinkages in the economy. Of course, in the hotel — (Aside) in the tourist industry, thank you — Senator Simmons knows like Senator Williams that once I start talking about sectoral interlinkages that it has to be the tourist industry. (Laughter) He knows it, Sir. I do not know why he is not the Minister, Sir. He knows it, a bright boy.

Sir, what I am trying to say, Sir, is that we must grow our food because the tourist like the local food. There is no point an American coming here to get a steak. Let us face it, Sir, it would be better if he had coucou and flying fish. What I am saying is that it would help our food import bill.

I would just like to mention, Sir, that I notice in the project that there is provision for dairy farming. I think that Government owes it to the workers of the Hope Dairy Farm, Sir, at an early stage, to let them know, Sir, what the position is.

Will the Government continue to operate the Hope Farm, or close it because of the establishment of the dairy farm in the Springhall Land Lease Scheme? I am not saying that we cannot operate two dairy farms, far from it, I am not saying that at all. But Sir, there were indications elsewhere, given previously, that the Hope Dairy Farm will be closed, Sir. So I would like the Minister, for the benefit of the people who work there, and, indeed, for our own elucidation, to tell us of the situation.

I noticed that the Minister, in his opening remarks made mention of the price of vegetables, he did, Sir. I wonder if the Minister was listening to those radio programmes — the Minister of Information — he is the boss at CBC — I believe he would have access to these tapes, he would know exactly the situation. I wonder if he is aware of the fact that small farmers were saying that there was a crying need for them to get rid of their products like the iceberg lettuce and cauliflower. They have been unable, at times, to get rid of them and they have to throw them away. Sir, it may be — I do not know, Sir, that they have not been advised properly in planning, but the farmer seems rather enlightened when he talks of manures. He seems to be very understanding when.....yes, Sir, the Minister must know that the farmers were complaining that they were unable to get their goods marketed.

That brings us Sir, to a very serious point — to the BMC. Farmers cannot get their goods marketed so let us find out something about the BMC. Sir, what was the purpose of the BMC when it was first introduced and implemented in 1968 by the Democratic Labour Party? The purpose, Sir, was that it would be a help-mate for the small farmer, it was part of the agricultural diversification programme. The Barbados Marketing Corporation was a marketing agency Sir, for the development of poultry, the pig industry, and vegetables and food enterprises. The plan was to grow more and to develop — that was the plan, Sir. Out of it saw the emergence of the Pine Hill Dairy, employing many Barbadians.

Sir, we heard earlier today, from no less a person than Senator David Seale, who said that the Government was unfair to the Pine Hill Dairy and as a consequence it could not pay the farmers for their milk. That was the impression I got and I am sorry that Senator Seale is not here because I would hate to misquote him, Sir. That is the impression I got, Sir, Senator Seale said that he was of the opinion that it was unfair to the Pine Hill

Dairy because they, in turn, could not pay. I suppose they would probably listen to what he had to say.

But there was the Food Producing Plant at Wildey, Sir, the thing about yam flakes, you know — instant yams. Is it not well known that yam is more nutritious than English potatoes? A lot of people don't know that, but it is true. So the instant yam production, when it could come out, was exported to Caribbean territories, at first it was, and... let me just finish up.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Hall are you proposing to wind up shortly?

SENATOR W. W. HALL: No, Sir, there are a few other Heads. I can wind up this Head, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no, you see we have certain problems concerning the staff with continuous working.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, are we suspending until tomorrow? Beautiful, I would just finish shortly, Sir. I must make this point now, to make it 24 hours after would not be relevant, even 12 hours — after 1976 the Barbados Marketing Corporation took a new turn. The yam processing plant was closed down. Yes, Sir, it was closed down. It is a pity really, and what is more, Sir, the collection system for the small farmers' produce was closed. That was no more, so that farmers had no way of getting their produce to the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Sir, with your approval I would just like to state, if it is convenient, that I would like to continue with the Barbados Marketing Corporation tomorrow. It will not be long, Sir.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right I propose to suspend the sitting at this time. This sitting will be suspended until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

On Resumption:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed, Senator Hall.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Good morning, Sir. Yesterday when the sitting was adjourned, I was nearly finished with wrapping the debate on the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The interference that I got, Sir, was such that I had to side-track. But this morning, Sir, fresh, I shall attempt to show or to correct any of the misapprehensions of yesterday. It has always been clear to me that what I would like to quote, Sir, is Chapter 255 the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act.

It is an Act to provide for the establishment of a marketing corporation charged with the duty of improving the growing and marketing of produce; and for matters incidental and connecting therein. It is too long to go into, so just having the title would be enough for me to say that no one in his right mind, who is familiar with the history of Barbados, could find fault with the objectives found outlined in that Act. Therefore, Sir, the facts which I was alluding to yesterday when I mentioned that the Barbados Marketing Corporation was meant to be a help-mate for the farmers, I had the Act very much in mind. It was meant to help them to market their agricultural produce.

But Sir, I got to the point where I said that yesterday after 1976 it took on a new role and I said that the collection systems throughout the country, where the small farmer could get their produce to the Barbados Marketing Corporation, were closed, Sir. I said also that the emphasis then shifted somewhat to a supermarket operation where you can get canned snails and that sort of thing, etc. It got to the stage, where at the airport, at the Duty Free Shop, rum had suddenly become agriculture. The selling of rum and competing with other business up there is something the Barbados Marketing Corporation has done and is still doing, Sir. The supermarket is incidental to the main purpose of the establishment of the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

In 1975/76 Sir, the Barbados Marketing Corporation had reached its zenith, in terms of accomplishing its objectives. But after 1976 there were full scale dismissals and it has subsequently become very clear that these dismissals had political motives.

It is amazing, Sir, that after no less a person than the honourable Prime Minister had said in Black Rock at a political meeting that the management of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, Sir, was of a very high standard and deserving of praise — I now question if that is true — Sir, why is it necessary for the new Chairman to completely reorganize the Barbados Marketing Corporation, and as far as I know, Sir, a lot of the hierarchy have been fired or they must have resigned.

I am tempted to ask, Sir, in these days where people go to jail for stealing \$2, indeed for a shirt, I am wondering if the Minister in, view of all the dismissals at the highest levels, has any knowledge of the \$40,000 that disappeared at the BMC during election time? It is a small question and I have just asked it because the Minister might know. I am sure if he knows he will let the Honourable Chamber know, Sir.

It is noteworthy, Sir, that five years after the development division had been effectively closed down, a

new attempt is made to put back the BMC on the right track, where it was in 1975–76. The Canadian Development Bank, Sir, completed a study and an agreement was reached that the marketing of agricultural produce would be enhanced by the establishment of a complex in St. Thomas. After six years of indecision on the part of the Government, we now hear that the project is being postponed. The decision to transfer the project to Lower Estate has thrown large acres of land out of production.

Sir, I believe that the Minister, when he gets up, could really give us the answers to all of these problems. It is also significant that the new Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, a systems analysis expert, and quite capable, in my opinion, is doing the reorganization that is needed. But I repeat, Sir, how come this is now necessary if all along the management was so good?

I asked in this Honourable Chamber already, Sir, about the dismissal of the people in the Abattoir and I did not get an answer. Perhaps, after a matter of three or four months, I might now be privileged to get that answer. The case of prosecution rest there, Sir, as far as the BMC is concerned.

Sir, we can move on to the Ministry of Housing and the Environment, page 88. I would just like to make a passing reference to the houses at West Terrace. It is not a matter of flogging a dead horse, because I do not recall it being debated in this Hon. Chamber. Indeed, I am not going to be at great length with this, I am only going to mention a few facts as I see them.

In West Terrace there are about 96 homes, and the price range is somewhat between \$103 000 and \$120 000. Inflationary trends have no doubt pushed these prices in such a way that today they are hardly in the range of any but the very affluent. That means that they are outside the range of the people they are intended for. For a civil servant to qualify today for one of those houses, he will have to be getting somewhere in the region of \$34 300.

A perusal of the personal emoluments in the Civil Service will show you that only Permanent Secretaries and above that level can really claim that they can qualify for these houses. That leaves out a mighty lot of people. Not even the Commissioner of Police can qualify for one of these houses. If that is disputable, if I am subject to correction, Sir, perhaps I will bow to it when it is proven otherwise.

You see, Sir, you must get three times the gross salary maximum to be entitled, and that is why I have come to the conclusion that only those people I have mentioned before can qualify for these houses. It

therefore means, and perhaps although it was not intended — and I say perhaps because I do not know — there is now a snob value attached to them.

My information is that the site preparation cost some \$1.56 million. Only the top soil is pushed away and what is left is something resembling a quarry. It is rather quarry like, Sir, so simple arithmetic says that the site preparation works out at \$16 000 per house. What is regrettable is that the top soil was carried away so that the owners now have to pay to bring back top soil for landscaping purposes.

I do not know if you are aware of the location, Sir, but there is a sort of a gradual decline as you go towards the sea, so that the original site would have allowed for houses with basements — you know that type of house, Sir — and the natural slope would have sort of enhanced the development and made it more valuable, because with the slope you can utilise it better. It would provide more space, and that is important with the type of families that we would have, a few children, some relatives and friends coming for a vacation and things like that. After all, the cost is \$103 000 to \$120 000, and if one buys a house in that region, then one expects that you would be comfortable.

A study has revealed that the houses with basements would have been sold for about the same price if better professional advice, and, indeed, better management was carried out in this operation. It is worthy of note that no middle income houses were constructed for sale last year. I think that is true, Sir, houses in the \$60 000 range. I know that I will hear about the St. Cecilia block, but that is expensive, and in my humble opinion outside the range of the working class people. To be honest, I have nothing against the swimming pool, but what I would like to ask is, can we afford it with so many people as we have today waiting for rental units? As I said before, this money could be better spent.

While I am at it, Sir, it is said that that top soil from West Terrace was taken to Sion Hill, at considerable cost, to one of the recreational fields, and I think that only tends to compound the situation.

I should also like to mention the Land Acquisition, Act, Cap. 228 and to say that yesterday I mentioned the fact that there were many pieces of land acquired by the Government and I personally do not see how we can develop them for recreational facilities in the foreseeable future. There seems to be a system of massive cut backs.

Now what I am saying today is that when you acquire land, there should be some machinery set up whereby people whose lands have been acquired would know, because judging from the newspaper reports that I saw, there seems to suggest that some people's land has been

ploughed up and they hardly had a hint of it. That might well be so.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, the Land Acquisition Act, I think it is Cap. 228, has very clearly laid out procedures in order for Government, in doing an acquisition, to be put in possession of the land. I believe the Senator's attention may usefully be directed to Sections 3, 4 and 5 of that Act, all of which are sections which quite clearly outline the steps which make it impossible, really, for the average owner of land not to know that Government has entered upon his land. Elaborate steps including publicity have to be gone through before any such acquisition can take place.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, the Minister jumped up, so I sat down. What I am saying is that the Minister of Housing and Lands, himself, went up to St. Barnabas where a lady's land had been bulldozed and he said in a newspaper report that he would have to speak to the people who were doing it, and I think it is probably against the same law that the Minister is talking about. I was not saying that there is no provision, but what I am saying is that people might be breaking the law.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, I rise a second time on a point of order. The fact is that what the Senator is speaking about is an incidence in which the land had been trespassed on. It is not a matter of Government acquiring the land. That land should have been acquired in the list for acquisition. For some reason or another it was not, therefore what happened then constituted a trespass, but I would not like the Senator to mislead the Senate into believing that the procedures for acquisition are such that people do not know when their lands are being acquired. In that case no acquisition was actually taking place.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I would like to thank the Minister for his elucidation. I was not seeking to mislead the House I can assure you, but I must say that having explained it, honourable Senators will understand exactly what he said.

What I want to mention now, Sir, is that the Minister said in the Other Place that there are \$10 million in claims outstanding from these acquisitions. I am imploring the Minister to inform us what machinery is set up so that the hardships — and there must be hardships if that amount of money is owing — and the problems derived from this situation will be alleviated and the interests of those people, who have been going for a relatively long time without compensation, would be looked into as soon as possible.

I believe that the Minister will give that assurance, because if he does not, it would then show a disregard for these people's plight and a clear lack of judgment. I am sure that he would give that assurance today.

Sir, we move on to Education, which is a very serious matter. We all know how important education is and today we will probably hear arguments from both sides. I make no apologies for saying that I will discuss education from the view of the proletariat. I, Sir, will be down here on *terra firma*. It will be, of course, the proletariat versus the intelligentsia. The returning officer will be stylistic from our learned gentleman.

I say, Sir, that you can spend all the money you like on education. We are spending some \$99 361 765 on education. That figure is only exceeded by I will tell you what it is exceeded by as soon as I go through the Estimates a little bit more. (A VOICE: Health.) It would not be Health, don't give me that. I have a note here, and it is clear that it is no big thing if we seek to mislead other people. Sir, that figure for education is exceeded by Charges of Debt to the tune of \$99 536 338. That is the highest, not health at all, so the Minister does not even know what is in the Estimates.

Sir, it is our view that you have to give our children a good education. Of course, we boast — with justification, no doubt — of our lovely literacy rate, which is one of the highest in the world. Industrialists coming to Barbados ask for, and sometimes insist that workers have three and four "O" Levels and, Sir, they get this with considerable ease.

Yes, Sir, you can spend all the money you like on education. We concur that our people must be educated. That is a fact. We have no quarrel with that but at the same time if you neglect other areas my contention is, is that that will fall down. For instance, Sir, if I live in squalid conditions, there is no point in chastising me for littering. That is the point, Sir.

Now, Sir, it was mentioned in the Other Place that education will have to be reassessed. That might well be true but, Sir, what I am saying on this side, or in fact what I am counselling is that while you reassess education you reassess the society as well. But when the reassessments are done, they will find that they will be faced with several harsh facts.

Sir, we look on somewhat unconcerned as our children are exploited by the film industry — Kung Fu, crime, illicit sex are just a few examples, Sir. What has caused me a lot of concern is the recent showing of two films. One called "Endless Love" — the whole of Barbados, the parish and the parish, went to see that, including children. (Asides) The Minister did not go, Sir. It is a pity he did not go, because at Cabinet level he might have been able to counsel his colleagues in the things that not only their children should not see, but indeed, all the children of Barbados.

The other one, Sir, was the one called "Blue Lagoon". This is not a review, Sir, not a review at all, but I think it might be necessary to just say what happened. There were using 15 year old stars, Sir, and the logistics of it were simply that this 15 year old boy was regularly climbing through the window of his girlfriend and when her parents found out and put a stop to it, that boy burned the house and went stark raving mad. That is what happened. Now you see this is the sort of thing, Sir, that our children are watching.

I am not really going to talk anything about a Censor Board because then somebody would just push in "Adults" in the advertisement and they showed it at the Drive-In. What scrutiny is there from the point of view of the ages of people at the Drive-In Cinemas? Let us be frank about, it, Sir, there is no great scrutiny.

Sir, this is how it was advertised in the *Sunday Sun* on March 28, 1982. The story is of two children shipwrecked on a deserted island and who grow up to find love with each other. And the ads were on TV too, Sir, and so you find our children become TV addicts, watching all manner of shows with no apparent guidance, watching the good, bad and the ugly. That is what is happening, Sir, and that is why I said you have to reassess the society. There is no doubt in my mind about that.

And yet we have to make excuses. That is the point, Sir. The adults have to make excuses and hush up our problems. Maybe they have been too busy, when before our very eyes our little children have grown into big men and women. Do you not see, Sir, that this is not the way we grew up? It is a different ball game, Sir. Hence, here in Barbados today there is a major increase in pregnancies in our secondary schools, not forgetting the teenage pregnancies outside schools. This is a fact, Sir.

To talk about dope, Sir, the serious peddling of dope among our young children is diabolical. It is, Sir. Bad habits have reached us in Barbados from overseas. I remember some 10 years ago when I was doing some work in the depressed areas of Laventille, where people are conditioned to failure and, Sir, where it is not uncommon for the young boys of the ages of 11 and 12, Sir, to be taking dope on a regular basis. And when you question the big people who have given these youngsters the dope, they will tell you very plainly, Sir, that they will give it to them now but they know that they are prospective buyers. They will be buyers in the future when they are working and can get money to get this drug. And if they are not working, Sir, it is so habit forming that they will commit a crime, and this is so serious, Sir, they will commit a crime to get the money to buy dope.

There is no point, Sir, us just paying lip service every day of our lives and making excuses and what is so regrettable, Sir, — indeed it is a sad commentary — is that the hands of the law seem to be tied. (*Asides*) He is a lawyer so he might have the benefit of that.

I would refer, to substantiate this point. (*Aside*) It hurts me to say that, Sir, so it is nothing that I am saying with a great sense of pride. At least I am ashamed, Sir, to see an article in the Sunday Sun of February 21, when it was stated that a senior, I repeat Sir, a senior police officer, said that marijuana trafficking becomes more profitable every day in Barbados and persons at every scale of the ladder were involved in the trade. Is that not ridiculous, Sir? What is even more distressing and appalling is the allegation that the police are inhibited by senior persons in our society — Sir, that was in the papers — and nobody has denied it. I had hoped that the next day somebody would have come out and deny that; somebody would have said it is not true.

But we know in the courts that some smart lawyers like Senator Linton (Laughter). — oh dear imagine me saying that, Sir, (Laughter) I must be getting soft, Sir. (Laughter) But you see I am getting carried away with this thing, it is a serious thing, this is no political issue. Senator Linton and I can hug up on this because his children and my children could be affected, because you heard what the man said, Sir? — He said that every strata of the society — well those are my words, I don't know if he would say that — but I think what he means is that everybody, the rich and the poor — class is no barrier — are involved. And he said that senior persons in our society are inhibiting the police.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR W. W. HALL at this stage were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. PRESIDENT.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You may proceed.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I will proceed by saying that I concur with what you said and to say that I do believe that a reassessment of education is necessary, but we should reassess the society too. But, Sir, what else do you expect from a society when only last week or so, a psychologist — not the church at all — the church has been very out-spoken on very important issues over the years, and rightfully so, but they have never complained to my knowledge that fact that Scripture is not in the curricula of schools. I feel that this compounds the problem.

After all the things I have said pertaining to reassessing the society, we find that today we do not learn Scripture like in the days when all of us in this room were at school and it was compulsory for us to learn

the Scriptures. One would know that by the time you were 11 years, you would know everything about Paul's three missionary journeys, you would know about Antioch, you would know everything including Paul's speech at Mars' Hill — you would know that like the Ten Commandments. And you found that because of this, we had a rather Christian upbringing and this was no doubt, continued throughout your entire school life, plus the fact that, even out of school, you had to go to Sunday School very often — most of us — and you would probably find that there was this every lingering Christian thought with you.

I find that today that people are not encouraged, and that is why the Prime Minister in his address said that the drop-outs from the educational system were failing the country in its economic needs, Sir. Yes, he said that. But all the things I have said today, Sir, I am sure will leave you, as it has left me, to conclude — that our nation may well be failing — the youth and the adults — we could well be doing it — and hence they have become the same very drop-outs that the Prime Minister mentioned. And therefore, you must ask yourself the question “which comes first, the chicken or the egg?” That is true, Sir. You have to ask yourself that question.

Sir, I would like you to address your mind, and the Minister to address his mind to Subhead 19. I do not have much to say on this, Sir. I just want to ask a few questions because on page 70, Sir, you will notice that in the Revised Estimates of 1981–82, there was a provision made for \$900 000 for uniforms and in the Estimates for 1982–83 the provision is \$550 000.

What I would like to ask the Minister is if this reduction, Sir, from \$900 000 to \$550 000, means that less children will be getting uniforms or if the same amount of children will be getting half the money? I wonder what will happen since I see there is a massive reduction — it is nearly cut in half, Sir, and I think that the Minister — I know, not think — will let us know what the situation is.

The other queries that I have, Sir, relate to page 63, Subhead 17, the School Meals Department. To be honest, Sir, there are a lot of decreases here but in the Statutory Personal Emoluments there is a reduction of \$20 008, Sir, and under Other Personal Emoluments there is a decrease of \$387 406, and since I notice that National Insurance Contributions would also increase by \$31 564, I would like to know if this means, Mr. Minister, that there will be retrenchments, and if the answer is in the affirmative how many, Sir? I think that is the question I would like to ask because there are a lot of decreases, Sir.

I would now like to go on. It is just another question, Sir, these are questions to the Minister which I would like him to answer and I am sure he will. On page 59 — I am dealing, Sir, with Pre-primary and Special Education — I notice that there are also a few decreases here, especially in the Other Personal Emoluments \$290 054 and there is a slight one in the Plant, Equipment and Furniture and further down \$40 000 for Plant and Equipment in the Secondary Education.

In the primary schools now, Sir, there seems to be no such teachers and it is a fact that some of the kids would then have to go over and share some teachers. In other words, some kids would move to another teacher's class, hence making the class a little bigger. I wonder how soon that would be alleviated?

I also would like to ask, Sir, if this reduction will be occasioned by regrading or the non filling of posts or what, Sir.

On the question of furniture, I know it is a vexed problem, I know that. I know that kids do not particularly like to go to school, with no furniture, but I also know that there might be wanton destruction of school property — I am aware of that, Sir — but sometimes when you mention furniture in schools, like it was mentioned in the Other Place a few weeks ago and the speaker was more or less castigated for it — I think they were more or less talking about furniture at St. Leonard's School — and I notice that the Principal of the Erdiston College, Sir, said in a graduation address that he felt it was a little unfair — this is my conception, Sir, — for the graduate teachers to go out to schools that had no furniture for the children to sit on.

I know that some schools are located in areas where vandalism plays a great part. As a matter of fact, some people claim that at the same St. Leonard's, that residents — that is the claim, Sir, I do not know — play a big part in it. Some have claimed, for instance, that at Princess Margaret, children from other schools have sort of played havoc with their furniture. This is the contention that has reached perhaps, if certainly not people in the Ministry, it has reached people who have been interested enough to enquire.

One other question, Sir. On page 61, Sir, there is a decrease of \$614 978 under Grants to Public Institutions and it seems a bit of money to me, Sir. I would like the Minister to probably just say something about that.

I cannot even find the page for this one, but even in Subhead 15 over the page, Sir, we see that for Supplies and Materials and, indeed, Plant, Equipment and Furniture, there is also a decrease at the Industrial Schools and Subhead 11, the Higher Education Award,

there is a decrease of some \$767 747 in grants to individuals.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Page 60.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Page 60, Sir? This fine print, Sir. (Aside) What Senator Seale alluded to yesterday, Sir, lighting, Sir, is quite manifested here. But I shall only say that with this situation, Sir, it would seem to me that we would probably get a few supplementaries later.

On page 58 under Local Training Overseas, I was of the opinion, Sir, that Local Training Overseas was, should I say, postponed until 1984 and if that is so, I notice that still every morning on Opportunity Knocks, there are still a lot of jobs and training, things advertised. I just wonder if that is an oversight or what. Maybe the Minister could probably correct me on that.

Sir, I know the burning issue of the day is the question of zoning. I am not going to get into any semantics, I would merely say that our position is quite clear.

We say that we are interested in equal facilities for the schools in Barbados, but we are cognisant that that will take time — at least I am. But it is a fact, Sir, that there is a difference between the older secondary schools and the newer secondary schools. It is also a fact that there is a difference in the quality of staff and, indeed, it is also a fact that teachers gravitate to the older secondary schools.

We feel that if the schools are upgraded in certain areas that zoning will come about with minimum inputs from the Government, Sir. But there will be a lot of debate on this.

People have always been confused, sometimes by their own lack of application to the task of getting their children into schools, even filling in the form, even the old form, Sir, some people will go into the Ministry, I know, and do not even know what school their children are going to. I know there are problems, Sir, and therefore, this issue is very debatable. All I sought to do was to put the position of the Democratic Labour Party on zoning.

No doubt, the Honourable Minister will expound on the Barbados Labour Party's views on zoning and perhaps, he might not have to, because a booklet has been recently circulated and no doubt he would feel that people know all about it. I only sought, Sir, to say a few words about it and *punto finito*, finish with that.

Sir, the problem however — I had better not finish with zoning yet because one of the arguments of zoning

is that absenteeism might not become a big problem. I admit that I have seen kids in uniform walking about aimlessly, indeed liming on the street corners, indeed playing pool in uniform. That is a fact, Sir. And so, it has been argued that zoning might help with this problem of absenteeism.

I can understand the concept that one might likely come to school a little more regularly if he lives near. But those of us who are in business and notice the work attitude of the work force will know that it is not necessarily so. People think that because a man lives next door to his workplace that he would come early. On the contrary, those people who tend to live further away might very well come to work earlier and that is a fact.

And, I said that, Sir, to say this — probably the problems I highlighted earlier could well be the cause of the delinquent behaviour that we see exhibited by some school children, as far as absenteeism is concerned. And maybe, Sir, we must look at the idea that a child whose parents hardly go to work might well turn out to be a child who will hardly go to school.

If you look at the absenteeism trends, the patterns, Sir, you would find that sometimes in the workplace, people will never come to work before a bank holiday, and so the children might feel that that is a bank holiday, Sir, also designated by their parents. And so you see, Sir, while I am calling, again, for the proposed reassessment in education, I am saying, Sir, we must recognise that we also need a reassessment of the society.

I think, Sir, we could now turn to Tourism. A nation's wealth, Sir, is created by its people and tourism is our second money spinner. I think that people will say first now, but it does not matter, it is up there, Sir, and therefore, what I would like to know, Sir, is can our people create that wealth? Can they smile again and be courteous? Can our people understand, Sir, the importance of tourism to this country? These are facts, Sir, that have to be aired, they have to be debated and they must be clearly understood by everyone in our society.

People are saying that Barbadians do not have much to smile about, they are also saying that no longer are we friendly with our neighbours. I do not know, Sir, if you have seen that trend, but somehow, we seem not to be as friendly, even with our own, far less going out of our way, it seems to some of us, to be courteous to strangers on our shores and people who bring that very much needed foreign currency. So, Sir, we always seem to be looking for ways to woo the tourists.

Jamaica seems now to be a great competitor of ours in this field. It is no secret that Jamaica, having slumped badly in her tourist trade, and having gone to rock bottom in previous years, have made a concerted attempt,

have decided that they will stop at nothing to regain their tourist trade. The advertisements are now saying "Come back to Jamaica, it is now as it used to be." I must admit, Sir, that Jamaica used to be a wonderful place, and so if I were a tourist, having known Jamaica on previous visits, and they told me that it was back to its former glories, then I too would go and see for myself if what the advertisements say is true.

When you advertise a place, as we advertise Barbados, the advertisement will only bring the tourist once, it will only get him here. What happens here from the time he gets to the airport to the time he gets back there is important in terms of whether he will come back, so to repeat, the trade is paramount.

I think that concept is well known, but I believe we must spread it to the rank and file of our people. We must understand that when people are tourists and they meet us in the countryside we should again smile, we should again wave, if necessary. Maybe the schools should play their part, maybe the parents can play a part, if we are all seriously worried about tourism. If not, the customary bad manners, and some crime that is meted out to tourists when they come here, would run them away. I am not proud of it, none of us would be proud.

What I am saying is that if we tend to reduce that type of attitude, if we tend to give tourism a chance, if we could, some way through our public relations, spread it to all and sundry that that is what is required in this country, I think that we will go a long way towards getting it back together again, to use a pun. So it would seem that there is a thorough lack of understanding, and perhaps some of the measures that I mentioned would help.

Another thing too, Sir. When tourists come here, if they perchance feel that there is any deterioration in our quality of life, it tends to have a tail spin — you would hear them say then that it is not as it used to be. My plea therefore is to try and let us keep it the way it used to be, so that people coming here will forever say that they will come back another time.

Even things like bad roads, if you get that sort of thing, bad transportation. The tourists nowadays, as I mentioned some time previously, catch the bus too, Sir, and if we have an inadequate system, that too might cause some irritation to tourists and they might not come to us and travel as they used to. These are merely measures that I feel we must look into.

Again, Sir, you will find that the hotel operators will tell you that they have a business to run and they will say that they have taxes to pay, staff to pay, Transport Levy and a resultant cost of living. They would

mention that they cannot do any better than the prices they charge. That is a hotel owner's viewpoint, but, Sir, in Jamaica they are cutting their rates this winter, and no less a person than the President of the Barbados Hotel Association this week said that they, too, will have to look towards freezing the winter rates. So you see, Sir, the tourists are not going to break any barriers or break down any doors to come to beautiful Barbados if they find that by doing so they might be disadvantaged. They will go to places where they think they would get better value for money.

Therefore, Sir, since as a Barbadian I have always felt that there is no place in the world that is better than this little rock, there is no place in the world where there is better value for money — and I say so because I know the friendliness of our people, I know what we are capable of — I am only saying that we must sustain it. If we do, and everyone understands what the situation is, I think that things will go on. What we need is some charismatic leadership. (SENATOR H. R. LINTON: We have got it). A dynamo, an innovative driving force. Do you have that too? That is what we need.

I know I do not have to ask who that remark came from — that we have got it, because you were here, as I was, when Senator Linton castigated one of the Government Senators in a debate here. The attack was vicious, but all he did say, as far as I remember, was that someone had taken him to lunch at a good hotel, and that was the measure of his driving force. But I know that Senator Linton will come better than that, so I have no doubt that he will let us know exactly how things are going.

I believe that this issue is not one of party politics. I have said so before, I think, but let me reiterate that it is not particularly one of party politics at all, and what I feel should be done is that all Barbadians should join hand in hand, because if we cannot do anything about the sugar industry, another area from which we derive most of our money, because most of the circumstances might be out of our hands, I am saying that the average man can do something about tourism, and if that is so, I think that we should really try to do something about it.

I would like to turn just briefly to Health. I do not want to make a speech, but what I want to do is to ask the Minister a question. This starts on page 74 and goes right through.

You know, Sir, that the most talked about thing nowadays in health is the closure of the polyclinics. They are what are commonly known as walk-in clinics, where patients, for example, like diabetics were able to go and get treatment. My understanding is that they must now

go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or to a private doctor.

I think the Minister will admit that if there is any place in a hospital that would tend to be congested at the best of times, it would be the Casualty — and I almost forgot that you worked there. As a matter of fact, you were one of the driving forces at the hospital. I remember seeing some photographs of the proposed site of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in 1954–55 and the then Dr. Arnott Cato figured prominently and rightly so. So you would understand that there is a bit of congestion in a Casualty.

I just wonder if the Casualty, now that it will have more people going there through the closure of these polyclinics, can stand the strain, what are the arrangements to accommodate this increasing traffic? I did mention that these people would have to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or to a private doctor, and it would seem to me that if they go to a private doctor, they would have to pay the doctor for the time being, and this might become rather burdensome. I am wondering if the Minister can give me some indication as to what will happen in this area.

I think it is the Prime Minister's Office, Subhead 3 under which we see that there is \$5 million for Ilaro Court, on page 9.

I know that some tourists to this island are invited to Ilaro Court to cocktail parties and things like that. I see nothing wrong with that because I believe if you are going to encourage people to come here, and if the Government of Barbados invites them to a cocktail party at the Prime Minister's residence, then personally I see nothing wrong with that. Senator Seale said yesterday that Culloden Farm, I do not remember the word he used, but it was, not as mild as downgraded — oh yes, the word he used was "desecrated."

The question I would like to ask the Minister is when is the Prime Minister going to move into Ilaro Court? If you are coming for \$½ million for this building, and we are inviting people to it, we should know when it is going to be the official residence. Perhaps, while he is at it, Sir, he could give us the total amount that this building is costing us in Barbados.

Under Head 17 — Defence and Security — I have not got a lot to ask on this. I notice that there is a sum of \$245,000 for professional services, and to my way of thinking, this is double what it was last year, and for a thing like a Defence Force, I do not know what methods we are going to have to make sure that it is kept at the minimum, or whether it will go on rising *ad infinitum*.

One point I would like to raise here is that I notice that half a mile from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Defence Force has got its own hospital which cost \$1 million. We are into rough times and maybe the Minister could put me right on that. I just wonder, why is it all that desirable to have a hospital just half a mile away?

Let us face it, the police go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and I am not aware of the fact that the personnel of the Defence Force are anything but strong, healthy people. I did not see anything in this Chamber about it, and I do not think there was any hint about it, but just out of a clear blue sky, I saw this, and that is what has tempted me to ask this question of the Minister.

I notice also that the Capital Expenditure and Current Expenditure are about \$30 million each, and I am wondering if these figures are right. Perhaps, the Minister could let us know whether, in fact, that is true, because I do recall that a few months ago when it was said that the cost was way up in \$50 million, there were suggestions that this might have not been so. I am just wondering whether or not this is the situation.

The Electoral Office, Sir, I think that Senator Greaves talked about that yesterday, and I think that those of us who ran in the last elections will all have all different ideas. There will be no spilt milk, Sir. I am not a bad loser, I am not, Sir. I would say that I fought a clean campaign and I had no intentions then, or now, to sort of assassinate anybody's character.

But, Sir, there were some things that happened on Election Day that really bothered me and this is why I would renew the call for the monthly list made by Senator Greaves yesterday. It does not matter what people may tell you. I think that if you fought the elections and you were in the constituency on that day you knew what happened on that day. That is a fact. That you will find people willing to vote and going to eight or nine stations and could not find their names, that is a reality, Sir, and the fact that that happened does show that something was wrong. Whose fault it was is now left to be determined.

It is true that after the elections one might seek redress in the courts and things like that. Courts in the Commonwealth, I think, have not particularly got many of these cases and one feels that if you happen to lose, well, that is the end of it.

But one cannot help but to refer to many instances that happened on Election Day. I will not really go into it in detail as my colleague did, but I would say there were very serious things happening where you would find that people who were not in Barbados for many years were on the list and then the people who were living here, their own families living here, were not on. You

found that you would canvass people and they were not on the list and you made sure that they had their I.D. cards and that they are on the list and then suddenly on that last day, too, their names were not on.

These are things that have happened, if not with monotonous regularity, it happened all over Barbados, although no one has come out, yet, to say so. It is true that even from the Government side on Election Day there were suggestions, Sir, that some of the candidates had said that they were not too pleased with the way things had gone.

What I would say though is that something should be done about candidates who, I think it is taking the law in their hands when they tend to go out of their way to talk to people in the line beyond the point of no return, and indeed I would not even say some Returning Officers, I am not really into that, I mean the fact that it was rather easy to tell people the wrong thing and they did it just like that. Even your opponent's people, you would probably find that people would be giving wrong instructions, and it did happen.

What I am saying Sir, is that when those sort of things happen, you could lose when you should have won, and I feel we must pay some attention to this. I do not believe that anyone has cast aspersions on the character of the Chief Electoral Officer, far from it, Sir, but I do believe that on that day there were a lot of things that looked rather funny to me.

As I said, Sir, I am not going to come straight out and tell anybody that I did anything else but fight a very clean election. I know that my opponent apparently thought so. He said that he owes it to a specific gap or type of people in a certain area and on a matter of health — I spoke on Health already, Sir, so I cannot say it, — I feel that I would now publicly say it that as far as I am concerned, I think that a lot is left to be desired.

I believe that candidates will have to stay within the law, and their agents too, and that Electoral Officers, they too will have to despatch their duties in such a way that everyone would know that they are fair and square. I think that if this is done, Sir, we have four years, perhaps somebody might tell me something else, but I think we have enough time to put it right and the introduction of the monthly list will give candidates the time necessary to do their homework and I believe if that is done, that most of the things that happened in the last election will not happen again.

Now, under Community Services, Head 43, Page 102, I think that we have got to understand that the people who make the decisions when it comes to things like National Assistance, how it is distributed, Sir, and

when you realise that in most cases it would seem to me that, even in here, on these Boards, it seems to have people making these decisions who ran in the last elections — there are at least two or three in here, Sir.

It may be coincidental — but I believe that when you look in to the St. Michael area or you look into an area where you will find that most of the distribution of the National Assistance money is made, in the depressed areas — as it were, welfare — you will find and it is strange to me that some of the candidates of the last election, and indeed would be candidates of the next, are the people who are making those decisions, but of the Barbados Labour Party, Sir.

I hope that there is no plan, Sir, because if there was, then it would be good to say that we would be privy to it, that you would recapture St. Michael by way of largesse. It is the taxpayers' money, Sir, and I feel we have to be very careful about this. We on this side, Sir, notice these things and it just might be coincidental, and there is no accusation, but strikes me as funny. I just thought I would mention it so that the record would show that we have alluded to that. Under Prisons — don't confuse me man — page 52 Sir. I was going to hurry through it but I just thought that rather than mislead you I was trying to take my time and go through it as quickly as I can. Sir, sometime ago I spoke at length in this Honourable Chamber on some of the conditions in the prisons and I must say that over the years there have been some improvements in the quality of life up on the hill. Sir, I was born 50 yards outside of those walls — not inside, Station Hill — and as a boy it was customary for anyone in such close proximity to Glendairy Prison to go into there, during the war to get food, not to beg for prison food, but to get coupons to buy food. Sir, one could not help at that tender age but notice some of the things that seemed rather wrong to me. The food, for instance, but I must say that during the war the food for everyone might not have been exactly what we would want because there was scarcity.

But I am talking about the improvements. I have noticed prisoners are now allowed to have underwear. That is a fact, it did not before, Sir. It must have been very painful, Sir, those blue dungaree shirts and the chafing that went on, that must have been terrible. Sir, I am pleased to see that because I give credit where credit is due. Lux soap in the prisons. The old blue soap seem to have gone and, Sir, the old flour bags as towels have not completely disappeared but they are steadily disappearing.

But I feel that when people are sentenced and they appeal, that in the past there have been cases where, because of the slow movement of the courts, a man who

is sentenced and appeals, may see the two years that he is sentenced for elapse before he hears his case. Now when a man is in that situation, when he is sentenced and appeals, he cannot work and he is just sitting down there under strain. It tends to make your hair white, Sir. I understand that there have been some measures to speed up this thing, but I am hoping that the Minister would be able to say that this problem is not as serious as it used to be, because I know for instance, Sir, that for one crime Mark Young got about seven years, Baptiste, who was a Barbadian sprinter of great renown and John Payne, the son of a policeman, got seven and five years, respectively, and a young chap named Derick — I do not remember his surname — got three years for his part in the crime, and he appealed. And while the others who got five years are out, he still is in jail. Even if it is speeded up now, there is a case right now in jail that having to wait for.....(Asides)

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Sir, I think that Senator Hall could do with a measure of information here, so he is indeed saying the correct thing, or is he saying what he wants to say? I understand him to say.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I want to save you any problem in making a Second Reading speech if you have any intention of doing so.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I think he is certainly misleading the Chamber, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you going to make a speech?

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: No, Sir, I just want to correct the impression he is giving that persons whose appeal is pending

Mr. PRESIDENT: Is that something you can do later on?

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: It won't have the same effect but I am guided.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I gave a warning yesterday that if these interruptions and explanations are persistent they may prejudice members chances of making Second Reading speeches. I think you are on safer ground not to do it. Yes, Senator Hall.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, they are always so eager to attack me that they don't even recognise that they can do it when they make their own speeches.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let's get on with it.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: It is funny that I mentioned Mark Young, Sir, a boy who was headboy at Princess Margaret, and when you are headboy in

secondary school you would have been picked, not only by the boys, but by the headmaster and the leading prefects. I am saying that if one transgresses and goes to jail, the rehabilitation process must be such that one who is bright or intelligent can be made to spend a beneficial time. Because if that is not done you will probably find that you would release on the public something that they might not really want.

I wanted to get on, Sir, to ask the Minister if there are any correspondence courses up there. I know it used to happen, I am not sure if it still does — I think that people used to be able to take the GCE while they were up there. (Aside) CXC, I do not know. I said, they used to take the GCE. Whether they take the CXC or not, I do not know, Sir. (Aside) But, I am saying that if it were published, if there were some way of knowing, then I would not have to ask that question in here. So, Sir, I am just asking, I can look at my notes whenever I feel like looking at it. So that, I feel that one of the things you have to do is to try and improve them mentally.

You must be aware of the fact, Sir, that there are some people — I know of a case in Strangeways in Manchester where people become habitual criminals and when they come out, they are so lost that they would try to commit something very quickly to get back inside. There used to be a fellow in Barbados called "Rubberman" that used to go up there as quickly as possible just to perform at the Christmas Party.

And, Sir, what I was trying to get on to before I was interrupted is that we should try to have some correspondence courses, and if there are, do have them, well let the Honourable Minister say so and that is okay with me. I am just asking if there are any correspondence courses, or if there are not, what about the idea of giving them lessons so that they can take the GCE and indeed, the CXC. If that is done, I would be pretty happy with that.

Sir, to recap, what I would like to say is that — I am sorry that on Prisons, I missed the page and things like that — in my submissions on Tourism, Education, on Prisons and indeed on Agriculture, what I have tried to do, Sir, is to get some indication from the Minister as to what direction the Government is taking in these areas. They are rather important areas, Sir, and I do hope that when he replies that he will be in a position to let us know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have been rather leaning on the side of the left and I think it is time I gave a chance to somebody on the right. Senator Williams.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. President. I know that you have been hearing the words,

"I shall not be too long" both yesterday and today, and indeed I have no intention of being too long.

Now, yesterday, we were treated to a long exposition from Senator Greaves, almost five hours to be exact. I sat down and I went through almost everything he had to say trying to look for areas to which I could reply. I suppose some members on my side might even find it amazing that I could at least find four points to which I could reply to Senator Greaves, and to be quite honest, that was four points out of five hours.

The first point that he made, to my mind, which was a misrepresentation, was that the debt servicing was in the range of \$99 million. I think that Senator Greaves knows better. He knows that, in truth and in fact, this is not the case. If he does his homework he would find out that it comes closer to between \$65 million and \$70 million.

And a further investigation will show that there are certain components like the repaying of \$10 million to the Central Bank, the repaying of approximately \$10 million by the electric company and about \$9 million for the Cement Plant. The point I want to make about that portion with regards to Light and Power the electric company is that although we are asked to pay back that amount of money, both in interest and in repayment, you will find that the savings which will accrue in the area of fuel expenses will go a long way in balancing out that increased debt to Government. Well, in a sense. We have to look for foreign exchange for that portion.

And another point I could make in this area, is that you have to look at that portion of your debt, which requires a foreign exchange component, from that portion of the debt which can be paid out of local revenue. Senator Greaves refused to look at it in those terms but he just came and told us that, in his estimation, it is between \$99 million and \$100 million. He went on further to suggest, even, that there is no improvement in the standard of living in this country and that, to his mind, the Estimates reflect that.

In 1975, the per capita income in Barbados stood at some \$2 824 and in 1981 some \$5 674. Now, I am sure, Mr. President, that the first person to point out to me that to use per capita income as an indicator of development and welfare would be Senator McClean.

I know that Senator McClean would be the first to point out to me that you cannot in isolation determine that that is an indication of an improvement in the welfare of people in a country. That is a fact. It says nothing whether a country produces arms or not. It says nothing about the distribution of income. It says nothing about the amount of money that is spent

in the area of welfare, old age pensioners. But the point is this — we have not been producing arms.

Furthermore, you would find that the savings of people between 1975 and 1981 have almost doubled. The savings in 1975 were some \$205 million. In 1981, some \$449 million. And I am suggesting, Mr. President, that there is a correlation when we talk about an increase in the standard of living, there is a linkage between these two things, but yet we will hear from Senator Greaves that nothing has been done — people are worse off, when, in truth and in fact, he knows to the contrary.

Another thing apparently that he found difficult to accept was that unemployment was at the figure of 10.1 per cent. I think he probably finds it difficult to understand how things could be as they are in Barbados and yet Government is able to keep unemployment at that particular level, when we have high levels of unemployment in other countries which are better off than Barbados, which have more natural resources than Barbados. But because of our skillful management we have been able to keep unemployment to the figure of 10.1 per cent.

It is a strange thing. He is not prepared to accept the figures of the Statistical Department. He questions them, yet the individual sits on the Immigration Advisory Committee who uses figures from the same department.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. President. Senator Williams has indicated that I sit on the Immigration Advisory Committee. I do not sit on the Immigration Advisory Committee.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, the union sits on that Committee, and I am saying that they use the same figures put out by the Statistical Department for manpower planning and manpower studies, and they are not questioned. That is the point I am making. They are not questioned when they are used for something else, but yet we are going to hear that as far as using them for unemployment, he is not prepared to accept those figures. They are prepared to accept them for something else, the figures from the same Statistical Department.

Mr. President, he went on to put up a good plea, and I would have to go along with this one, for Government to send someone to the ILO Conference this year. We in Barbados have ratified ILO Conventions, we are part of them and we have a responsibility to that particular organisation, and I would want to go along with Senator Greaves. Out of five hours, at least he said something I agreed with.

I would want to go along with him that Government should give full consideration to sending someone

to that particular Conference. I think he also indicated that it is Barbados' turn now to sit on the Council, and I do not think that we should give up that opportunity.

I think he also made the point that either employers or individual persons cannot go and pay their way, and it must be a Government effort. His point is taken.

One other thing that both he and Senator Wickham alluded to was that we have to look more closely at the area of occupational health and certain standards which ought to be set. I think Senator Wickham spoke of an instance where a particular product was being sold here, although the counterparts of the people overseas knew very well that it presented certain threats to people's health.

I, Mr. President, work for an organisation which, from time to time, has to look at certain substances that you use, and as soon as new information comes out about whether those particular substances create health problems, then a particular directive is given not to use them. As a matter of fact, they go on to a list as items which should not be purchased. I think Senator Wickham was speaking of an approach like that, and I do take his point.

Senator Greaves also made the point, and I am not quite sure if he did go on to talk about factories legislation, but in a sense you will find that it is all interwoven. Factory legislation is still being drafted, and I hope that in the not too distant future we will see that legislation before this Honourable Chamber. That is something that the union has been asking for, for a long time, and I am talking about legislation which incorporates what we have been talking about in terms of occupational health.

He made some point, both he and Senator Hall, about grievances arising out of the General Elections. I do not know, I thought that by now Senator Greaves would have understood that Mr. Roy Brathwaite is the M.P. for St. Lucy. Up until now, Sir, Senator Greaves has failed to accept the defeat, and every available opportunity he gets, he talks about grievances. Once again he took the opportunity yesterday to allude to grievances.

Senator Hall was a little more palatable in his approach. He said that he accepted defeat gracefully, something apparently which Senator Greaves has not done yet, to my mind, but it is interesting and I have construed it that neither one of them — this may not be the case — probably took time to read the report from the Chief Electoral Officer about those same alleged grievances.

You would find that as much as they talk about these numbers of people — I am subject to correction — but I think only about 11 people sent in any information

at all to that effect, to the Electoral Office, after an investigation was carried out. It is in here, Sir, I am sure that this is a document of the House already, but yet Senator Greaves is going to get up and try to give the impression that numerous grievances first of all occurred, which is something that was not substantiated in the report, and I am sure he would not want to refute the report.

He is an advocate of refuting statistics and reports, I think he even alluded to the fact that the World Bank gets reports, and the way he put it, the kind of information that we are given would result in the sort of glorified pictures that are printed. That is Senator Greaves' inimical style, Sir.

He went on to speak about the Defence Force, and I think it is necessary to pause at this point, because there are two issues.

Apparently Senator Greaves does not speak to the Shadow Minister of Defence and Security on his side, because what the Shadow Minister of Defence, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, said surely conflicted with what Senator Greaves was alluding to yesterday.

Part of the contribution by the honourable Member for St. Michael South was that certain threats were made to Barbados, to his Government when it was in power, and they voted to set up a Defence Force. In other words, he was saying that they saw the necessity for it. He went further than that — he said it should not be a political issue. He said he, personally, was for it and the Democratic Labour Party had to be for it too. In other words, what he was saying, and these are my words with all due respect to the individual, is that there is a necessity within the society for us to have a Defence Force.

Senator Hall talked about the Japanese coming down here and plundering our waters. I think those were his words. I find it a little difficult to understand the kind of mechanism that we would have to detect these things or to protect these same waters.

Sir, there is a little ambivalence and I find it a little difficult to understand because Senator Greaves made the point that the Defence Force was disbanded in Dominica. I do not want to draw the bottom line; I do not want to draw any conclusions to that. I would not want to believe that he is suggesting that you should disband ours. I would not even suggest that this is what he was thinking; but just in case that was the case, what would he have been saying? Sir, he would be saying you should disband the 800 people. Then it would be like the question Senator Wickham asked when he said,

"After sugar, what?" Sir, after these 800 people are put out of work, what?

Mind you, in all of Senator Greaves' contributions, his exposition I may say, there was not one word of suggestion as to how all these alleged problems could be solved, not even a suggestion as to how we should deal with these 800 people that we were putting out of work as a consequence of disbanding our Defence Force and Coast Guard. Sir, I do not even know how we would protect our waters.

We have been talking about the possibility of the Coast Guard doing surveillance of our waters to make sure that ships do not come to this country and discharge oil, which could reach our shores and ultimately affect tourism and the environment. Now Senator Greaves did not have much to say about the environment, but how do we police the waters without the same Coast Guard that I alluded to?

Sir, furthermore, the Coast Guard has the function to perform sea-rescue of our fishing boats when they are in distress. If we disband it, what do you replace it with that would be parallel to a Coast Guard which will perform such a function? I do not know. I think one has got to give a lot of consideration to what the Shadow Minister of Defence and Security suggested when he said it should no longer be a political issue.

I think the time has come when people in the Other Place and honourable Senators in here should accept, and be able to get up and agree with Government, that in a day like today, with the kind of things that are happening on the international scene, the mere fact that no man is an island, no individual operates in isolation — we are part of a chain, we are part of the world itself and whatever happens over there sooner or later will affect us.

We must accept that a Defence Force is absolutely necessary for Barbados, and I think the Opposition Senators recognise this, but their idea is to criticise it because this Government had the courage of its convictions to establish it. They saw the need and did not do it. It is like many other things they saw the need for during their tenure, but did not have the conviction to carry them out. We carried them out.

Sir, the next point that he made was to do with the IDC, and to my mind what he suggested would be a gross indictment on the part of IDC in itself, because he suggested that IDC while encouraging investors to come to Barbados, tell them that they do not have to worry about unions down here. I do not know if he is suggesting that these investors would have to ignore them. If investors ignored the trade union in the past,

I am sure that is not as a consequence of any information or any suggestion coming from IDC, that when you get down here you do not have to worry about trade unions.

In this Honourable Chamber, two sittings ago, Mr. President, I made a plea for legislation to deal with the recognition and acceptance of trade unions. Apparently the Press did not see it necessary to carry it, but however the record will reflect it, and what Senator Greaves said yesterday, is nothing I did not say. I believe that investors should know before hand that when they come to Barbados there are certain laws to which they have to conform, and I think that one of the things that we do need is legislation dealing with the recognition of trade unions.

We have just moved in the direction of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and as I said before, that is one of the reasons why now, moreso than ever, we need such legislation.

I even want to go a little further with the legislation, Sir. For a long time now you have the Minister of Labour being involved in a number of disputes, and regardless of how dispassionate and impartial the individual might be in his findings, you will find that there are certain people, because he is a Minister of the Government, who are not prepared to accept what he says.

I believe when we are looking at this legislation that I suggest for the recognition of trade unions, that we should also think in terms of establishing an Independent Disputes Board. I do not have any grandiose names for it like a tribunal or anything so, Sir.

We have people in this society, and I saw during the last dispute with the sugar industry, that Sir Hugh Springer, along with comrade Burns Bonadie could cause a meeting of the minds in that issue.

But there are other people — take out Burns Bonadie because he is still associated with the movement — there are other people out there in the society who can sit on Boards so that a lot of acrimony which now goes into certain disputes, where people are not prepared to accept the decision of a Minister of Labour, and unfortunately so, would be taken out of it. There are a lot of other people who have passed through unions, who have been in other forms of activity in Barbados who can sit on that Board.

I know, Sir, that the Labour movement, in itself, is not adverse to the idea of trade union recognition and its associated legislation, with that *per se*. But I know that whenever you talk about legislation which might help rationalise our industrial disputes they are always more in

favour not to go along with it. But I think that, taking the situation in Barbados as it is now, we should seriously look at it. It could very well be worth our while.

We still have the situation in this country where one or two misguided individuals have people out of work. That is indeed an unfortunate thing. We even have people in this country who fail to recognise a trade union as the rightful bargaining agent for workers. All of these are problems.

For those people, and when I speak of those people I mean not only those recalcitrant employers but those misguided individuals who mislead workers, there should always be something for them to read and understand, which would guide them as to what direction a Government, a union, or any employer, should take to deal with any such disputes. I have no doubt, Sir and I have implicit faith in the Minister and I know that any outstanding issues will be dealt with objectively.

Sir, Senator Wickham, as always, Sir, makes a very good contribution whenever he gets up to speak, and I associate myself with all his remarks and he too made the point about industrial health. He also made the point about, "After sugar, what?" Sir, I wish to deal with that a little later.

Senator Seale made a point talking about the School Meals and Sir, the most I can say on that is that I take his point with regards to the School Meals.

Sir, Senator Hall asked a very interesting question. I got the impression, though, that he somehow, as the Shadow Minister or the so-called Shadow Minister, in here, that is, because I know there is a Shadow Minister in the Other Place, Sir, or I should say he is shadowing that particular Ministry, the Ministry of Agriculture.

Sir, he asked the question, what has the ADC done? What has it done? Sir, I was somewhat amazed that such a question would come from Senator Hall. He wanted to know what contribution it has made to agriculture and, Sir, under Head 74, Page 43, on which you will find the ADC, I will now attempt, if nothing more, to enlighten Senator Hall as to what it has done.

Sir, from time to time, whenever it is expedient for the Opposition, they will get up and try to castigate the Agricultural Development Corporation and, Sir, may I add, without justification. It is a fact, Sir, that their financial record over the years have not been good, that is a fact, but there are a number of reasons why this has been so.

Sir, you will find that because of the estates themselves, the kinds of estates, the fact that some are marginal estates, their financial records are not what they

ought to be. You will find also that there has been a misallocation of land resource through unsuccessful agricultural diversification programmes.

Further than that, you will find, Sir, that the amount of money taken to put some of those agricultural lands back into sugar production has been very, very costly and these, I may add, were agricultural lands which the former Administration saw it fit to take out of sugar production. Bath Plantation is a typical example, Sir. We have seen it fit, Sir, to correct a lot of those mistakes.

There have also been a number of difficulties experienced in recruiting and retaining, may I add, Sir, good qualified people. That in itself has been a problem. But, during the previous Administration a lot of ill-conceived projects were implemented, against suggestions to the contrary.

Sir, I said previously that the ADC operates marginal and submarginal plantations. But if this was not the case and the plantations that the ADC now operate albeit at a loss, were taken out of sugar production, you would find that they would be an increase in the overall industry average cost. I know that Senator McClean knows what I am talking about when I talk about overall industry costs. Having kept them in operation, it has resulted in a decrease in the industry average cost.

Sir, in 1980 those plantations that the ADC operated produced some 57 200 tons of cane. This resulted in some 6 251 tons of sugar and that in itself represented some 4.8 per cent of the sugar produced in Barbados. As a consequence, Sir, we received some \$5.1 million in foreign exchange. And if we recall, 1980 was a year which saw us with excess receipts and the workers of this country benefitted as a result. I think almost some \$10 million, subject to correction, was paid back to those workers.

Sir, in order for us to meet our projected 150 000 tonnes of sugar that we have set, it is absolutely necessary to keep the ADC operating plantations. It is necessary to keep them in operation if we are to meet that projected figure. In 1980, by our putting Bath plantation back into sugar production, we were able to reach 130 000 tonnes of sugar. But this can only happen Sir, if ADC continues to operate because if the opposite happens a lot of people will not want to operate those marginal and submarginal plantations.

Sir, ADC is also involved in agricultural diversification but we have done this via the Springhall Land Lease Project and the Integrated Rural Development Project. The ADC has both a developmental function as well as a commercial function and a lot of studies have shown that it would have been better if the Agricultural Development Corporation had kept the majority of its plantations in sugar production.

Under the Democratic Labour Party they attempted with their so-called diversification projects and Senator Hall is going to get up here last night and ask us what has happened with some machinery dealing with cotton. Sir, he should be ashamed to talk about cotton. That whole exercise was chaotic, it was a disgrace to the Democratic Labour Party. But yet he is going to ask, "what has happened to some cotton machinery?"

Sir, the point is this, and if Senator Hall was shadowing agriculture he would know, with those marginal and submarginal lands the best thing you can do is to plant them with canes and all research pointed to that.

Sir, the ADC has to continue to rehabilitate idle land. There is still a lot of idle land at present and I think that it may be necessary for the Agricultural Development Corporation, if it is indeed possible, either to lease, on a long term basis, some of those lands, and I believe some are plantations as well, and operate them rather than they remain idle.

The ADC has a very important role to play in agriculture. Sir, I will get some asides from the other side, because up to now they do not understand why the ADC was set up and what it was suppose to achieve. Sir, I think it should move in the direction it has taken and that is to transfer land to owner operators. It has a rural function to the small holder sector.

Sir, I think Senator Hall made the point about efforts towards mechanising and I do take his point that whereas at present the ADC mechanising scheme assist people in Christ Church and St. Philip, that indeed, in the not too distant future, it will be extended to other areas in Barbados.

I read an article where certain small farmers were highlighting certain problems they were facing — having their canes reaped and any effort by the ADC to extend such a programme would facilitate a lot of other people who, I believe, are experiencing such difficulties in other parishes. I am sure that Senator Greaves would want to plug one for St. Lucy. Sorry, Sir, that would be Mr. Roy Brathwaite.

Sir, you would find that as a consequence of operating plantations, or anything for that matter, at a lost continually, you would create a certain degree of low morale. I believe that ADC should seriously think in terms of purchasing a high productivity plantation which in itself might offset expenses in other areas.

Sir, I also think that a full time agronomist who would not only be in a position to assist the corporation, but would also render assistance to small farmers and other people, would be a step, Sir, in the right direction.

I would trust and hope, Sir, that the Pilot Small-holder Mechanisation Scheme would be continued. And I think one thing that consideration should be given to in the future, Sir — it might not be possible now — is the buying of fertiliser. This is a very expensive thing and you find that there are certain economies of scale, Sir, that could accrue from purchasing in bulk, and therefore, Sir, I think that the ADC should seriously think in future of buying fertiliser in bulk, both for itself as well as for distribution to small holders. (Aside) Senator Greaves would not succeed, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order, order, please.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Sir, one thing that has also worried me, like it has worried Senator Wickham, is the fact that day after day, you could find the canes in Barbados being burnt. I think the last SPA's release indicated that canes were burnt to the level of approximately 70 acres per day. I think that is a sad commentary of our history.

In the same article, subject to correction, I think they suggested that in some instances one field was lit no less than six times. Obviously, that has to be purpose work. It has to be purpose work, Sir. It has to be a deliberate attempt by some people who I do not know, Sir, and I do not know for what reason. I find it hard to believe that people would want to disrupt the sugar industry. I find it hard to believe so, Sir. (Aside) I would find it hard to believe that people in this country would want to see the end to the sugar industry.

A lot of plantation owners have suggested that they will not be planting canes again next year. Such action and such steps, Sir, will have grave consequences for this country. I would not want to see that happen, Sir, and I would appeal to all Barbadians, we need to maintain our sugar industry, it is vital to our economy. The closing down of the sugar industry will see no fewer than about 6 000 people placed out of work. There is no activity that can absorb 6 000 people.

People are suggesting detection, there are even certain comments about the Defence Force, Sir, but I would coerce people not to take this too lightly. This is a very, very serious and I repeat, a very serious matter.

I agree with Senator Wickham, Sir, "After sugar what?" What are we going to replace it with? What other economic activity is going to bring in that same degree of foreign exchange to Barbados? It is absolutely necessary and vital that the sugar industry be sustained via every individual in society and via every organisation. Every organisation must make sure that it be maintained.

Sir, I notice that praedial larceny still poses a problem and I think that this is something which has to be

gone into in depth. One cannot expect small farmers to plant crops, taking into consideration the cost of production, just to come and find one morning that all their labour, their efforts, their monies have gone. I think the time will come when that little contribution that we get from individuals will no longer be there. We need to look at the effect that praedial larceny is having on the small farmers, and something has got to be done about it.

One other area that has been posing a problem over the years has been the ability of farmers to determine that equilibrium point, the point between supply and demand. I notice, however, that there have been efforts made by the present Minister of Agriculture towards establishing a Crop Information System.

We will find that that system embraces the Ministry of Agriculture, the Barbados Agricultural Society and the BMC. Previously you would find periods of glut and periods of scarcity, and farmers have found it difficult to be able to strike such a balance, like I said, between supply and demand. I believe that this new Crop Information System would go a long way towards eliminating a number of the problems which Senator Hall spoke about yesterday afternoon.

Sir, all in all, under the heading of Agriculture, we have found, over the last months, a serious attempt by the Minister, and those responsible on this side, towards looking at this whole question of agriculture. The other side suggested a number of things which were problems under their Administration, and agriculture is only now being looked at seriously under the Barbados Labour Party, under this Administration, and what we are doing is trying to clear up a lot of the mess that the Democratic Labour Party left for us.

Senator Hall spoke about the BMC, but, Sir, only now, although the BMC was established during their Administration.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before the honourable Senator starts on another department, perhaps he could give some indication of how long he will be.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I would like to speak on two more Heads, and I cannot see myself finishing too soon.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Proceed.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Sir, it is only now that the BMC is making a profit. Over the years, the BMC has operated at a loss and we are projecting this year, for the first time, that the BMC will be in a position at least to break even. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: What

percentage?) A substantial profit, Sir. Senator Greaves knows the losses which the BMC incurred during their Administration.

The next Head I would like to deal with is Housing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you proposing to be long on that?

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, if you are going to be long, do not start it now. I think this is a convenient time to suspend the sitting.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting will be suspended for 45 minutes.

On Resumption:—

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed. I would like to draw again to members' attention the fact that we have a legal limitation of time by which we must finish this debate, and I would like to appeal to all honourable members to be as brief as they reasonably can in their contributions. Otherwise, some members who may wish to speak would just not be able to do so. Senator Williams.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. President, and your point is very well taken. Indeed, I shall not be long. You can probably take it that I am beginning to wind up, but before I conclude I would like to deal with Head 82 — Housing — Subhead 1.

A number of queries were raised with respect to payments to claimants for lands which were acquired under the Land Acquisition Act. Under this Subhead, it is expected that we will see some settlements in this respect. I must emphasise, however, that a lot of the delay in settling these claims can be attributed to the fact that there has been a failure on the part of claimants to produce proper titles. This has created certain problems and difficulties and therefore it has resulted in a protraction of settlements.

Also, one will find that difficulty has been experienced because people have been asking exorbitant prices for properties — I dare say prices that they would not normally ask for in the open market. But when you

begin to deal with Government, it predisposes you differently, and therefore you will find that figures have been put forward that bear absolutely no relation to what exists, bear absolutely no relation to reality. In such cases, you will find that there is indeed a time lapse in there being a settlement to a number of claims. However, those which are in a position to be settled, we expect that under this Head there will be a speedy settlement.

One of the things that we are likely to see this year, 1982–83, is more emphasis being placed on the provision of fully serviced lots for rent or for sale. Indeed there are people who in some cases would prefer if they had land where they can build their own homes, and we will see in future a move in such a direction to provide fully serviced lots either on a rental basis or for sale.

Sir, under Subhead 3 provision is made for the completion of the jetty at Hometown. As you know, in that area there is an Underwater Park, and as a consequence it is necessary to build a jetty. We hope that in this year we will be able to build a jetty at Hometown. That falls under Subhead 3.

Subhead 4 has to do with the National Park. As you know, and I think Senator Greaves hinted about it as well, Government is planning to develop a National Park from Archers Bay in St. Lucy to Ragged Point in St. Philip.

Under the British Technical Assistance Scheme we were able to secure the services of a specialist who is assisting in the planning of the park, and we are hoping that finally, he will be able to come up with the actual boundaries and will be able to define a policy for conservation, landscaping and preserving the historic and cultural value in that particular area. It is hoped that he would also come up with the administrative framework for the park.

Obviously this will now fall under the National Conservation Commission, because no longer do we have that body called the Parks and Beaches Commission, and it is hoped that he would also come up with some kind of plan to deal with training. That being the case, Sir, then obviously one would have to seek the funds, but we are hoping that within this particular area we would be able to obtain such a plan in this direction.

Subhead 5 has to do with the Integrated Urban Programme and the idea is to improve the physical environment of the depressed areas, both in the rural sector as well as in the urban sector. Although it is classified as an urban programme, the nomenclature has to do with the fact that, by and large, institutions like the World Bank regard places like Barbados as all urban, so no one in the rural districts has to worry about

the fact that the programme is prefaced by the word "urban".

You will also see efforts to improve the tenancies. On more than one occasion in this Honourable Chamber, Sir, I have pointed out that a number of these tenancies — as a matter of fact, almost all of them — need physical development, and it is because of the efforts of this particular Government that we are talking about tenancies in the first place. Under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Scheme you will find that efforts will be made towards people being able to obtain their lands.

I suppose that I could say at this particular point, for the benefit of all Honourable Senators, that up until now some 2 273 tenants have been investigated. We have approximately 19 surveyors out in the field, the total number of lots surveyed are around 1 147 and the total number of lot plans already supplied is approximately 500.

So, Sir, under this particular Head, you will find that indeed assistance will be forthcoming to people who eagerly want to purchase their lands, and I am sure all of them do.

Sir, you will also find that this particular Head has to do with beach protection. Now erosion of our coastal area still, in a sense, poses a problem. There has been a number of short term solutions in the past — for example, the building of groynes on the south coast and revetment walls on the west coast, but those were just short term solutions.

A Coastal Conservation Project has been devised, largely through an IADB grant, and the idea is that in future, we will be able to come up with a long term solution to the problem. Obviously we are not satisfied with the short term measures which have been taken. We believe that this is indeed an important thing and it must be looked at in depth, and therefore we are hoping that in future, out of these studies, some kind of overall long term plan will come about.

Sir, in the area of Housing falls the Harrison Cave, and I must say that this has been doing pretty well. We have found that between December last year and February this year some \$232 000 has been collected from over 33 000 visitors, and that indeed speaks for itself. It is estimated that we should get an annual budgeted income of approximately \$750 000, we are talking about a projected expenditure of \$650 000, and therefore we can see that we are talking about a project that is going to sustain itself.

Sir, like I told you, I have no intention of being too long. Moving on quickly, I will just make a few brief comments in the area of Welfare.

Sir, earlier I spoke about the fact that to use per capita income by itself, as the determinant of welfare is not the correct approach. It does not achieve its objective. However, on the whole question of welfare, I would like to say that time and time again, Government is asked to make a greater and greater contribution to the whole question of welfarism, and while that in itself is a good thing, one must however understand that any expansion in the area of welfarism must be concomitant with an expansion in the economic development of the country. In other words, we must make sure that we are in a position to sustain any increased level in welfare assistance.

I know quite a sum of money has been voted in this area, but I think that we must understand that welfare, in itself, is intended for those individuals who do not have the means to pay for those particular services, and I am sure that if it were at all possible — and I say at all possible — to investigate in the minutest detail the number of claims that people have been making for assistance, one would find that there are some people who are indeed in a position to pay.

However, Sir, we as a Government is committed to the concept of welfarism, and wherever possible we will render assistance to those individuals who are indeed in a position where they cannot afford these things for themselves.

Sir, the only other thing I want to mention before I close, Sir, is in the area of education generally. I just want to make a general comment.

Sir, there is much talk about what Government should do, the directions which Government should take in reference to education, but I think that we are losing sight of something. There was a time when the efforts of the school teacher and the efforts of the parents were complementary — one complemented the other. Now, you find that we have a whole attitude when it comes to parents with education.

I was appalled, Sir, to be told, may I add — by the teacher who was involved, that on one occasion when she saw it fit to discipline a child for not doing his work, which saw her imposing a detention on that child, that the parent wrote a letter to her telling her that she could not keep him on Thursday because he goes to horse riding on Thursday.

It only shows you that whereas before when that child got home, he again would have been corrected by the parent, it no longer happens now. As a matter of fact, some parents suggest that you cannot even keep them in at all.

And I am saying that while other people would identify different problems — and obviously in any system you will find problems — nothing is perfect — we, as parents, have a responsibility to our children and to the maintenance of law and order within schools. (Asides) I am not supposed to hear asides.

Sir, in closing, I just want to say that it is my first attempt at making a contribution to the Estimates and I am not sure what kind of presentation we have had before, but, indeed, I am impressed with what I have heard, and I will not hold other honourable Senators from speaking. I thank you.

SENATOR C. I. E. DEANE: Now, Mr. President, like the former honourable Senator I mean to make this as quick as possible, but I should like to do this with your permission, Sir.

First of all, you remember Macaulay wrote in his "Holding of the Rich by Horatius" "then none was for a party then all were for the State." Coupling that with Senator Wickham's statement, "After sugar, what?", I think he is as good as Macaulay in this particular thing. However, Sir, it is almost too much to hope for out and out patricians these days but that is what Barbados needs at the moment, patricians.

I am not for one moment going to say that there are a lot of things that need to be looked into, that need to be done, and I have no intention whatsoever, Sir, of going over the Estimates from page to page with the thoroughness with which Senator Greaves, especially, did in his microscopic, if I may say so, investigation — and I say that in all honesty, Sir, I do not mean to be ridiculous there at all, but I should still like to make a little contribution.

I think that the impression I had was that the situation in agriculture needed a lot of explanation. Well, what I can say is this, Sir, never have I known agriculture to be in such a lamentable situation as it is. In 1975, sugar went to a very high price in so much that the Government was able to collect an export levy of around \$30 million and then the very next year, 1976, the sugar went right back down again.

Well, it strikes me that 1980 and 1981 are a repetition of that performance, because in 1980 things looked reasonably well. As Senator Williams said earlier, the ADC put in a record crop during that year, they did very well indeed.

First of all I think I should like to say that things looked so rosy at the beginning last year that the initial price paid for canes was \$70 and it was found, Sir, that that was far too much, it was reduced afterwards to \$45 as the initial payment.

That created a real difficulty, or whatever you like to call it, Sir, because some people that had gotten their canes early at the \$70 found that there were in a position, when the final payment came, that they owed the Barbados Sugar Factories money, which was most unfortunate, and as a member of the Sugar Factories, I cannot blame them for that, because things looked so rosy at the beginning that \$70 was a reasonable amount to pay for canes. We expected somewhere between \$75 and \$80 a ton for canes, actually.

You all well know that the places work through the different banks, the Agricultural Aids Act chiefly, and that means that all the plantations owe the banks a lot of money on which to pay interest. If there is locked-up money involved as well, it is higher interest than the rate advanced by the Central Bank, and one thing and another. So I cannot really blame the Sugar Factories for that — it was unfortunate, but I cannot say that it was indiscreet.

Now, Sir, I think I should take this at this point, Sir. Senator Williams said that it was his understanding — if I am wrong, Sir, I stand corrected — that the plantation owners had said that they were not going to plant any more canes. Well, I do know that some small farmers, of which I am one — not that I said I am not going to plant any more canes — said that they are not going to plant any more canes. But can you blame them? Some of these farmers were paid at the rate of \$70 a ton, and then they found that they should have been paid at a much lower rate, and they owe the Sugar Factories money.

Now, you take the sugar industry as a whole. The European Community buys quite a lot of our sugar and we have no say whatever in the price. Moreover, as Senator Wickham quite correctly said, if Barbados stopped producing sugar tomorrow nobody would be poorer off. And the European Community, organised as it were — chiefly by the French politicians, and beet, makes it very difficult for the ACP sugar, and as you know we are members of that particular community. I think, Mr. President, all the members here know the difficulty the negotiators had in obtaining the final price this year, because beet sugar was increased by a higher rate than cane sugar. That, thank God, has been excepted now.

Sir, there is a very sour point here, and that is the question of Portvale factory. I think it is my duty, Sir, and I am constrained to say this: with regard to the Portvale factory, Vaucluse and Porters were operating at a very substantial loss — their recovery was poor, their operating expenses were very high, and it became necessary — it would have to be done sooner or later — to close them down.

But a lot of the machinery from Vacluse and Porters is being used in the new factory and I am still foretelling that it won't be a smooth start, because these things have to be synchronised with the new importations and what not. So far, I have not heard the general manager this morning — I tried to get him, but he was too busy — anyhow my latest understanding is that Portvale will be ready to start no later than the end of April. Well that is bad enough, I agree with Senator Greaves, that is bad enough. Nonetheless, what can we do about that. Unfortunately, Portvale capacity is going to be 130,000 tonnes of cane an hour, so you can imagine the dent in the time to reap the sugar crop.

Now, Sir, going back to the possession of industry problem, we all are aware of the Lome Convention — that is supposed to give a fairly square deal to everybody. But we have members of the Community, some Belgians, French, Germans and what not, but the French and their beet could be real trouble.

The boilers at Portvale gave a bit of trouble in the installation. With regard to escape clauses and time penalties, Mr. President, that is all right, but in all contracts there are going to be escape clauses, and with the conditions in Barbados, as they had been when this thing started, with some things not easily obtainable, you could not say that you have to finish by the end of December, because no contractor would have taken it under those circumstances, with the problems that existed at the time.

Also, Sir, I may say that the sugar industry is the most vulnerable industry I can think of — it all depends on the weather, and you know what the weather did to us last year — the pattern changed, you had the rainy season outside the rainy season, and that brought havoc with the reaping, with the cutting, the compaction of the soil, the mud sent to the factory spoiling the juice, the boilers not steaming because of the mud going into the furnaces and so on.

Apart from the weather, we had the question of expenditure. You don't know what kind of weather you are going to have and so there are certain things you have to do — apply artificial fertilizer, cultivate the land and one thing after the other. Moreover, the cost of artificial fertiliser has gone up and up. Nobody carries stock because they cannot afford to do it. The suggestion was made earlier by Senator Williams, and I agree with him, that if the ADC did bulk purchasing and let the small farmers have it, that would be a very good idea. I agree with Senator Williams, and he is absolutely right.

We have labour difficulties. What has always appeared to me as a tremendous paradox is that we speak of unemployment all the time and, notwithstanding unemployment, we import people to cut our canes, while we send people to cut canes in Florida and other places. To

me, Sir, that is the number one paradox. I never heard anything like it, Sir. Mind you, the prices over there are better and a lot of these young people like the idea of going away. The average age of sugar workers have increased tremendously with very few young workers coming in.

Another restriction is construction. These young workers, a lot of them — God forbid that should be so, but it is so, — cane cutting is a hard job everyone knows that, but these fellows will go over to construction, and the hardest thing for them is to sign on and then they can go to the sea and do whatever they like. The real point is again whatever the job costs, the consumer has to pay. He can pass on these charges. Sugar industries cannot do that because they get that for their sugar and no more. The same thing is true for molasses, rum, — whatever, they get that and no more.

Now we come on to the subject of diversification. The sugar industry had a specific diversification unit, but nothing was found whatsoever to replace sugar, or even go near to it — and that unit was disbanded. And, as Senator Williams wisely said just now, that was one of the fall downs of the ADC, because instead of proportioning a certain amount of their operation to the production of sugar cane, which could bring in some revenue, they put too much into experimentation. So it was all cost and no receipts.

I remember another place I joined, and as soon as I joined I realized the real fault of the ADC and that they would have to bring in cane land and get some kind of revenue and not all expenses. Unfortunately, when the ADC produced a ground crop like potatoes, carrots, etc., the fellows in the districts, especially those with the dread locks or whatever, would move in and reap them. The same thing happens with canes, but not to that large extent.

Now, Sir, we go on to vegetables. You know, very often we see vegetables on plantations and it is very costly to produce on that large scale. But, nonetheless, it is still being carried on to a large extent and I agree with them entirely.

With regard to the question of cotton, anybody who advocates cotton today would be classified as ridiculous right away. I don't mean that to be personal to anyone, but that is the truth, Mr. President.

Now there is another thing — this is by the way, Sir — the world price for sugar today, as I understand it, is 11 cents, American. Last year, you will remember, I believe it was 34 cents, American, for a pound of sugar. Well, you can quite see what the prospects are with for sugar this year, especially when you take into considera-

tion the fact that a lot of plantations have colossal lock-ups at one bank or another. And thank God the Barbados National Bank was put into operation, because no other commercial bank would treat borrowers with the consideration that the Barbados National Bank treats them.

Now we know that the Government was behind this because if you take the export levy, stabilisation, several of those funds, quite true it was recommended by the McGregor Report, the Government has passed on money from these different things to help not only agriculture, sugar and vegetables and so on, but also to help fisheries.

After the last hurricane, colossal sums were passed on by the Government to assist with the reconditioning of boats and what not. A lot of people went out of operation because, you see, they need to go out for a long time and to install machines that are going to fulfill that situation will cost them too much money therefore, they cannot do it.

With regards to insurance, all the boats, to my knowledge, that had been financed by the Barbados National Bank are insurable. But with regards to Senator Hall's point, which I think was a very good one, I do not know that the fishermen are insured, and what is more, it is a very dangerous calling anyway. Every now and then you hear of a boat drifting. You pray to God that you will find them, but I do not know that they are insured.

On the whole, Mr. President, I would like to emphasise that the state of the sugar industry in Barbados could not be much worse than it is. It is in an awful predicament at the moment and I couple that with the other statement, "After sugar, what?" I think, Sir, that we all must realise that agriculture is the backbone of any country.

You remember right after the War, Japan started a regular campaign. They said, "Agriculture first before anything else". I believe they got agriculture promoted like that. When I think of the billions of foreign exchange that Japan gets, even we ourselves are a tribute to that. We buy Datsuns and Toyotas and what have you, Sir. What have we got for foreign exchange? Absolutely nothing. Moreover, Japan is so far away and they produce goods so much cheaper than we can produce them that there is small inter-trade between the two countries, or very little to speak of anyhow.

With regards to the BMC, Sir, well I am not going to get too far into that because I do not quite fully understand it. My idea was that the BMC was established to counteract the situation, circumvent the situation of glut and shortage. In other words, better marketing would be found for local produce. But I do not see how that situation, I mean glut and shortage, can ever be

circumvented without a possible method for storage, because all that you have in glut would not be used right off and if you have no means of storing it, you are still out of luck, Sir.

Another small thing, Sir, this is also dealing with the sugar factories, is the atmospheric pollution. While I have the honour, or otherwise to be, a member of the Smoke Control Board which is established and the members are appointed by the Government. We fully realise the danger of pollution and one clause in the Smoke Control Board's Resolution says that if fly ash can be proved as a national hazard, there is no option — you bring an injunction and it has got to be shut down. I am quite aware of it, Mr. President. Senator Trotman is fully aware of it. Sometimes you get a lot of complaints and you go out and see what can be done, and if nothing can be done by the factory, then Sugar Factories will have to pay expenses, the cost of cleaning it up again. So much on pollution.

There is another thing, Sir, and this is digressing a bit, but I am trying to get through in a hurry. With regards to the recent confusion that took place in the Anglican Church relative to burial grounds, does that not make more prominent the situation that it is high time — I am not criticising, I am only remarking — that a crematorium is started in Barbados. If you go down to the cemetery, you go down there to a funeral, you would see that they are going further and further out all the time and I think the time for a crematorium has come. It was considered once, but it went out of vogue altogether.

To go back to this factory business once again, we have a Bill to the effect that if there is an accident at a plantation or a factory, whatever, in the sugar industry, then you are supposed to report it to the Chief Labour Officer within seven days, and if you do not report it he is going to send and remind you anyhow. He is very considerate, he has never prosecuted anybody as far as I know, but then, nobody has opened themselves to prosecution, as far as I know.

Just very shortly, Sir, on the question of Education. In this Honourable Chamber, and in other places, with certain members in the Government themselves, I have raised the question, "What should take place, if the same thing happens in Barbados which happened in Canada?" In Canada, there came a time when there were more schools than there were pupils for these schools.

In other words, if the population explosion is controlled, then the lower ones will move up and there would not be any ones to fill the bottom and therefore, what happens to those schools then, Sir? Are they being

constructed — this is my question, Mr. President, — are they being constructed in a way that they can be converted, easily and cheaply, into something else, or have they got to remain schools all the time?

Moreover, Sir, this was another question to which I got no answer — I am not talking about in here, this is another place. With education as it is today, are pupils trained for say job X, are they flexible enough to realise that if job X is not available when they want it, they will take job Y until X comes along? Is there enough flexibility in school teaching?

Mr. President, I am not going to keep you much longer but I want to finish up with some announcements which I know everybody would be glad to hear. Four-square Factory is saving no end of bagasse. You would remember that last year, the Government had considered generating electricity from bagasse, but there was such a shortage of bagasse that all of that had to be shelved. But, from what I see all the factories that are working are saving bagasse this year and the Government may be able to go ahead with that again.

But you know, Sir, never in my life have I seen a situation where the economy, a Government, has not been doubled banked, but tripled or quadrupled banked, whatever you like to call it. It is sugar, tourism, manufacturing and oil. It is bad enough to be hit on one, but when you are hit on all four their economy is in a bad way and they need our help, our co-operation and our assistance.

This is a criticism, Sir, — with regards to CARIFESTA, I hope that this Government, or no other Government, will ever allow itself to be taken for the ride that I consider, I might be entirely wrong, that I consider that was taken by them by CARIFESTA.

There is another question which has been raised in here often in your presence, the question of medical expenses. You know, there is an allowance for medical expenses, and I remember Mr. Hewitt, when he was in here as a Senator, was very explicit on this matter. I am not going to pay much attention to that now because of this health scheme in the pipeline, as it were, and what not. I do not think this is the proper time. So many concessions were made, Income Tax wise, that I do not think this is the proper time to raise that particular question.

With regard to tourism, Senator Seale made a brilliant speech, I thought, but yesterday he very wisely used this expression "rip off". Quite recently I watched a television programme and a visitor, some magazine co-ordinator or something, I forget what, said that what the visitor to Barbados really hated was the idea of being ripped off. You are taken from A to B for \$20, but when they take you from B to A they charge you \$30.

Therefore, along those lines I am again agitating for meters in taxis so that the visitors would know what they have to pay and not trust to the honesty or otherwise of the taxi driver, or whatever. I know there has been a case where a visitor paid a taxi driver \$100 for \$20 and the taxi driver found out where he lived and carried it back, so there is always some good. I know there is always some good, but visitors want to know what they should pay, not what they are told by the taxi drivers.

You know, Mr. President, Barbados at the moment has the reputation of being the most expensive holiday resort in the world. It used to be Italy, West Germany, and Jamaica is coming up again, but now Barbados has the reputation of being the most expensive holiday resort in the world.

I think the hotel owners, or whoever, should take cognisance of this because of the juxtaposition of the crime — although they tell me that has abated — overcharges and what not. And I may say, Sir, a lot of visitors complain about rudeness at the airport when they come into Barbados, and the Minister needs to take note of that and have it corrected.

Anyhow, Sir, there is a lot, lot more that I could say and which I do not intend to say, except this: With regard to sport, I am all for sport, but may I ask the Minister this — are we allowing sport to so supersede everything else that is a sport first? Why is it not on even terms with work or something like that? I know of a place very near to where I live, and you will see people working until 4 p.m. or half past four, but as soon as the school children are out, say at half past three, the place is crowded with young players in shorts kicking a ball or something or other. That is a bad situation. I do not deprecate the question of sport, but I am deprecating the place sport is given — ahead of everything else in some areas.

Now, CERO I think is wonderful, because among other things that Barbados has the best reputation for, it is in respect to CERO. They say Barbados is the best organised in the Caribbean.

The Defence Force, Mr. President, I will not go too deep into that, because you know my feelings there. Whenever the Defence Force is right, we are happy, but it can be wrong sometimes.

The West Terrace business — well, that was also an outcome of CARIFESTA and I will not go any further into that, but I say that every living Barbadian should put aside partisanship, forget what party he belongs to or anything, and put his shoulder to the wheel to restore Barbados to a very happy economic situation.

I would like to finish with these words, just as I said just now, Senator Wickham's quotation: "After sugar, what?" Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I would like to begin by taking a look at the fiscal performance of the Barbados economy as projected to the end of the current financial year, which I think ends tomorrow, as stated in the document on the Estimates which we received, and I am directing attention to the first page of the first section of that document, the Memorandum on Estimates 1982-83. I am using this as the basis for looking at the performance, because this document claims to provide the most up to date figures, so to speak, in terms of the projections for the year 1981-82, and you will see there at the top of that page the Estimates as contained in last year's submission are stated and at the bottom you have an indication of the projected performance by the end of the current financial year tomorrow.

The first thing which strikes me is that the estimated current revenue has not been realised. The estimated figure was \$483,726,736 and the projection here is \$463,453,000. This is about \$20 million short, and given the experience of the past year, I would say that this seems to be quite a reasonable performance. Indeed, if we did not have such a set back in sugar and tourism, and also certain policy errors which I will speak to later, it would seem as though we would have exceeded the estimate. In these circumstances, therefore, I cannot agree with the suggestion which even came out from Senator Barrow that the situation which we have before us is one which is particularly problematical.

The overall situation is that Government was projecting a surplus of \$14.2 million and now they are projecting a deficit of slightly under \$10 million, so that is a turn around of about \$24 million, explained by the shortfall in revenue plus a slight increase in expenditure, but this has been matched by a reduction in the expenditure on Capital Works. Government, at the beginning of this financial year, was budgeting for expenditure in excess of \$200 million, and now they are estimating that it would be in the vicinity of \$175 million, so that the overall deficit as is projected in this Memorandum will be slightly lower than what Government was projecting.

Government was projecting for \$185.96 million, even more than that, and they are now projecting \$184,973,000. It means, therefore, that in terms of financing the deficit, Government should have had arrangements in train to finance a deficit of the size that would materialise, and if one presumed that Government had engaged in adequate planning in terms of financing

the deficit as it should unfold, one is left to wonder why around about August we had this big alarm about problems with the Government deficit and our Balance of Payments and so on.

The reason why we had this alarm is because, apparently, somewhere along the line, somebody did not follow through with the implications of this model, in terms of the type of financial arrangements which should be in place at a particular point in time, and it was felt that the Central Bank could at least temporarily, if not permanently - I do not know what the current thinking was at the time - finance a substantial portion of that deficit.

The problem which confronted us at the time was that around about July, August, when the accumulative deficit was about \$52 million, this was financed up to then to the tune of about \$45 million by the Central Bank and that was complicated by other things in terms of the commercial banks, because the Central Bank did not take the precautionary action to preclude that possibility, although it was evident that that was on the cards for quite some time. I think that basically, the alarm which we had late last year is a result, not of any vast deviation from what was projected in terms of Government revenue and expenditure, but because of failure to make provision for deficits of a magnitude which were not planned for in time.

If we turn to page 2 of the Memorandum, you will see how Government proposes to finance that deficit. In the first table are sources of funds and in the first column indicates what they have already done, and the second one relates to what they will do. When I say already, this is up to January 31, and the other one indicates what they have done for February and this month.

There are a few interesting figures in this table here and the first one I want to direct attention to is the contribution of the World Bank of \$7.6 million, which is essentially a paltry figure which we could almost have done without.

This \$7.6 million is not a significant contribution to this figure of \$184 million when one sets this against the type of things that the World Bank has done in Barbados in the last year or so.

Undoubtedly, the World Bank, in terms of the conditionalities which they attach to certain things, have imposed upon different agencies within Government postures which were not in the best interest of the country, and it is all because of this paltry contribution of \$7.6 million.

Again I think we have to think very carefully about the way in which we give places like the World Bank leverage over, or for things that we can do without.

Now the other figure that I will direct attention to is the commercial banks. The way the table is set up, it seems that this is presumably in the main foreign commercial banks, because at the bottom we have other domestic financing, and that is the only item of domestic financing which is clearly identified. A large component of commercial banks financing would have to be the Orion Bank loan, which we approved in here some time ago, but I would like some clarification as to how much is the domestic component in that commercial banks' entry there.

It is that particular entry, I believe, which more or less came to the rescue, in terms of the Orion Bank and so on, last year. And I am saying that the situation should have been anticipated, and what was done late last year should have been done early last year, so that we should never have been really in the type of problem which stampeded us into doing some unfortunate things.

The other one I want to direct attention to is "Other Domestic Financing". I notice that as of January 31, this was only \$1.3 million, and in the remaining two months it was supposed to be almost another \$38 million of other domestic financing. The amount is \$37 959 000, which is almost \$38 million. Now, again, I would like some information on what is the up to date position in terms of how that has been financed.

The latest figures which I have in relation to the Central Bank and so on, would suggest that it might have been possible to accommodate a reasonable amount of this, temporarily, out of the Central Bank, but again one would hope that a substantial amount of it would be financed through the private banking and non-banking sector in Barbados.

So the situation here is that the fiscal performance of Barbados during this year, which is ending tomorrow, has not been as bright as we would have hoped for, but it has not been as bad as we were led to believe or as many people believed it has been. There is a feeling that the situation has been so bad that the whole country's performance has been bad, and people are wondering how in the context of such a bad performance you can talk about low levels of unemployment and so on. But the situation has not been all that bad.

Now the question is, however, why wasn't it better. We have identified some of these reasons long ago, but recently there has been a public pronouncement, by no less a person than the Governor of the Central Bank, that high wage increases have been responsible for the woes of the Barbados economy today, and I would like to repudiate that statement in the most strenuous terms.

First of all, to get to the type of theoretical underpinnings of that statement, the Governor on many occasions has outlined the process which he sees at work, which follow on, as a result of wage increases. He does a little simple arithmetic and he divides the imports into Barbados by the Gross National Product, that is the total income of the country, and he probably finds that the imports would be 70 per cent, or some similarly high percentage of our Gross National Product, and proceed to make the simplistic statement that out of every dollar that we spend, 70 cents of it goes for imports.

Well, even if that is so, he goes on further to make the false connection between that type of statement, which is not entirely correct, and the statement that when you increase wages, when you give the workers \$10 more, seven of those dollars go on imports — and the Central Bank has to get \$7 in foreign exchange, therefore there is a limit to these wage increases.

That is very, very poor economics, and let us illustrate it in terms of our own experience. You have a businessman over there, and he is producing goods and services, selling them — some locally and some overseas, and he negotiates to pay his workers some more money. In the first instance, when he increases the wage bill, the first impact is not an increase in the income of the country; it is an increase in the income of the workers and a reduction in his profits more or less equivalent to that. So you cannot behave as though increasing the wages generates increases of income all around.

Now when the businessman attempts to protect his position, if he does find it necessary, by increasing prices, what happens now is that the things that we would spend our money on will cost more in our own money, not more to import them, and so you will be spending the additional money, but on the same amount of goods more or less. Therefore, you will not be importing any more goods, and it would not necessarily call for any increased thing by virtue of that increase. So the type of simplistic analysis you get there is entirely false.

But even if you trace it to the times when we have had wage increases in Barbados, you will see that almost every time we have had a significant wage increase, the economy becomes rather buoyant — we get a good year. Remember last year was quite a good year and we had a wage increase the year before — we are now negotiating this time around — and whenever there are delays, whether because of protracted negotiations or whatever or when there are lower settlements, you usually find that the economy goes into some kind of decline and there is a reason for that — the economy needs the purchasing power of the vast number of people in the country to keep it buoyant.

There are a lot of industries and businesses which provide goods and services for the local population, and the quantum of those goods and services are not so much related to the increases in the overall income in the community, but more so to the levels of income among the poor people. There are lots of things, food, clothing and things like that, the basic thing we produce around here.

If a rich man gets more money he does not buy more beer, more insurance, more tomatoes and so on, he does not go into the supermarket any more, and when the poor man loses income you find that he cannot go into the supermarket. So when we allow wages to be retarded, the immediate effect is a redistribution from the poor people to the not so poor, and this impacts upon the amount of the basic necessities of life that we purchase in Barbados, and it impacts on the sales in the supermarkets, on the sales of the garment industry locally, and so on.

This causes things to decline, and when they decline they lay-off people, and when they lay-off people that sets in train another sequence of the same, where the people who are laid off now cannot buy, and as a consequence the supermarkets experience a deterioration in sales and so on.

So it is absolutely important to this country that the wages of the workers in this country should be maintained at a level which would keep demand for the goods and services of those industries, which cater to the local market, reasonably buoyant. And this is a point from the point of view of the interest of the business community. You do not have even now to mention the more general welfare point about making sure that the poor people can take care of their families and so on. Even prior to that, if you want to look after big business you have to look after the big business by making sure that the small man can buy the things that the big business is selling him.

Going beyond that, again Sir, there is another pernicious aspect of identifying the wages as a component of cost that contributes to any kind of problem. You see, you have, let us say, various elements of cost, wages and other things, and if you single out one of those components and say that is the one that is too high, this must be associated with some value judgment as to where the rewards should go. And I am saying that, given the low level of wages in our country, to suggest that wage increases should be identified as the culprit in any situation of high cost, is to betray an attitude which is prejudicial to the poor people in this country. If you are talking about areas of high and unnecessary costs of production in various areas, I would identify interest rates and the cost of utilities and in particular electricity.

Part of the reason why the businesses in Barbados have gone into recession a bit is because they have been faced with unnecessarily high interest rates and they are faced with unnecessarily high prices for utilities.

These things can be modified without doing violence to anybody, and I mentioned that Government in responding to the perceived problem that they thought they had, which was not really a problem — it was a lack of perception of what was going on which caused them to formulate it as a problem — increased interest rates in this country and then made a policy contribution to the shortfall in revenue.

If you want to know what the interest rates have been doing and will do to the Government's budgetary position, you just have to look at these Estimates here, and I want to direct attention to page 24, Head 22. There is a page marked 24 but before it there is an unnumbered page which is a summary to Head 22 so we can start from the reverse side of Page 24, the summary, and you will see there that the projection in the Estimates for public debt servicing is 499 536 358 and this is to be compared with what was in the Estimates for last year of 460 812 570.

Now, that figure of \$99 million on any calculus must be a bit alarming, because it is an increase which does not reflect really the debt servicing of money borrowed last year — this is a debt that was borrowed some time ago. It is largely an increase in interest charges and we can see that by going back to Page 3 of the Memorandum where you have an economic classification of current expenditure for the fiscal period 1982/83 and under interest payments you see there Domestic, \$46 420 834 and Foreign \$20 661 788 — this is Page 3 of the Memorandum, right up front, the first section, the Memorandum of the Estimates — making a total of \$67 082 622. That is the figure given here. Elsewhere in these broad sheets, the sheets that can be folded out the figure is \$70 million. I do not know where the discrepancy comes from, but here it is 67 million. The corresponding figures for last year under Domestic, which can be obtained from last year's Estimates, is \$16 672 240 and under Foreign, \$21 727 785.

In actuality, what we have seen here is that in terms of the interest payment on the outstanding debt, this year's Estimates are projecting a decline in foreign interest as compared with last year's Estimates, a decline of about \$1 million and they are projecting an increase in domestic interest of somewhere close to \$30 million.

Let us see the main item involved in that \$30 million. Let us go back to Page 24 under Subhead 1, Treasury Bills. The interest on Treasury Bills is projected to be \$36 million as compared to \$11 million last

year, an increase of \$25 million. So most of that increase is projected to be in terms of Treasury Bills.

We have authorized an increase in Treasury Bills up to about \$100 million, which is about a 50 per cent increase, but notice the interest is going from 100 to 36 million, which is over a 230 per cent increase or something like that. The reason why that is projected is that this is projected on prevailing levels of interest rates in Barbados.

If you check the latest publication of Economic and Financial Statistics, February 1982, and you look at — I get them early, the Central Bank sends them to me — the comparative Treasury Bill Rates and Bank Rates — this is on Page 49, I think it is — you will notice that in November last year the average Treasury Bill rate was 14.29 per cent and in December it was 13.82 per cent and this is to be compared with a figure of 5.94 per cent in November of 1980 and 6.19 per cent in December of 1980.

The Ministry of Finance and Planning in association with the Central Bank have control over those rates, essentially. They are out for tender, but basically because the commercial banks are required to hold a certain amount of Government securities and so on, the Government is in a position to ensure that they do not put them at the disposal at any ridiculous rate like 14 per cent or 20 per cent.

So we can control that rate, and if we are spending \$36 million in Treasury Bills, it is because we as a Government, want to do it. The question is why? It cannot be because of any sensible financial management, it would have to be some other reason.

I can say that the commercial banks make a killing out of it, they may have healthy profits. The main beneficiaries of the high interest rate in Barbados have been the commercial banks I do not know why anyone connected with the Government would have any vested interest in making sure that commercial banks can make more profit than anybody else. But basically that has been the main outcome of the high interest rates strategy in Barbados.

And it is the reason why we have a projected deficit here of \$6 864 000. Those interest rate charges, at least that \$36 million in Treasury Bills, are at least \$20 million too high. And if that was budgeted as a realistic figure which Government could attain, retaining all other figures here we would have a surplus of about \$14 million, the same as last year.

So this deficit on the projected performance on the economy is one which has been brought about by one policy act, the business of high interest rates. And if it is

not reversed, we will not get \$6 million deficit — it would be higher than that, because the impact of raising those rates, around September and October last year, is now reaching the economy, we are experiencing the recession from high interest rates.

Things take a while to work through the economy just as it takes a while to work through your body. If you give a man poison, it has to be a very venomous poison for him to drop dead in five minutes. Likewise when you do something wrong to an economy, it takes time to work through the system. If you get it in time, all right, but, if we do not correct those high interest rates now, our last condition will be much worse than it is at the moment. You will have a further decline in the economy and all these bills in projecting this revenue, you are not going to get it, and it is going to cost the Government.

The cost to Government of those interest rates is not only in terms of that money in Treasury Bills — Government pays most of the mortgage interest, people have to pay. Do you know why? — because mortgage interest is a deductible expense for income purposes. So if you are in the 60 per cent bracket and your mortgage interest rate has gone up by, say \$10 000 the Government will pay \$6 000 for you.

So basically the high interest strategy has injured this country. We have had rationalization about that — I have spoken about it and will not repeat — but the fact of the matter is that there is no rational basis for those increases. It cannot be justified in terms of an understanding of the workings of the Barbados economy. Yes, it can be justified by opening a text book and reading about how people believe economies work in North America, not how they work in Barbados. But even there they are discovering that the notions that they have are not appropriate.

I would like to make some specific comments, quickly, on a number of Heads in the Estimates. I direct your attention to page 17, Head 19, Subheads 4 and 5. Head 19, Subheads 4 and 5 — this is the Ministry of Finance and Planning — Subhead 4 relates to Management and Accounting section in the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and Subhead 5 deals with the Economic Planning Section. I am directing attention to the Statutory Personal Emoluments, which seems to have been budgeted in terms of a decline — \$38 000 in the case of Subhead 4 and \$89 000 of Subhead 5.

If you check the schedules of Personal Emoluments which are given on pages 18 and 19, you can see precisely what is happening here. In the case of the Management and Accounting Section no money is budgeted for the person called the Chief Management Accountant.

Apparently they are planning to go through the year without a Chief Management Accountant. In the case of Economic Planning, no money is budgeted for one out of the two Chief Project Analysts and for two out of the four Senior Economists, neither for the Administrative Officer II.

I really would like some explanation for the reason why the Ministry of Finance and Planning believes it can do without personnel in these areas. I can hardly think that these people do not have anything to do, because basically the situation is, now, that these people are not doing a lot of things which should be done. I feel that the Ministry of Finance should have a Research Section. It should have people in there devoting their energies, fulltime, to research at various levels in terms of the wider economy which would be oriented towards fiscal matters and so on and also in terms of the organization of the Public Service. We can only talk about increasing the efficiency of our expenditure when we really understand what we are getting for what and so on. We need officers to be worked in those areas.

Moving on, I would also like to direct attention to page 21, Head 20, Subhead 2. This relates to the Customs Department and here you will see a substantial reduction of \$199 457 for Statutory Personal Emoluments and also we have a reduction for operating expenses. It seems as though the Customs Department can operate without incurring any expenses of that type this year — a reduction from \$122 780 to \$5 700. This needs some kind of explanation.

When you look at the Schedule of Personal Emoluments on page 27, you have provision for five Customs Officers which were \$101 771 now reduced to \$85 056, which seems to be like one officer is out. There is a reduction also in provision of Customs Officer II and a quite substantial reduction for Customs Officers 3. There is some increase in provision for overtime, but again, I wonder what is the reason for this. I would not have thought that we were over supplied with Customs Officers and so on, but if we are I would like to know about it.

The next one is on page 22, Subhead 20. This is a different type of point and I am not making it because of any newspaper report. I believe that that point is one that could be observed without reference to any foreign consultants who usually, anyhow, talk to people here and get ideas of what to put in the Report, so a lot of the advice you get is not foreign advice, it is local advice. (Laughter)

Now, you have a department, the Rates and Taxes Department, which is budgeted for slightly under \$1 million, in terms of the expenses for running that department, and in the Explanatory Note on the side this

is going to collect \$16 million. (ASIDE: Which page?) This is \$16 million out of the \$494 million. This is page 22. You are spending \$1 million to collect \$16 million and you are spending overall \$4.5 million to collect \$494 million. So, you can see really that this department is cost inefficient. I do not think that it should continue to exist, really it is an anachronism, the Rates and Taxes Department. (SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Close them down then.) (SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: No, not the offices.)

On page 23, Head 21, this is a comment of a different order. Senator Greaves had some remarks to make about the Statistical Services and I believe that because of information which I have, I should really respond to that.

I do not think it is fair to accuse the Statistical Department of operating in a manner which suggests that they throw out unreliable statistics and you cannot trust the things coming from there and so on. The particular problem was with the unemployment statistics and Senator Greaves suggests that perhaps the methodology is wrong and hazarded a guess that it might be related to National Insurance data. But I do not think it is related.

The nonsense which we get is not normally related to National Insurance data, they are related to continuous household surveys, where people report that they have work or they are out of work, it is a sample survey and then on the basis of that sample survey, you adopt the proportions from that sample survey and suggest that that is representative of the entire country.

In terms of the overall levels of employment and unemployment, and the Labour force size and so on, this is projected in terms of some estimate of what the size of the labour force is, then you indicate on the basis of the estimate of the labour force size, then you get the numbers from that. But the survey itself would not give you the number of people employed or unemployed.* It just gives you an estimate of the percentage.

This survey is going to be subject to various types of error. One type of error which you cannot really avoid is the sampling error. Any time you have a random sample, there is a distinct possibility that that sample can be a sample of the people of one particular type. In other words, if you have income distribution, you may one in a million chance get a sample which had all the people with low income or with high income, but most of the time you get a spread, and hence the reason why people rely on that method.

But even then when you get that statistic and you get the figure from the sample, strictly speaking, you should speak, not of a point estimate, you should speak of some type of a confidence interval, and say that we

are say 99 per cent certain that the unemployment figure is between 8 per cent and 12 per cent or something like that.

There are techniques for estimating these intervals and any statistician would be more interested in that interval than the fact that you say 10 per cent. But, if all the time you keep coming up with 10 per cent, 10 per cent, you would start to maybe lend some credibility, not the opposite, to the performance of the sample as giving you something close to the average figure, because most of the time you get something close to the average figure.

On the question of National Insurance data, I would think that, contrary to the view expressed by Senator Greaves, we should make much more of that. This is a point for collecting information, not on unemployment, but information on employment, and that in a sense is even the more important statistic. It is rather more important how many people are working than what percentage of unemployed you are talking about, and that is a source of information about employment and the labour force which should be more actively cultivated.

So I would not like to associate myself with any suggestion that we cannot have competence in the Statistical Department. They have a number of professionals there. I would not even want to associate myself with any comments that you do not have competence in the Central Bank's statistics.

In spite of the fact that we hear that certain people cannot disagree in public with pronouncements of Ministers — and Ministers have a way of pronouncing on everything advanced as information, (Laughter) — and therefore your hands are tied, that might be so in terms of the analyses of the Central Bank. But the actual figures that they get from the commercial banks and so on are usually alright. Occasionally, when you look in the survey you might wonder who did this analysis, that no serious economist could not have come up with that analysis based on the figures they have, and then you might see the idea of not disagreeing with the people in public.

What I would suggest there, is that somewhere along the line, it should be pointed out that there is nothing wrong with central banks bringing out information which contradicts statements made by Ministers and so on. If we ever move to a situation where that is considered not to be the done thing, we would suffer heavily for it.

In other countries, Governors of Central Banks openly disagree with positions taken by Ministers of Finance and Ministers of Finance criticise Governors of Central Banks. It is the only way that the community can get the best out of both, in terms of the ideas that they have to contribute to the situation. If you make one

the lackey of the other, you are going to have very severe problems.

You might have had a point if you were talking about certain things, not the statistics, but the analyses coming out of the Central Bank, on some occasions when the Minister is speaking in advance of the information.

I would now like to turn to page 29, and basically from 29 onwards, these deal with Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs and I would like to comment briefly on a few points raised by various Senators.

The question, "After sugar, what?" seem to have been a very popular statement and maybe it is a slogan that perhaps Barbados should adopt and keep in the forefront of our minds — "After sugar, what?"

But I rather think Senator Williams misinterpreted Senator Wickham's intent. He was not saying, "After sugar, what? Therefore, sugar always." He was not saying that our future lies in sugar. He was not saying, "After sugar, nothing."

Indeed, he was saying simply the opposite. He was saying that we should be intelligent enough to read the signs of ten times and see that sugar's life is coming to an end so to speak. Sugar is becoming more and more of a problematic industry and we cannot expect it to survive indefinitely, and so we should be addressing our minds to the problem as to what we are going to do when sugar is no longer able to do for us. So, I think he entirely misinterpreted his intent there.

And I suspect Senator Deane's comment was more in line with Senator Wickham's where he is suggesting that the state of sugar is in a worse predicament now than perhaps any other time that he can think of.

This does not mean that it will be in this predicament for the next two years. We know sugar prices oscillate, the amplitude is very severe and so on, but it so happens that the low prices persist about three or four times as long as the high prices — you get one good price every five years or so — and we really cannot build a future around that type of thing.

Part of the problem here is that we are in the raw sugar business, we are in the business of producing semi-refined sugar and shipping it off to England to Tate and Lyle for them to refine and send back some to us, and send it to other parts of the world. There is no future in being in the raw material business as such, providing other people with raw material, and so it may be that sugar can be given a new lease of life — it would not be able to live for ever, but it would be given a new lease of life — if we see sugar in all terms, not as a raw

material to be sent to Tate and Lyle, but as a source which we can use as a basic input into a wider range of industries.

Indeed I said sugar, but it is not only sugar, the sugar cane can be used as such a resource, and if it is that given the known types of plants and plant life that provide raw materials and food, and given the known ways of using our land, if our conditions are quite conducive to the growing of sugar cane, perhaps we should address our minds to being more imaginative in the use of sugar cane. But again I cannot subscribe to the view that our land is good for nothing other than sugar cane. That would have to be a joke.

I believe that man's endeavours are always limited by his imagination. Israel can take desert and do all sorts of things with it, and our land is not desert yet. People grow crops today without soil and so on, so you can grow it with bad soil. People take soil and breed all sorts of things to suit their purposes, so do not tell me that our land is good for nothing other than sugar cane — it cannot be. That is more a reflection on our imagination than on the land.

And I agree that we need to get people together to address these problems on a continuing basis. It is not a problem for an economist alone, or for any specialist alone, you need people in the biological sciences, people in the marketing area, you need economists and so on. I will not be able to give you a ready answer now, but I know an answer is out there waiting, and it is only as difficult as we make it, and then we discover it is as simple and straightforward as anything else.

In a sense, the sugar industry is in a bind now and we have to plan for the future. I believe that, here and now, we can start organising sugar in a better way. Senator Deane made reference to the scarcity of labour and so on. I am not so sure that we make the most efficient use of the labour in the sugar industry. I speak subject to correction, but I have the feeling that plantations make their own arrangements for labour. Each plantation advertises it needs so many people and so on, and you work at a particular plantation. We had a situation some time ago when Haymans started late and the people had to slow down the cutting of canes, and you will probably find that when the crop has finished in certain areas, the crop is finished for the sugar workers.

I believe that the people who are involved in the harvesting of canes should be brought together in a single pool — maybe the Sugar Producers' Association, or whatever, should be responsible for that aspect of the harvesting — and if we could organise those men and move them any part of Barbados in accordance with the schedule for cutting canes, not only on plantation lands but on private small holders' lands as well, you would

be surprised at how you would reduce your demand for men by maybe 30 per cent.

You need the same amount of labour to cut the canes, but everybody would work from the beginning to the end of the crop, rather than some coming in halfway through and others dropping out halfway through — you would have a labour force that would work from day one to day last. When the crop finishes, it finishes for all, not for some now and some later on.

I believe that we can improve our organisation in areas like that. That is just one thought. I do not have a lot of time to go into all of it, but the whole idea is that we have to sit down and confront our organisational problems.

Senator Williams spoke about the need for marginal land in sugar, thereby reducing the average cost of the sugar industry, and so on. If you define the sugar industry as the factories, the average cost of refining the sugar, this may very well be so, because there is a fixed amount of machinery for grinding canes and so on, and the capacity we have is more than the canes. The factories can operate more than the canes, so if you can get more canes into them and they are available to you at the same price, your marginal cost would be less than average and the average will come down. That is because when you do the calculation you do it on the basis that the through-put of canes is at some constant supply price to the factory.

But if you speak of the sugar industry as embracing the land and so on, bring everybody into one calculation, you will probably find that it may not be true that keeping certain marginal things in would reduce the average cost. What has happened is that you reduce the average cost to the factory by keeping certain marginal people in, and those people are making losses. In other words, some plantations make losses so that the factories can reduce their average cost, and, in terms of the overall economy, this is not particularly desirable.

In any event, if the land is marginal in the production of sugar, this almost by interpretation means that the contribution that it is making is minimal, and it is very likely that it could make a better contribution elsewhere. If, in those circumstances, we have excess capacity, we have a whole lot of factories due to be retired and we could rationalise the industry and make it a little smaller, instead of trying to maintain the existing factories for longer than they should be maintained.

Senator Seale made some reference to the Pine Hill Dairy. He felt that Government was giving it a hard time keeping down the price of the product and they cannot make a profit. If this is so, it ought not to be, but again

talking about the costing of products the question of efficiency has to be borne in mind.

If the Pine Hill Dairy is operating highly inefficiently, it ought not to make any profit — indeed, it ought to be closed down. A lot of people believe, with fairly good reason, that the Pine Hill Dairy is inefficient in some of its operations, like the evaporated milk and certain other things. It might be all right in terms of the pasteurized milk, but certainly they have rather more wastage and spoilage than they ought to.

If it is some problem with the plant and so on, it may be better to re-equip the place properly. If it is that this is an area of activity which could never really and truly be viable except they have highly subsidised prices, meaning that we have to pay for milk here three times as much as we can get it if we import it in cans from elsewhere, the Pine Hill Dairy ought not to exist to operate in those areas.

So, before we talk about increasing the price, we should examine the efficiency of the Pine Hill Dairy's operations and whether certain aspects of its operations should not be closed. There is no point paying a lot of money for bad milk. We have had cases where the milk could not be consumed, and the Pine Hill Dairy is embarrassed that people are bringing back the milk to them with some high degree of frequency — this is evaporated milk.

We have had some words on the BMC, rather guarded, but I would like to say here and now that I would like to commend the Government, and since Ministers who have specific responsibilities can often be the decisive persons in getting changes, I would like specifically to compliment the present Minister of Agriculture in reconstituting the Board of the BMC.

I think, basically, for the first time the BMC has a Board which one can believe is really capable of discharging the responsibilities of that Board and ensuring that the BMC performs in the way it ought to.

I do not know if those people have any political affiliations and so on, but it would be even more commendable if that was not a factor in selection. I suspect that it would not be the sole consideration because you could find any number of political yard-fowls that you can put there if that were what you were interested in.

So that irrespective of the people's political affiliation, for once you have professionals with skills in the appropriate area whom you can expect would do a job, if they are permitted to do this job.

I say this because you can put men with skills and then you ensnare them and not allow them to

operate — do not give them any discretion. And the way in which Statutory Boards have been operating in this country, you know the Ministers might become habituated into believing that they have to be involved in every little thing, and if that should happen the experiment will surely fail.

But I think it is time we recognise that any Government which selects a yard-fowl board is doing itself a disservice, because almost certainly these people are going to function in a way which would conduce to the mal-functioning of the institution, which, in turn, will come back to plague the Government.

It should be recognised that when you appoint true professionals, they do not consider themselves to be creatures of anybody — they have their professional pride, and that is the most important thing to them. Politics is secondary, so you can rely on them to make sure that they understand their functions, and that they can go home and be proud of themselves and do not believe that they have sold themselves short. When Governments recognise that, and proceed along those lines, Barbados will become a better place.

Now I would like to turn to page 59, Subhead 7, and this is about secondary education. Basically I do not want to query any of the provisions under this Head, but what I want to say is that it is quite evident that secondary education in Barbados is in a transitory phase.

The organisation of secondary schools will change, attitudes in secondary schools will have to change in Barbados, and I would like to suggest that we should view the recent occurrence at the Lodge School in this light.

A lot of people hung their heads in shame and said, "I am a Lodge boy, I will throw away my school tie." They cried shame on those people and four boys were suspended.

Maybe four of the boys needed suspending, but I am not so sure that they necessarily needed to be suspended for involving themselves in a sit out. Again we must recognise that there are going to be sit outs and sit outs, and protest need not be disorderly, it need not be disrespectful. It is just a way of indicating, firmly, opposition to a matter.

Our schools for too long have been too autocratic. That was all right in colonial times when we lived in an autocratic society. Then you were really getting the type of schooling to fit us to live in an autocratic society, and you bred a lot of people with authoritarian personalities who felt they could not criticise the fellow above them and the fellow below could not ask them a question

either. That is the type of society that we had in Barbados and we were schooled to accommodate ourselves to that. That has changed. Barbados is not like that again, and schools ought to change.

We cannot talk about having democracy, having 18 year olds voting and when they want to speak to their headmaster on a point that they disagree with him on, they cannot have audience with him. That has to be out.

So you have to see the behaviour of these Lodge boys in that light – you have to recognise that school boys do not do things like that lightly. You have to recognise that most of those would be the leaders in the school, people who are looked up to, the responsible people in the school, and so they are having recourse to action which they know to be drastic. They even know they were putting their future in school on the line, but they did it because they felt they had to, and so we ought to see it in that light – not in terms of trying to put these people down.

Maybe certain things might have happened that simply went too far and you had to suspend them. If you suspended them just because they were the leaders, you are making a very big mistake. And it is not the first time we have had that type of protest in Barbados from school children – it will not be the last time.

It is not generally known in Barbados that Fifth Formers at Harrison College walked out of the classroom and went out on the playing field. It happened this year. I believe the people at the Nation and the Advocate know, but you know what? It is Harrison College and you are not going to put it there.

Lodge School for too long may have its faults, but it is becoming fashionable now in Barbados to attack and criticise the Lodge School. As I said, it might have its faults and it may be in need of severe criticism, but criticism should not degenerate to the stage where people are just following fashion and criticising because they feel this is a fashionable thing to do.

It may be that the Press do not know that the Harrison College boys walked out, but I know the Press in Barbados have their ears to the ground and they know most things – but we do not see it in the papers. Harrison College is just up there and they found their way all the way in St. John to take pictures. This is a reflection of something that is wrong in this society, which I addressed already, on the last occasion.

We have had another manifestation of things that are wrong with attitudes towards schools in Barbados. We have this term of prestige school and ordinary school. You heard this term bandied around fairly recently in casual conversation – not in this Chamber.

Another thing associated with the schools recently is that we heard about the 70th anniversary of scouting in Barbados, and they had this thing and they put up a plaque to give recognition to this fact, and they put the plaque at a girls' school – well it has boys in the first form now – they put the plaque at Queens College. Do you know the pretext? It is that Combermere School started at that site.

If Combermere School had started at St. Leonards, they would not put it there. If Combermere School had started in Fairchild Street market, they would not put it there. If Combermere School had started at St. Michael's School, they would not put it there – but they put it at Queens College.

You must ask yourself what type of mentality these people have, if when, basically, what you associate events like that with would be institutions, not land. That land could go into the sea for all the difference it makes, but the fact of the matter is that a particular institution called Combermere School was involved in starting scouting in this country.

There was a plaque at that same site in Constitution Road saying this school was founded in such and such a year, indicating when it was built and they moved it, and wherever Combermere School goes this association with Combermere School goes there.

Likewise, any plaque which speaks of the starting of scouting by First Barbados, which is still in existence at Combermere, should be where that is, and if Combermere moves from Waterford, they should take up the plaque and carry it somewhere else.

The Combermere School P.T.A., of which I happen to be President at the moment, have agreed to make a public protest. We are going to write the scouting people involved – first to indicate our dissatisfaction with that and ask that they move it, and we have agreed that if they do not move it, we are going to put up one – we are going to put up our plaque at Combermere.

I think that basically some of these things look small, but they are symptomatic of rather deep and profound ailments in this society. The headmaster of Lodge School had a letter in the papers the other day. I make no comment. That too spoke a mouthful.

Statements were made in here critical of different schools, and events at different schools and so on, and the only points that were taken up were picked up by way of response by organisations representing all the schools, but the points made were perceived to be critical of Harrison College and Queens College, not the ones that were critical of the Lodge School.

I do not really object to people picking up points and criticising me and saying I should not do that — by all means, I cannot be perfect all the time. But I know I was right on that occasion, and it is a fact that students provide false information to those questions that I identify, and they will continue to provide false information — certain students in certain income brackets — for as long as these questions continue to be asked. And it is a poor excuse to suggest that that is good educational practice moving from the known to the unknown.

What does the teacher know about the home circumstances of the child, and he does not know where the child lives. If you are moving from the known to the unknown, you are moving from the known to the unknown for the teachers, too — the teachers are the first who should know. So when you are involved in an exercise where the child knows but the teacher does not know, that is no movement where the teacher is guiding the student from the known to the unknown. So even at that level the pretext for settling this thing is flimsy.

I am not suggesting the particular reasons why it is. The Headmasters put up two reasons. It is either A or B, it is either the teachers are unwitting or something worse — that they have bad motives and so on. They can have their pick. I state the facts that students do provide false information, and if those facts suggest that teachers are unwitting or that they are malicious in some way, they can have their pick — I do not know which they are. But the facts are there which cannot be altered.

I would like to speak briefly now on Page 60, Subheads 10 and 11. This subhead relates to the provision for higher education. Senator Greaves has already identified the cuts in this area, and I presume if that is to be interpreted in accordance with the commitments of Barbados to the funding of the university, it means that Barbados is planning to have a smaller number of students at the University of the West Indies during this financial year than previously.

If it does not mean that, the budget is not properly formulated because the basis on which they pay is on the basis of the per capita cost of the students in the University, that is the contribution to the University. The other basis in terms of the grants to students and so on, is that they give grants to people who are in the University, not to people who are not in the university, so probably they are projecting some reduction in this area during the coming year.

I would really like to suggest that Government rethink that situation very carefully because the reduction seems to be fairly dramatic, too, in terms of a shift in one year. There are a lot of people in the university already who really cannot pull out, so it is going to impact on people who should be going in this year and I

would think they should rethink that situation rather carefully.

You find that sometimes that is a one way track — you go down there and you never come out, and many territories which contribute to the University of the West Indies find that they have been impoverished, intellectually, in their own country, because it is gradually cut down and cut down. They cannot find accommodation in their budget for this kind of expense again, because other things have a way of crowding in and laying a claim that you cannot shift them off later on. So you shake out higher education and you will have a rough time getting it back to where it should be.

The other point on that is that I presume that it could have some relationship to some perceived rearrangement in funding, but this ought not to be so, because as far as I know there is no agreement on that, and any projections should be based on the known circumstances. But in terms of the type of involvement of this Government in the wage increases in the university, I think that in the past this Government — not this Government in terms of any particular party, but the Government of Barbados — has unwittingly done things which were not in their better interest.

In other words, you could find a situation where Barbadian representatives in negotiations with WIGUT — I used to be a negotiator for WIGUT for University salaries — Barbadian representative would go in there and try to take a line that would give Trinidad a higher increase than the staff at Cave Hill. But you know what? — it does not matter if the increase is at Cave Hill or anywhere.

When there is an increase in the cost of the University, it is across the board, so you do not have one cost for students at Cave Hill and one cost for students at St. Augustine — all the expenses are amalgamated and then divided through. So whether the increase in cost is at Cave Hill or St. Augustine, you would still have to cost the university for having the students at Cave Hill, so you are not going to have the escape route by saying let the Trinidad people get higher wages and you do not get any.

But what is worse, when you have increases at Cave Hill, the Government gets back between 50 per cent and 60 per cent, because most university lecturers are in that tax bracket. So the Barbados Government pays 10 per cent of my increase and they get back 60 per cent. They make a profit out my wage increase. (Laughter) It is a fact. They make a profit.

If salaries in St. Augustine and Jamaica were to remain constant, and they increased salaries at Cave Hill by say \$1 million, the Government of Barbados would

probably pay about 10 per cent of that \$1 million and get back half a million dollars, they pay about \$10,000 and get back \$500,000. What keeps things in balance is when everybody go out together.

But any time you build up a bias and let St. Augustine get more money, put it to the extreme — let St. Augustine get \$1 million, the Government of Barbados would still pay \$10,000 of that but they will not get it back a half penny. So sometimes in bargaining you have to find out what your situation is inside of there and sometimes you feel that you are doing yourself a favour and you are doing yourself a disfavour. I just throw that out.

On Page 63, Subhead 17, the School Meals Service, Senator Seale made a comment about the cost of school meals and he worked out a figure of \$1.65, which he said seems low as the cost for a meal. But he said the food cost in there was only 65¢ and the \$1 was going on other charges, and he felt that was an inappropriate balance.

The first point I would like to make is that when you cost the relationship between the components of a cost in a meal in a Restaurant as opposed to the School Meals Service, they cannot be on all fours, for two reasons. Restaurants do not normally prepare food one place and carry it all over Barbados to schools. The transportation cost would be much lower. That is one element of cost that an ordinary restaurant would not have in preparing a meal for somebody.

Secondly, in terms of the cost components, the School Meals Service is not pricing out these things in terms of a profit, so the wage component would be rather higher than in a situation where there is no profit component as compared to one where there is a profit component, and things of that order.

I do not know about the cost of the foodstuff but once upon a time I know that some of the foodstuff was subsidized. You got it at a cheaper price, maybe still now. You got it free from the World Church and so on.

So you cannot view it in terms of costings of a dish in a restaurant, you have to look at the actual cost components. There might be waste but you have to identify the wage specifically, and this would have to be done without reference to what the cost factors are.

Then there is page 88, Head 37, Subhead 2, the West Terrace. It seems to be the consensus that there have been errors made in West Terrace, that the increases in cost cannot be explained entirely merely by the cost of building materials and labour going up and so on.

Certain costs were not even anticipated and you have this error of \$1.5 million in preparation costs. And I understand that some fairly absurd things were done in terms of site preparation — like carrying away all of the removable mould. Rather than just levelling the particular area where you are going to put the house and digging out the foundation, they engaged in whole scale earth movement.

So that basically a high component of that cost is associated — \$1.5 million divided between the houses there cannot be so small — with that specific error, and there may be others. But more importantly, with the type of houses at West Terrace, it was conceived that Barbadians with certain types of occupations, not income brackets, should be able to live in those houses. That was the Government's plan, but they cannot live in them now because their salaries have not kept pace with the increase in the estimated cost of those houses.

So one of two things are wrong. If the cost of those houses are realistic in terms of the building costs in Barbados, wages are way out of line, people have to get more money. But I suspect that that is not the full explanation, and those houses cost more than they should. If those are owned by a private person, they would probably end up going bankrupt. I do believe that Government should absorb some of that cost, look over it, and make a realistic assessment of the wastage and say that "X" constitutes wastage and take that off, and sell those houses at a loss, but for a realistic price.

Selling those houses at those inflated prices is going to distort the housing market in Barbados, because people are going to say if Government can sell those houses in West Terrace for that kind of money why can't I sell mine for more. Government should take the loss, and it has nothing to do with losing face and criticising the Government — errors are made and good Governments face up to errors, and people respect you for facing up to errors. When you try to bluff your way, you are not bluffing anybody but yourself, so you have to face up to these things — just identify the wastage and put a realistic price on those houses so that people like school teachers and people in the occupations which Government envisioned were to live in those houses, can still be able to live in those particular houses.

That is the particular point and also Government should take the opportunity to learn their lesson in terms of the selection of people as project managers, and what not. You see we have a system of feeling that anybody can do any job in Barbados, you can appoint anybody to anything and that is not so. People because of their limitations may make errors, so you have to be more careful in terms of project managers.

I will try to finish within the next minutes or so, Mr. President, I would like to make a few comments on some of the remarks made by Senator Barrow in his opening address. Already I have indicated that the fiscal situation in Barbados is not as bad as he believes, and Government believes, and as most people in Barbados believe. The question is in understanding of the situation as it is. There is a song which says, "Things get a little easier, once you understand."

Senator Barrow repeated a statement, which was reported as being made by the Prime Minister in the House of Assembly, that Government has tried, with some measure of success, to keep the inflation rate in Barbados down, and somewhere along the line some mention was made about the price of vegetables and so on.

Now the Government should not delude themselves that any policy measures which they introduced did anything significant about the inflation rates in Barbados. To do that is to elevate those measures to a status they don't deserve and might injure you later on. One of those measures is the high interest rates and they have not contributed.

In the convention theory, high interest rates help to bring down the prices by dampening the demand, and therefore because the demand falls, people sell less. It does not work so in Barbados. Interest rates constitute a cost of service and tend to escalate prices. So if you feel that that did something you will find yourself in a bad situation and would not understand why you are in it. Government did not do anything to bring down inflation rates — likewise, they did not do anything to carry them up on this occasion, apart from the interest rates.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I am being misunderstood here. When I talk about doing what I could in order to keep inflation down, I did not attribute the price of vegetables to this. What I said was that if we think of vegetables, sometimes we talk about the high price of vegetables, but in the few weeks the price of cabbage and so on have come down, and when the price of vegetables are low this is reflected in the low cost of living index, and that is one of the factors in inflation being kept at a certain level. I am not trying to take responsibility for gluts anymore than I am trying to take responsibility for the scarcities.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Yes, I think I had you more or less correctly, I did not intend to misinterpret you. What I was going on to say is that the reason why our prices would have been moderated because of the vegetables, is not because of any reduction in the demand for vegetables, because certain people manage the economy and dampen the demand, but because of the over supply in vegetables. I am not saying

that you are making this point, remember I prefaced my remark by saying the point has been reported as being made elsewhere.

Then, another point which was mentioned by Senator Barrow, which was reported as being used elsewhere — I am using my own words now — is that Government repudiates the monetary supports to economic management, saying that people who talk about certain business of containing expenditure on Capital Works and certain other things are putting themselves in the monetarists' camp.

That is not Senator Barrow, but that says that certain types of criticism can be dismissed by saying that that is a monetarist view. That is a ploy used by certain people who cannot think for themselves, who like to dismiss an argument by branding it. You cannot do that. The responsible criticisms that have been made of anything done by Government cannot be explained in terms of monetarism. I do not have the time to go into what that really means, but it is a misunderstanding of monetarism and a misunderstanding of what people have been saying about what should be done in Barbados — to talk about putting yourself in the camp of the monetarist. That is a throw away that gets us nowhere.

In closing, I would like to comment on a particular set of points on taxation made by Senator Greaves. Senator Greaves suggested that Government has shifted the emphasis from direct to indirect taxes. That is not correct.

Government has increased allowances and modified the bans on Income Tax on a number of occasions and they have imposed Consumption Tax on a number of things also. In terms of the effective levels of taxation, income is as highly taxed now as it ever was, and it may be higher. The reason for that is that the Income Tax is a progressive structure on the number of dollars you get in your pay packet, you pay more gradually on the number of dollar bills.

So if you are working for a certain salary, you might be in a tax bracket of 40 per cent and then inflation now doubles prices, and if you get your pay packet doubled it would put you in the tax bracket of 60 per cent. But that pay packet really cannot buy anymore than half of that could have bought a few years ago but the tax on it is heavier.

When Government allows allowances, it barely changes so that things remain the same, and if they do not change often enough things become worse. So that this year if Government does not give any allowances on income and so on, Income Tax will be higher in Barbados next year than this year. Don't be deceived into believing that when you get these allowances that you are stopping

the thing from escalating too fast, you are stopping the burden from increasing more and more on your wages.

Senator Greaves suggested that indirect taxes are regressive, meaning that people with low incomes pay proportionately more than people with higher incomes. That is an old fashion view that some people believe, it is not true. That may be so if you had taxes on certain basic necessities. But when you are selecting the items that you are taxing and you have all sorts of different levels of taxing, and you can identify the items that are bought predominantly by people with high incomes and put heavy tax on them, like on motor cars over a certain value, you have almost 100 per cent tax by Government, you know we have Import Tax and Consumption Tax at a high level. All of these devices can make indirect taxation as progressive as any other tax.

The idea that indirect tax revenue is less buoyant than direct tax revenue — again this is a Democratic Labour Party idea which has been voiced in the other House — is not true. It is not true that Government is in trouble now because they are emphasising indirect taxes and the economy is in recession, and therefore the things they put the taxes on are not being sold. When an economy goes into recession income falls faster than expenditure. You know why? People do not reduce their expenditure by as much as their income is reduced.

In a limited case, if you lose your income and you have some savings, you live off your savings or somebody else has to provide for you. So in recession, expenditure does not fall as fast as income, so the taxes on expenditure will prove to be rather more buoyant than ones on income. In other words, you don't need to have income in any particular time period to spend, and you can spend relatively more of your income when it starts to decline.

So that is not the reason for any apparent decline in tax performance, and I have already pointed out that the tax performance is not really that bad, having regard to certain basic things like the performance of the sugar industry and so on. The tax performance has been decidedly good in my opinion, not as good as Government would expect it. So there are no fears in this area.

But the problem is that not only the DLP and so on, but I believe the Government might be persuaded that things are not so rosy, you must come back to this. And it is in the belief that things are worse than they really are, and that you can open a text book or listen to someone from the IMF to tell you how to get around these things — that damage has been done and will continue to be done to the Barbados economy. I will await the next round in the damage.

I thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Reader.

SENATOR Mrs. G. G. READER: Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about the welfare, this is the child care part of it, page 125, Head 43. It is not really much to do with the Head itself, Mr. President, but yesterday, a Senator said that he did not see how we could do away with large children's homes as the Minister had suggested.

I can only say that this is definitely an 18th century colonial idea, because large children's homes went out practically with the Ark. We were saddled with them here in Barbados, Mr. President, because nothing better could be done. We were given — this is the Child Care Board — large children's homes, large buildings to convert into children's homes, because children had to be removed speedily from the almshouses. We could do no better than that.

But, Mr. President, over the years, we have seen that in bringing up these children in these institutions, we are doing absolutely nothing for the children.

First of all, when they are brought into care they are suffering from emotional trauma, they are children from homes which have broken down completely, they are children who have been ill-treated or have been orphaned suddenly and cannot be considered, in any way, to have had a fair deal in life.

We are bringing them up in these large institutions and not teaching them proper inter-personal relationships. We are not teaching them how to form attachments with adults because they are looked after by staff who perforce have got to move and leave from time to time.

It must be awful to be a small child whose mother has died, been killed suddenly, who has been taken into a children's home and then you form a strong attachment with, say, a general worker in that home — you see, these children have not been taught yet to despise domestics, so they form strong attachments with these people — and then there is a vacancy somewhere else and this person is shifted from this home to, say a day nursery, and the child's woes are compounded because of this. We are doing these children damage by bringing them up in this.

Now when the Minister said that he wanted to see the children in Barbados fostered, it is thought of as something new. Fostering in Barbados is nothing new. Everybody in this room knows of children in Barbados who have been brought up by other than their own parents and have been well brought up, and happily brought up, who have become people of worth. Fostering has been a facet of Barbadian life for over 200 or 300

years. It is nothing new. The idea behind this Child Care Board at the present is to find the right people to foster the right children.

But, Mr. President, we are suffering from two things: (1) there was a new Child Care Board Act passed just before the last Parliament was dissolved. This was in about May, 1981. This Act gave the Board the teeth to carry out its work properly. It was passed by both Houses, by both the House of Assembly and by the Senate, and it has not yet been proclaimed, so the Board is still toothless.

We are spoken of by the Honourable Minister as a Board that does its job properly. We do our job, Mr. President, because we are staffed by dedicated, efficient and caring people who are highly qualified at their jobs.

Mr. President, in September an Act was passed here in this Chamber to purchase "Savoy" on Bay Street for the new headquarters for the Child Care Board. I am sure that the Senator who spoke on that motion at that time, gave you some idea of what was happening within the present Child Care Board headquarters.

Mr. President, the Board Room is so small that when the Board meets, if someone has to move from the table, the Chairman has to get up from his chair, open the door, push his chair out the door so that they can walk past. The staff — this is a highly qualified, dedicated staff — are sitting two to a desk and the rest of them sit around the Child Care Board table, the Board Room table.

Under these circumstances, how can they interview people for adoption and fostering when these people have got to come in and tell them the very most intimate details of their life. You cannot interview people in the middle of Broad Street, neither can you interview people like this in a room where there are two or three people working on something else. It is not fair to the citizens of Barbados, and it is not fair to the staff of the Board, and something must be done to help us.

And yet, I see that in the Estimates, under Housing, the vote for the repair of Government buildings has been drastically reduced. I do hope that this does not mean that the Child Care Board's staff continues to work under conditions which are so frustrating that we may lose our dedicated staff and have to start again from scratch. We have got these new thrusts to make once the Act is proclaimed. The Adoption Act has already been proclaimed, we already have to do all the adoption work. This work does not take a few minutes you know, it takes a lot of time, and I am appealing to those in power to do whatever they possibly

can to expedite these matters for the Child Care Department.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I, too, just have a few remarks to make. First, I will begin with a query and I would invite you to look at Appendix A in the Estimates where I see under Government Secondary Schools two things that I do not understand. I see on page (3) that at Foundation School, with a staff of 59, their expenditure on teaching staff is \$1,344,507, and if you turn to page (9) you will see that St. Michael's with a staff, according to this, of 42, has expenditure of \$1,988,057. I do not quite understand that. I would like that explained. How is it that a school with a staff of 59 has less expenditure than one of 42, unless there is some typographical error. I would like the Leader of the Government to explain if that is a typographical error or what — it must be.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The total at the bottom has a "3" in it.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Yes, I am sorry, I did not see that.

I would like first to comment on Agriculture, and I must say I do not quite agree with Senator McClean's interpretation of Senator Wickham's statement: "After sugar, what?" If I were asked to answer, "After sugar, what?" as far as Barbados is concerned, I would say: "After sugar, the deluge," because I feel that whatever else might be said of this island, that if there is one thing we know a lot about, that is sugar.

We have some people with vast knowledge of sugar, and our Sugar Cane Breeding Station here supplies plants for all parts of the world. We have lived on sugar for all these years, and I feel we will continue to live on sugar for many, many more years, and I hope that we shall. I do not think that we should be siphoned off thinking about sugar, because of the amount of fires we have been having and all those things that have been working against the sugar industry here in Barbados.

I think it is better to bear those ills that we now have than try to slide to others that we do not know of. As some other Senator said, what could we put in place of sugar here in Barbados? We have to talk about diversifying the economy, but we have tried to do that. Whatever industry you think of — and I do not think you would try to go back to tobacco — cotton or whatever else you think of — I do not see anything to take the place of sugar cane in this country.

We know that they are now experimenting with the sugar cane peeling, and it is possible that out of that we may be able to get some industry going, so I do not think that the Senator meant that he was visualising that sugar was on the way out, and what was going to happen after it had gone out. I think what he was saying was that it is so difficult to get people to work in the fields nowadays and one has to ask oneself why is there this contempt for sugar and what it can do for this country.

I think one of the things is that people still associate working in the canefields today with slavery. I do not know why they should think this. I know it is hard work, I would not like to have to do it myself. It is back breaking work, but somebody has got to do it. Thank goodness — also by struggling and fighting with our sugar — we have got someone to produce the kind of machinery now that can reap many of our canes — something we could not do before, and possibly in the not too distant future we will find some other kind of machines that can work even in the undulating fields.

There is always hope in this industry, but this idea of thinking that we have to be looking to other industries, that we have had sugar long enough and we can sort of do without it, I do not think that is proper thinking at all. I think we have to stick with it as long as we possibly can.

I feel that what has caused people to be looking down on sugar is this: I have never been able to understand why in an agriculturally based economy — because agriculture is the base of our economy — why it is that Agricultural Science and agricultural theory are not taught in schools in Barbados. We are talking a lot about modifying the curriculum and so on, and we know that all things have to change if you want to develop, and the only school that I know of in this country that any Agricultural Science is ever taught is the Alleyne School in St. Andrew. Why could it not be taught at Harrison College, Lodge School, Queen's College and other schools too? Why can boys and girls not be introduced to something about agriculture in school? I feel if that were done people would have a completely different approach to agriculture.

I know I will possibly be hounded on this one — people will tell me that these schools are situated in St. Michael and there is nowhere people can practise agriculture, but they can learn agricultural theory and that in itself would make them interested more in the fields and the crops, and when they grow up they might be able to do something to help further the industry.

If you get the best brains in a country and some of those best brains are exposed to things in agriculture,

some of them may take it up, instead of everybody thinking of wanting to become a doctor or a lawyer. That is all they think about, they do not think of doing something for agriculture which is really vital to this country.

To think we can rest upon tourism and expect tourism to bring all this glory and greatness to us is, in my view, very short sighted, because it is a very volatile industry, and it is a fly-by-night — it can disappear overnight. If we have a few cases of smallpox or something like that in this island, we would not have any tourists at all, so I do not see how people can go thinking of basing an economy of a country on a thing as fickle as tourism when we have a basic thing like our agricultural crops.

What is more, the sugar cane is a plant, a sort of a grass plant, that is resistant to hurricanes. We are in a hurricane zone. When the hurricane comes, the canes will fall to the ground — but they will still grow, and when the hurricane is over the canes are still there. If we had cocoa, or copra, or coconut, I think we would lose the entire crop; so this idea of thinking that we can do without sugar is, in my view, very short sighted. We have lived with it for a long time and we will continue to live with it too.

As I said, talking about agriculture and the different approach to agriculture, if we could get the better students in this country to be exposed to that kind of learning, it would do a lot to re-emphasise the importance of it, and also to give it a sort of dignity. That is what it does not have now, and there is dignity in labour.

Another thing I would like to say is this: all this increase in crime and so on that we are having has to do, in my view, with something being wrong in our education system.

We spend so much money on education in Barbados. I saw in the Estimates that we spend about \$62 million on education, and I saw in the paper that it is \$99 million, and I see in the Estimates we spend about \$14 million on agriculture. I do not see how you could have that kind of imbalance.

I think a lot more money should be spent on agriculture than is being spent, and a little less on education, because we have to ask ourselves what are we producing when we spend all this money on education, what kind of people are we getting out of the schools? I think you will find that the type of people we are getting out of the schools are people that you really cannot depend upon as you used to be able to before.

I teach in a school myself and I can tell you that there is so much absenteeism amongst teachers in the schools nowadays. Nearly every day in schools you will find five or six teachers absent, and most of them are young teachers. Very seldom do you find the old teachers absent.

There is something very wrong with the system that we are producing now in schools, and when Senator McClean talked about autocracy and the autocratic approach in schools, he is talking about years ago; he is certainly not talking about today, because he is out of touch with what is happening in the schools today. There is not that kind of autocracy in our schools today at all.

There is a much greater liaison between teachers and pupils today than there ever was in all the years I have known here in Barbados, and we have Student Councils now that can go with their problems to the Headmaster or the Deputy Head and discuss things with him. Things have changed quite a lot from the time Senator McClean was at Combermere School.

It might be factual when Senator McClean mentioned that he knows as a fact that teachers do ask children to write things about where they come from and so on, and that, he argues, has nothing to do with the axiomatic truth that you go from the known to the unknown, because his argument is that the teacher does not know where some of the students have come from. That is not the point.

Whether you know where the student has come from or not, what you are trying to get the student to do is to write about what the student knows, not what you know, and once he writes about what he knows, then he would be able to express himself much more freely in what he actually knows. I do not see anything wrong with that as an educational idea to make a child proceed from the known to the unknown. It is done all over the world.

If a child writes and tells lies in what he writes, he would have told lies anyhow; but I do not think that that idea of telling lies and answering questions like that arises with the average child, because I have corrected some of these things and the children express themselves as best they know how. I do not see any harm done in that, and that is what teachers have done for all the years, as far as I know.

I would like to suggest that what is happening in our education today is that we are putting too much emphasis on science and technological things and you are placing too little emphasis on moral, ethical and spiritual things. I think that because the ethical and spiritual things are being discounted, that is why we are turning out the type of people we have — people that we cannot depend

upon, people you cannot rely on, people you cannot trust, people that will always try to get whatever they can as cheaply as they can, people who do not intend to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

All this comes as a result of discounting the moral, spiritual and ethical values, and that is what is wrong in our society today. And I would suggest to the Minister of Education, and to those concerned with education, to see what it is the schools are doing as far as religious teaching and Scripture are concerned.

You know, there are a lot of people who feel that Religious Knowledge should not be on the curriculum at all. They ask what will I do with a certificate in Religious Knowledge. People do not seem to understand that no man can truly call himself educated who is unaware of the facts as a religious experience of life. There is religious interpretation of life. You have to know something about that if you really want to call yourself an educated person.

I also feel that we are getting in our schools today, and this is where the trouble starts, a lot of teachers on staff — but how many of them ever turn out to any house prayers nowadays? Very few.

I can remember the time was when if we had 40 members of staff about 30 or 35 would turn out to prayers, but nowadays if you have 45 members of staff, if you get 8 or 10 out to prayers, you are lucky. This is what is happening, and what teachers do not understand is that it is example rather than precept that helps the child.

If a child sees that a teacher is not himself or herself coming out to prayers and that they have to go to prayers, after a time it means nothing to them, either because they say this is how my teacher behaves, or they do not think there could be much in it, and I think these are the things we have to look at.

I would suggest to the Ministry of Education that it is that serious omission to the exposure of ethical and moral training that is, in my view, the root cause of the majority of problems our country is now faced with.

There is one other thing I would like to say and it is about the polyclinics, and I heard Senator Greaves mention this when he was talking about the polyclinics.

I am at a loss to understand how a Government can talk about closing down certain sections of the polyclinics, that is, the walk-in sections where people are coming into various districts to relieve the congestion at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Now they cannot find enough money to keep them going, but right in the same newspaper, as soon as you read that, cheek

by jowl you see that the Government is going to build or is thinking of building a \$6 million polyclinic.

Now that does not make one bit of sense to me. It would seem to me that what you need is to try to do something for the people in the various outlying districts, those who would have to go all the way down to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for attention. You have these polyclinics in St. Peter, you have one in St. Thomas, one in St. Michael and so on, and I think you should do everything to keep these places open. I would like the Government to re-think their position on that, for after all it is the people who matter. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR Miss. J. CLARKE: Mr. President, I do not propose to speak to a number of points, but chiefly to be general in my contribution to this debate. The first thing I would like to say is that I was rather surprised that Senator McClean did not draw parallels between our economic scene and the international scene, because I would have liked to have heard him on the questions of the problems which we face, and which, obviously, have been a result of the international situation.

In looking at the performance of the local economy, I think that we must be conscious of the fact that a small developing nation such as ours cannot avoid the import of conditions which obtain in the developed countries of the world. To this end, we have to acknowledge that the problems which we face also face larger countries, but the difference is that we do not have the capacity, which the bigger countries have, to overcome these problems.

If we are to be honest with ourselves, we must acknowledge that the economic problems which face us, and indeed the world, would have been with whatever Government happens to be in power. To suggest otherwise, would first of all, be to have a total lack of understanding of what is happening around the world, but also would be a deliberate attempt to distort the facts.

The fact that an economic crisis is not unique to Barbados, and that all developing as well as developed countries are caught in the bind of world-wide economic decline, speaks for itself. What we must concern ourselves with, therefore, is the application of appropriate solutions, instead of trying to apportion blame. We should be closing ranks in the interest of the national well-being.

Mr. President, I believe that as responsible citizens, we must dispense with hypocritical pronouncements based on partisan leanings, and admit that there is no easy solution to our present situation. Even if, by some miracle, the international recession disappeared overnight, this would not mean that we could immediately return to a position of normalcy. I would therefore like to enter

a plea for meaningful debate at all times, with a view to the creation of a better climate of understanding as to what has happened, and will continue to happen, during the current period of world-wide recession.

Since ours is a fragile economy which does not have the resilience of bigger countries, which have a much broader economic base, and therefore much greater resources to counter the impact of recession, we have to be prepared to face the realities of the times and make necessary sacrifices, in order to prevent the development of greater problems.

I would therefore call on all Barbadians to act responsibly and put national well being before personal or political inclination. To this end, we have to be conscious of the fact that we run the risk of doing more damage to the economy, by virtue of locally or internally generated inflation than by externally generated inflation.

We cannot therefore afford to close our eyes to this fact, and we must understand and appreciate that since wages and salaries constitute a great significant proportion of the operating costs of business, in both private and the public sectors, we cannot, in all seriousness, conveniently criticise the cause of wage restraint and at the same time require the Government to do the impossible. Clearly, it must be understood that because of the size of the national wage bill, any unreasonable wage increases will have a very critical impact on the economy.

I have never understood how enlightened people in this community could imply that wage restraint means no increases or no increases for a certain sector of the labour force. But what is of even greater concern in this regard is the fact that such people will deliberately mislead the community for reasons best known to themselves. I call on such persons to desist from such acts and to put the country first and foremost in their scheme of things.

I am sure that all thinking persons appreciate that the Government cannot do the impossible. It therefore behoves us in this Chamber to act responsibly, and to forget posturing, so that we may better apply ourselves to the task which is before us.

We all know, Mr. President, that there is no easy method of generating much needed revenue to keep the ship of state afloat. We also know that there is no magic formula by which revenue lost in 1981, or indeed in any year, through a decline in earnings, for any sector of the economy, can be replaced. It is therefore essential that we face our problems squarely and dedicate ourselves to the task of preserving our economy, and ultimately the future

of our country, to the benefit of all citizens, whatever their religious or political affiliation.

Consequently, we must take our responsibility very seriously and avoid any possibility of misleading the people of this country by virtue of making statements, whether privately or publicly, which seek to capitalise on, or treat irresponsibly, matters of a serious nature.

Mr. President, I believe in the innate commonsense which is the basic characteristic of our people. I also believe that none of us would knowingly want to do anything which would be detrimental to our fellowmen. Nevertheless, I appeal to the Minister responsible for Information to take steps to implement and accelerate programmes geared to the development of a better understanding of the problems which face the country, and the Government, by all people of all walks of life.

If open government is to mean anything, and if democracy is to have a practical application, we must leave no stone unturned in pursuing a policy of education and information on national issues. I believe that the economic situation which faces our country today, and for some time to come, is sufficiently serious as to cause us, individually and collectively, to put our emphasis on needs rather than wants.

Furthermore, if we are to be effective in this regard, we must be prepared to tighten our belts even further, and be also prepared to accept necessary sacrifices in the spirit of national unity. We cannot, in all conscience, expect any Government to do the impossible, and therefore we have to make a conscious effort to appreciate that our failure to do so is to bury our heads in the sand, and to rely on some negative entity to generate a magic formula, which will allow us to live as long as we like without restraint and with no care for the public purse.

There is no doubt in my mind, that we are faced with a situation of an economic cake which has shrunk, and which therefore cannot produce bigger shares for all of us. The question must be asked, and answered, as to whether it is better for existing workers to receive smaller increases than they would like to enjoy, rather than insisting on higher and unreasonably and unaffordable increases enforcing inevitable lay-offs.

We all know, Mr. President, that man is by nature selfish, and so it is to be expected that we are generally preoccupied with our well being. Moreover, as our tastes for various services and commodities have been on the rise, we find ourselves in the position where we must all take stock of our individual situation so as to ensure that we do not allow ourselves to get carried away with our personal wants and desires, as opposed to our needs.

It follows, therefore, that all who are blind, or those who would not see, must surely understand that we cannot give more out of less and still expect all to share.

The problem of unemployment has been with us for a long time, Mr. President, and it is necessary that we continue to strive for reductions in the numbers of our people who are without work. We therefore have to be careful in our handling of our economy if the situation is not to be put in jeopardy.

The point is that we must be conscious of the dangers which can arise if some serious thought is not given to containing labour costs as a means of maintaining a reasonable level of employment in the face of reduced national revenue.

Mr. President, the Estimates which are before this Chamber suggest that a conscious effort has been made to keep costs down. I consider this to be an encouraging sign which indicates the degree of responsibility which needs to be extended throughout the society.

I believe, very sincerely, that responsible action must be the order of the day for some time to come. What is more, I feel we must look seriously towards the removal of any semblance of wastage in any form. We must therefore let our creative skills come to the fore, in a very true sense, so as to ensure that public administration is both cost effective and efficient.

The crisis which is upon us demands that we give serious attention to the need for running a tight ship of state so that for the future we can have the confidence of knowing that our public service is as efficient as it can be, and every dollar of Government expenditure is well spent.

As can be expected, Mr. President, any budgetary exercise can be agonising, even when all necessary financial inputs are readily available. When, however, there is some strain on the national purse, as is currently the case, it follows that the agony of cutting back in certain areas is more pronounced.

It is nevertheless necessary that we accept such acts in good grace, for as far as I am concerned, it makes no sense for Senators to call on Government to ease the situation in a number of areas which have special personal appeal but which, while being important, cannot be taken as being of equal or greater significance than the more fundamental areas.

Bearing in mind the losses suffered in tourism and sugar revenue in 1981, and the losses which are likely to occur in 1982, I find it difficult to understand how people can be critical of the size of the National Debt

and of the levels of taxation, and at the same time expect a continuation of Capital Projects, a reduction in unemployment, substantial increases in wages and salaries, improvements in health services and increased investment in housing construction, as well as the related increase in availability of funds for the purpose of financing mortgages.

Mr. President, I find it impossible to understand how we can expect to make demands which in effect, require Government to maintain, and indeed accelerate, existing levels of social and economic development in the kind of circumstances.

I estimate that we in this Chamber consider it a failure for us to believe that we can enjoy services without any restrictions at this time. We are mature people and therefore should be able to understand that we must get our priorities straight and cannot project national expenditure.

I would like to go further into certain Heads, on the significant cut back in Government's spending. Very serious consideration must be given to the matter of Government give-aways. I feel that many people are wasted and they feel that the world owes them a living, so we expect the Government to help them. Of course, we in this Chamber know that these things are not free and somebody must pay the cost.

I am concerned about this, Mr. President. I am convinced that many of our people do not appreciate and understand the value in what they are receiving, so little care is taken. I firmly believe that people should be made to pay for the goods they purchase themselves, and not only look to the Government.

While I appreciate there are people in great need — special assistance should be made available to these people. We should look very serious at all avenues with the approach in the interest of the economy and a greater display of personal responsibility on the part of individual citizens.

Mr. President, I am concerned particularly about the level of expenditure which is allocated to education year after year. I am not convinced that we are getting a reasonable yield on our investment I would therefore like to suggest that, bearing the fact that this high level of expenditure has been sustained for such a long time, that the time must be now ripe for us to take a second look at this.

I would like to suggest that some consideration be given to the thought of refusing the outlay of a period of time. It cannot be done all the time, but I think that it is important to place greater emphasis on the produc-

tion sector. I think we should take serious thought of this situation and we must realize that there comes a point in time where we might have to shift priorities.

I submit that agriculture, tourism, industry and manufacturing, all of these areas, would generate the revenue which supports the economy. If these areas are not strengthened, with some flexibility which allow us to cope with international recession, we are going to find ourselves in a very serious position.

We only have to consider what happened last year in relation to sugar. First of all it was the weather, the late start of the crop, and a question of the changing value of foreign currency which is after all, what we are concerned with. Having suffered a loss on foreign exchange, we had a Balance of Payments position which was problematic. This is why I would like Senator McClean to make a strong position in the area of foreign reserves.

In terms of tourism, the world right now has had a change in tourism, which, in effect, has had some impact in Barbados. I do not believe that our losses can be contributed solely by the fact that hotel rates are too high, because there are lots of specifics in the hotel industry which have to be looked at. I think we should take a very serious look into tourism overall. But I think we are going through a period right now where people are not spending money freely. In the past when the winter was particularly bad they were able to pick up their bags without having plans to do so previously.

The whole question of the economy is complex. Senator McClean stated that certain decisions taken by the Government have aggravated the situation. Whichever way you look at it, there is no easy formula. This is why I have tried this afternoon to make an appeal for responsible action. I do not think the world wide situation will remain this way, but we are not going to see immediate results for a while.

In terms of agriculture this loss suggested for sugar will plague us for some time to come. What we do today may have consequences for many years.

In the area of Government expenditure, greater care must be taken to get the best value for our money. In this regard, I would like that those statutory bodies be made to see drastic action, and they can be productive in the true sense of the word.

Housing is of great concern, and I notice that some Senators have made the point that West Terrace is a bit of a fiasco. Senator McClean has made a plea that certain parts be written off, that the building costs are too high. There is no easy solution because of the labour force and

there is a high degree of expenditure involved which relates to imports.

Sir, I am appealing to all Barbadians to be supportive of the measures which Government finds necessary at this time, recognizing that when it was possible to do better, better was done, and it will be done.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Lynch.

SENATOR Mrs. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, listening this afternoon to the contributions by various Senators, especially those who dealt with economic matters, I could not help repeating that in compiling the Estimates, even though I know it is necessary to have a considerable number of cuts this year, I would still have liked to see, in comparison with other items, greater emphasis on adult education.

I think I heard as I was going out the lady Senator opposite saying something about not getting returns for the money spent on education. Barbados has always placed a lot of emphasis on school education and I think that we need to realise that an important amount of learning is done out of school and that the reason we are having difficulty in the changes we want to make in education in other areas of development, is because the adult community will always act as a break.

We cannot, in a developing country, wait for a generation to grow up to bring about the changes we want. The world is changing much too quickly for that. What you have taught children in school, they are going to have to modify, to a considerable extent, very soon after they have left school, and they will have to go on modifying, and go on learning, and will often have to be retrained in the course of a lifetime.

I think, therefore, that we must realise that more has got to be done to keep the adult population properly informed and to teach — you know the new fangled politicians of today do not teach, they harang, they suggest — but they do not teach. The early politicians taught the people.

And if we are going to save our young people, if we are going to be able without a lot of conflict to get the necessary changes, the changes in attitudes, we have got to pay a lot more attention to the adults. I do not think this view is popular but it is one which in the light of my activities in the community is very necessary.

Of course, you know, Mr. President, I travel on things like buses and those mini vans and things of this sort, so that I hear what people are saying, and ever so often people have completely misunderstood the intention

of legislation passed. I think I have often mentioned this before, that we need to do a great deal more about seeing that legislation is understood and that people realise what it is intended to do.

I am happy nevertheless that education in the current revenue maintains its place at the head of the lean tables. I feel that given the situation, Government has done its best not to do too much harm to the processes that have begun.

I would like to point out that a great deal has been done to improve the facilities in what are commonly known as the newer secondary schools and that I see still the estimates for improving and building more primary schools, because there have been shifts in population and those new schools do not all represent increases in the number of schools, but rather the siting of schools in places where there are now needed because population has shifted to these new areas.

So long as the community is changing, and communities always change, but in our time they are changing very rapidly and we are constantly in touch with what is happening outside in a way we did not previously have to experience, therefore, our system, and our community in general, not only the educational system, will have certain conflicts and certain strains and what you see in our young people is confusion. The young people on the whole are confused.

Whenever you begin making changes in education, the children are at risk because you are trying out new ideas, trying out new types of organisation and I somehow feel that we should try to avoid a purely mechanical approach to these changes.

Children are receiving what I call conflicting messages. They hear one set of instructions and then they look into the community and they see adults doing all the things that they are being told they should not be doing. We have litter in the streets. Is it surprising that we also have litter in and around many school grounds?

In spite of the fact that there are more janitors and domestic staff in schools than ever before, more schools are more dirty than they were before. Who is taking the trouble to see that these children do learn to put their refuse in the bin and things of this sort?

What we hear is that the Sanitation Department or somebody will come around and clean it up, and the reason we have so much trouble with keeping the community clean, is because people do not realise, just as children do not, that the number of people to drop the litter are far more numerous than the people who clear it up. And we cannot get this improvement unless we have set personal responsibility for the things we want to see achieved.

I have heard long tirades in this and the Other Place on vandalism and many suggestions about its cure. Now, very near where I live, the wall surrounding the school is completely defaced by slogans and all kinds of advice, good and bad, which was put there during the last election campaign by supporters of both parties. Between May or June of that year until now, that writing which was done — some kind of indelible material was used to make these writings. It is still there, from then until now it is still there, in addition to the letterings on the back of bus stops all over the country.

Now, what do you think young people feel when they read how we have held forth in here on vandalism? — because we are giving the children inside that particular school a daily lesson in vandalism, and I would not be surprised if already, or in the very near future, you hear that that school has got a problem of vandalism.

Now, I hope that after I have said this, the Ministry of Communications and Works, or whoever it concerns, will see that those walls are cleaned, because this is the sort of contradiction with which we are confusing young people, when, in fact, their main handicap is that they are receiving very poor examples from us.

Disorderly scuffling to get in the buses, the veneer of civilisation seems to fall away as soon as the bus arrives. The weak, the old and the timid are thrust aside. Then we ask, "why do you not let old people travel all the time?" — it is an injustice to them to say that they can only travel during certain hours of the day. The truth is that we are probably preserving their lives. Certainly the bus conductors will give them more help when they find themselves in the midst of that melee.

There is widespread dishonesty, discourtesy, churches being burnt. Now, why are we preaching sermons to the young? They are not listening, or if they hear they are not heeding, because children learn by contact. What we should have to give them is men and women who by their own greatness, by their own thinking, by the stance they take before important issues, by the quality of the lessons they give the child, by the child's daily contact with them, teach them the important lessons of how to live.

We believe in talk. There is a lot of talk going on, but you can get very few people to take any kind of preventive action. There has to be a crisis, something has to be going wrong, we have to see a lot of people committing crimes and there has to be a few sensational articles in the Press before we think about doing anything.

Young people are not saved in that way. It is no use waiting until they have drifted into crime to set about

rehabilitating them. It is expensive and slow, and often ineffective.

I know that you would have remembered all the arguments and all the sensation about Dodds. I would like to say that although there are some deductions here in the Estimates for the running of that institution, a considerable sum of money has been spent in refurbishing those buildings, the staff are working with great dedication and there is considerable improvement at Dodds.

It is just not true to describe Dodds as a place which is lacking in humanity. In fact, I had the pleasure of having a little boy with me over the Christmas holidays and his behaviour would have done credit to a good home. He was able to mix with other guests and be comfortable, and I think he is overcoming his emotional problems and is at last beginning to speak. This is a boy of 13 years old.

I mention this because I want you to understand the kind of problem which the institution has to deal with. The children are not people who have just done wrong, they are children with so complicated and so sad a home background that you wonder that they can really be so pleasant and so cheerful when you get near them.

I hope that some of those people who did such a splendid job advertising their misery and their wrong doings will be willing to offer them a job in their newspaper office or something of the sort when they are ready to leave. The problem is that very often when they are ready to leave, there is no one to receive them, there is no home which they can really call home, so that you will hear a great deal about recidivism, but the fact is that the young people often go back to the very circumstances which first contributed to their pitiable condition.

These problems are not simple problems, and I should just like to indicate that there are only about 40 odd, not quite 50 boys there, and perhaps about five girls. So even though we lament at these things, the fact is that the problem is deep rather than wide, and that what we all have to do is to work in preventive services.

I am dealing with this at some length because we are sending our brightest students to our tertiary institutions. They are there for some years and when they come out they are full-fledged graduates. They expect to be paid for their qualifications, but they have had no time to give anything back. They share nothing with the less privileged young people in the society, and I think this is a matter at which we should look, because we have a right to expect much from those to whom much had been given.

The secondary schools have been having extensions, equipment, improved staffing, and some of these newer secondary schools are doing well. If you are going to judge them by the number of Barbados scholars produced, you will not think so, but the fact is that when they get students of high ability, they do produce results which compare quite favourably with the results which they would have got at one of the schools with which we have been more familiar.

In fact, these schools have a very special kind of contribution to make because the older schools have had a lot of experience in the production of bright students, but some of them are very skilled in getting rid of those students who present serious problems of any kind, problems of learning especially — there is a clause that says that people who for any reason fail to benefit, the Head may effect their removal.

When I was a Head, I used to say that the slower the child the longer it needed to be in school. You see, some of these regulations which existed before cut clean across the concept of free secondary education for all, because if schools do not learn to handle their slowest and their most difficult students, then this concept of equality of opportunity is a farce, or will be a farce, because children will be expected to remain in school to the age of 16.

Now the newer secondary schools, and to some extent the Fifth Form Girl's Schools, have had some experience in the handling of these children, and what will be new in our system is our ability to devise activities, programmes and a way of life for these children which they will enjoy, because I think that joy should be the outstanding characteristic of childhood.

Every child deserves at least one prize, that is, happiness at school, and truancy is often related to unhappiness at school. The problem may be at home, but sometimes it is at school that the child finds it difficult, to be very anxious to get to school where it is just going to fail at everything that it has put before it to do.

There is this new input to which I think all teachers have to address themselves. It is this study of the less able child, and the provision of an imaginative and stimulating course of activity for it that we have not really yet achieved.

There is the important matter also of work. Children formerly came out of school usually at the age of 14, when they were promptly apprenticed to a workman or the girls went to needlework. Now we are lengthening out the period of childhood.

To put it another way, they are being kept at school longer and they come out of school not ready to work. And it is that interval between coming out of school, leaving in some fashion, either at the end or dropping out, and foraging around, if you look at the ages of the people getting into trouble, where the problem starts.

These people at 15, 16 and 17 are the ones I think who should have a strong vocational content in those years at school to hold them there, and they should be ready to go into work when they step out of school. I should like to see them being registered for skills training during their final year at school, so that when they come out they can go straight into the skills training and are not just knocking around.

The police are to be congratulated for thinking up and initiating a scheme for dealing with the preventative aspect of training for these youngsters who get into trouble. I am not quite certain what the details of it are, but I know they are thinking about it.

I think all of us in the community, who are concerned about this problem, should not only see that our windows are well protected with iron grills. I think we should come out from behind those iron grills and get into the community centres, and try to share some of our skills and make contact, because what has happened in the society is that we are losing contact with each other.

Now in the old village situation, the simpler folk had a lot of contact with what we might call the middle class, for want of another way of putting it, but now we are making a break, and we are all collecting in separate districts and separate areas, and we are not communicating as we did before.

I know that there was in a debate here much talk about domestics. Nobody seemed to realise that that contact of the domestics with their employers often produced the type of person who trained their children and educated their own children as they had seen done in the homes of their employers. They had a certain amount of example and there was a certain amount of understanding. It was not all overwork and bad treatment. There were life-long friendships. The people who worked with you came back to see you after they left, and things of this sort. So there was an interaction, it has always been in the Barbadian community.

Even in the much discussed plantation system there was a kind of basic understanding between the Manager and his workers, in a way that we would not perhaps realise. It was not all tyranny and exploitation, there was often an under current of genuine understanding and good will. And I think we should try to preserve our

memory of those things, together with the memory of the best pleasant aspects of that period.

Some schools are being amalgamated, I think there are mainly primary schools now that are being amalgamated, and I think we should try to avoid a purely mechanical approach to matters of education. We are tempted to say, let us have this arrangement because it is more economical, it will cut down on expenses. But it is not very sensible to destroy schools in order to be more economical.

Work of that kind, handling amalgamation, requires sensitivity, imagination and clarity of aim which is understood by all the people who take part in that particular exercise. You are destroying the identity of two schools, and you are trying to build a new identity, but it is a traumatic experience for the people involved, and therefore it is not just a mechanical exercise. It has to be very sensitively handled.

One of the things that we are seeing is the need for wide selection of Headteachers. Headteachers are having to handle much bigger institutions than formerly, and they are handling a much wider collection of students, students from a very much more varied home background. The Headteacher now has to understand the changes going on in the society, because whatever is taking place in the society is going to be reflected in the school.

I notice there was some discussion here about children being asked to write compositions which disclose their home circumstances and things of this sort. Now in a school which is properly organized, this problem should not arise because of the initial interview which the Head should have with the parent or parents of the child.

I would have expected that a fairly clear picture of the child's circumstances — its potential, any handicaps or difficulties it might have, would have been fairly clear as the child enters the school. And one of the things that the child needs to grasp is that there is nothing to be ashamed of, that you know her home background, you know her home circumstances and you welcome her, accept their parents with them, and you impress on parents that the school will need — not that the school is going to demand that they come — the assistance of parents because they know their children better than the teachers do, and so you hope that they will come whenever necessary.

We need to have an entirely new approach, it can no longer be this business of hiding. When I went to school, children who had adverse circumstances, and whose circumstances were difficult, hid the fact. If their shoes had to be sent to the shoemaker, a letter came to the Head saying that because of unavoidable circum-

stances they could not attend school. They dared not say that their shoes were at the shoemaker.

Now we have got to get rid of all that kind of pretense and we have to remember that there is no use discussing the school system and the Common Entrance Examination. As soon as you say anything about education people start off talking about the Common Entrance Examination and there is a lot of lengthy discussion on that.

What is important is the inner life of our schools. I do not know who is taking a look at this. But it is really through the success of individual schools that you find evidence of the success of the system. The system does not exist up there in a vacuum by itself. It is what is happening in the individual schools that is important.

There should be no reason for children to have to strike or sit-out or things like that, because every school should have what I would call its system of communication. There should be somebody, a Form Mistress, Form Master, Counsellor, somebody, to whom a child goes to very naturally if there is a problem. You do not have to strike because it is your school, and you are going to be able to say what you would like your school to be, and have the responsibility of helping to make it as near your heart's desire as you would like.

It is the children's school. The children should be at the centre of the school, and I greatly deplore the growing tendency to involve children in the disputes of adults. The Headteacher's philosophy and skill are a most important factor in creating the atmosphere in which teachers and children can function happily, and in which they live and grow.

Not only the child has to grow, the teachers also have to grow, too. There is a great deal of frustration and unhappiness among teachers and although I heard the learned Divine saying that there was no autocracy and so on in the schools, I do not accept that. There are still some Heads who in practice, if not in theory, convey the message, "yours not to make reply, yours not to reason why."

It is a waste of time acquiring the services of highly qualified persons if all you wish from them when they arrive in the Staff Room is a robot-like existence. I really do feel that we need a lot more communication between, not only the Heads of Departments, but between staff and Heads.

In fact, the youngest and sometimes the person who seems the least important teacher, the one who most recently arrived, the youngest teacher is often the one whose opinion is most valuable. That teacher is nearest to the children in age, and it becomes increasingly

difficult as one grows older, and have a sounder knowledge of both good and evil, to see life through the eyes of the child. The child looks at life entirely differently from an adult, and we must make an effort to speak the language of the child and see through the eyes of the child.

I should mention that I have been asked, and really I heard a comment on Speech Day about the Curriculum Development Council. There are important changes being made on curriculum of schools and the Curriculum Development Council which was set up by the then Minister, Mr. Erskine Sandiford, continues to function. It meets every month and committees of teachers have drawn up the syllabuses and curriculum guides.

It is not true that Religious Knowledge is no longer taught in schools. What is true, is that there are now many subjects on the curriculum and there has to be a choice, usually after second or third form. So children do study Religious Knowledge, but some will probably have to drop it because there is a subject choice. Certainly, it is very much on the curriculum of primary schools, although you may not learn as many passages by heart as we did when we were children.

I know that the President wants me to conclude as soon as possible, but I must mention that I notice a reduction in the Estimates for Erdiston College. We must realize that with all the changes taking place in education, the preparation of the teacher is a vital matter. I believe that a residential teachers college is really the best, but we do have to face our economic problems. It is all right if we do that, provided we are honest and say this is not the ideal but it is what is necessary, and it is very likely that the college will not be residential. That will mean that special steps will have to be taken for people to be there, perhaps lengthening the day, or some special arrangements, so that they can have their cultural activities in order that when they go to the schools they do not carry the attitude that you just teach children and depart, and not have this rather closer association which you have with extra curricula activities.

What is necessary now, in a period which is perhaps one of difficulty, is to remember that this experience of unfavourable economic climate has occurred at various times in the history of our island. It is not new. Just as the people before us were able to meet their problems, and Barbados was able to continue to make progress and get over its difficulties, we in our generation must show similar courage, common sense, and must have faith in ourselves and in our ability to build a future.

Whatever initiatives may be prepared to help the Caribbean, whatever help may be offered us, in the final analysis it is what we do for ourselves, what we do for ourselves is worth much more than what others may try

to do for us. I hope that we will show a love of our country.

I am cutting my speech short, Mr. President, and I don't want to touch on CARIFESTA, but one of the things which shocked me in the CARIFESTA exercise, was the way in which we ourselves seem to see only the negative side of what was taking place.

We missed the joy of Community Contact Day, Barbados' special contribution to the Carifesta exercise, and the tremendous impression which it made on all the guests whom I met. We said nothing about the wonderful contacts which we found as we wandered through the exhibition rooms, and of the great joy of seeing the West Indian family being united.

I am an unrepentant Federationist. I look forward to the day when we will no longer be asking St. Lucians, Vincentians, and Jamaicans and our fellow West Indians to leave our shores. I hope we will make our way back some time, to being once more a West Indian family and being able, when we go to join in the North-South Dialogue and talk about expecting richer countries to assist us, to say that we did for each other; that we helped each other, because I do not see why we should dare to expect other countries from far off to help us when we refuse to help each other in the Caribbean.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons.....

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. President, I am not going to make the usual type of Estimates speech. There will be a number of opportunities in weeks ahead for me to deal with various aspects of government expenditure. What I want to do is just clarify the record of these proceedings, in one or two respects.

Yesterday afternoon, Mr. President, there seemed to have been a misunderstanding between Senator Hall and myself in respect to the playing field to be established at Belfield. Senator Hall said that at no time did we have the opportunity to discuss the Belfield matter, there speaking of the National Sports Council and himself a member of the National Sports Council. I rose on a point of order to say that he was laboring under a mistake and I think Senator Hall misunderstood the point I was making. Let me just set the record straight.

The National Sports Council has not had a directive, in writing, from the Minister responsible for Sport as to the nature and extent of the development that he desires at Belfield. To that extent, the members of the National Sports Council would not have known what is desired by the Minister. But on March 11, the Minister, Director of Sports, Permanent Secretary, Miss Farnum from the Ministry and myself met and discussed the Ministry of

Sports Estimates and it was indicated then that it would likely be given a subvention of \$400 000 for Capital.

Sir, it is clear that those are really not development funds in terms of sports development. But there are a number of playing fields whose sites have been acquired by the Ministry of Housing and Lands for which plans will have to be made within the next few years for the gradual and systematic development of sporting facilities.

What was decided is that there would be some playing field development this year but not as extensive as in the past. But in terms of priority, Belfield would be the highest on the list, number one on the list, for sports development this year.

It was then decided on the Thursday afternoon that the following week — I was not in the island — but I think it was the Wednesday, the following week — the Minister and representatives of the Sports Council's day to day management would go to Belfield and look over the site to see the need for further acquisition of land to make it into a proper and adequate sporting complex. This was done, Sir, and I think newspaper photographs and television coverage appeared of the visit of the Minister and representatives of the Council.

But Senator Hall is right to the extent that the Sports Council, as a body, does not yet know, but the Chairman and the Director have had indication from the Minister, Sir. That is the first point, Sir.

On the second point of Senator Hall's contribution yesterday dealing with sport, Sir, he said he was worried that this Government has not cleared the air on the vexed question of South African apartheid in sport. I am not sure to what length Senator Hall expects the Government to commit itself, but within days of the "Dirty Dozen" going to South Africa and the news reaching Barbados, the Prime Minister, himself, made a public statement to the effect that none of those English cricketers who are presently in South Africa would be allowed entry to Barbados. That, I think, makes the Government's position clear and having regard to the principles of the Gleneagles Agreement.

It was said by Senator Hall, Sir, that Jamaica and Guyana have very clear positions. I have with me a speech of the Minister responsible for Youth and Community Development, the honourable Errol Anderson in Jamaica, delivered on Thursday, March 18 to a meeting of ODILAC in Jamaica, and these are the words of the Minister of Sport in Jamaica, Sir:

"We have taken the position quite clearly and unequivocally that none of the English cricketers now taking part in that pirate series in South

Africa will be allowed to come Jamaica to play cricket or participate in any other sport."

It seems to me that the Jamaican position is exactly in harmony with the Barbados position, Sir, and I do not believe that at this stage there is need for me to say more on that, Sir.

On the question of West Terrace, an allusion was made to the development of West Terrace while I happened to be Chairman of the National Housing Corporation, Sir. I want to just make the record perfectly clear.

I left the Chairmanship of National Housing Corporation in August, 1979. At that time the National Housing Corporation was seized of the land for development at West Terrace and had commissioned Richard Gill Associates to do a plan of the roads for West Terrace.

When I left that was the stage at which that development had reached. I am not — although my back is broad and I am willing to take some political blows — I am not taking any political blows on West Terrace when I do not know what happened after Richard Gill was commissioned and I believe the roads may have been put in by COW Williams. All about the house building is not within the purview of my knowledge, Sir, so I am going to have to see those who succeeded me.

Sir, finally on Dodds. I am grateful that Senator Lynch was able — well, she was not able — Senator Lynch has always been very interested in proceedings at Dodds, not only by reason of the fact that she was a member of the Board of Visitors, but out of her own sense of humanity she always took a deep interest in Dodds.

And what is particularly disturbing is especially the way in which members of the Press carry out their responsibilities in Barbados.

After the fire in early January 4, 1980 at Dodds, and the riots, a departmental commission was set up under my Chairmanship and without gloating over it, Sir, I read the Riot Act to the boys at the very first meeting after my appointment.

We had a series of meetings and we wrote a Report and we made 32 recommendations, many of which have been implemented by the Ministry, many of the short-term recommendations have been implemented. The medium and long-term recommendations have not been dealt with and I see no provision in these Estimates for looking at what is really a matter of social development planning, but I will have a lot of things to say about that later on Sir.

But, the Press in this country, and particularly the Nation newspaper highlighted....(Aside)... I am a shareholder in it yes, but I can criticise it. People are married to wives, and criticise wives and quarrel with them. There is nothing wrong with that. All in the family....the Nation newspaper, Sir, highlighted the problems at Dodds, blew them out of proportion and gave the boys in Dodds an over meaning sense of their own importance and made heroes out of them.

This country has not heard any adverse comment, has not witnessed any deterioration in the standards at Dodds since my Committee reported in June, 1980. Indeed, I believe Dodds has settled down, and in many respects it is very much like the Dodds that I knew when I was a compulsive....(Laughter).... when I was compelled to be – Yes, they wanted to hear that, Sir – when I was compelled to be an inmate there in my father's house, Sir.

And, I really think that it is an abdication of journalistic responsibility for the Nation newspaper and the Advocate, and indeed CBC and all of them, not to have done a follow-up so that the general public could see what has happened to Dodds since the riots in 1980, and to learn that the situation has ameliorated.

I wish to compliment, Sir, the staff at Dodds who have done a fantastic job, in my view, in bringing those boys back on the rails, and seeing that they are no longer threats to the open community. (Applause)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, before I reply to the various points made in this Honourable Chamber yesterday and today, I want to spend just five minutes and talk about the Public Service which gets knocked about so much.

My former friends and colleagues, Sir, the National Union of Public Workers....(Aside)....I am still a member, but Senator Simmons said that we could be in the same household and have different points of view....both the President and the General Secretary at the last Annual Conference had a lot to talk about the Public Service and what should be done in the Public Service and what ought not to be done in the Public Service, and all kinds of things. Everybody, within the last week or so, was an authority on how best to get civil servants to work, and what they do not do right.

Now, appointments in the Public Service as re-defined by the constitutional amendment of 1974, the new Public Officer, as defined, does not include temporary officers, it does not include unestablished staff and this seemed to have given great offence to the Union.

The truth of that is that the Barbados Labour Party never joined in the move to take half the Civil Service out of the constitutional supervision of the Public Service Commission. In 1974, you well remember the great speeches where the Public Service Commission, the Judges, everybody were abused, and this was one of the results of that great abuse.

Now that they have it, now that the present Administration has established the Constitution Review Commission and that Commission has reported, recommending that all public officers go back to the old definition, now that something is being done with public officers, we are hearing that the Government is wrong, there is political interference and this kind of thing.

The people who now complain, forget that the real reason for the constitutional amendment was to save the seat in St. Michael South Central, and they barely saved it by 20 votes. The amendments made way for the then Minister of Education to put 94 people into the School Meals Service, personally from St. Michael South Central, and still he only won the seat by 20 votes, so we know that this thing of appointing friends does not work. That was one of the real reasons behind that amendment, to save St. Michael South Central.

The union seems to be at some loggerhead, because one part of the union says that all persons should go back to the Public Service Commission, that the present arrangement where the Chief Personnel Officer has to operate outside the scope of the Service Commissions, and make these appointments is wrong, and the other half of the Union is saying that the Public Service Commission method is slow, that people cannot get appointed, and all that kind of stupidity.

I just want to say that the NUPW and the people who talk will have to decide which system they want, because the old Public Service Commission in two years, between 1980 and 1981, only managed to organise 47 promotions in the Public Service. So when the union and the other people who talk about the greatness of the independence of the Service Commissions, they must realise that they are condemning themselves to a system which does not operate quickly, that if you want the independence of the Public Service Commission you will have to tolerate having 47 promotions in two years.

And there is no point trying to blame the political directorate, because it is none of our concern, except that we regret these things happening to citizens. But the Public Service Commission and the other Commissions have their protection from politicians, and they are laws unto themselves. The only recourse the poor Ministers have is to change the Commissions every five years.

When, in 1975, the Civil Service was divided down in half, it was found that there were some 1300 people who fell out of what was then the Civil Service and became unestablished and otherwise. It is none of our fault, and like Senator Simmons we are not taking any tack for that. The former Administration took away their rights and they must blame them. All we can do is promise to have them restored whenever the amendments to the Constitution are being instituted.

We heard, Sir, that there is a policy of unemployment in the Public Service. In 1976 the Public Service stood about 16,000 to 17,000 people. At present it is near 24,000 people in five years, but they say there is a policy of unemployment. When the Civil Service at present employs just under a quarter of the 100,000 people who work in Barbados, how can we talk about a policy of unemployment in the Civil Service?

Then we come down to last week in the Other Place, and the matter which has to do with immigration. You see headlines in the newspapers about immigration and all the things that happen or do not happen in immigration, and at first we thought something had gone wrong. Then we discovered that a spokesman for the other party in the Other Place was charging that there are a number of people who acquire citizenship before they get to Barbados.

I would not call him ignorant, I would merely say he does not know, because the Constitution of this country makes it clear in Section 2(2), Section 3(1), Section 5 and Section 6, that there are a large number of persons who are entitled to be citizens of Barbados. There is no question of discretion, they are entitled to be citizens of Barbados wherever they live, and at present large numbers of Barbadians who have migrated to Britain seek citizenship while in Britain for their children who were born in England.

This is a matter of course, it happens every day, there are hundreds of these people, but then we have this representation brought up to make it appear as if it is something mischievous and you are only carrying out the provisions of the Constitution of Barbados.

If they come from New Delhi, from Hong Kong or from the Moon — it does not matter. The Constitution makes no racial difference, and we really cannot understand how it is possible to take a straightforward application of the law and have it blown up as if something had dropped out in Barbados.

The spokesman in the Other Place also spoke about persons who were granted work permits without ever being in Barbados. Let all know from now that there is a

definite policy of not granting work permits to people who are in Barbados. You have to apply from outside, and there is nothing new in that.

Nobody goes to Britain and then seeks to get an entry certificate. You do not go to America and apply for a green card from Washington. You do not try to get residence in Canada by living in Vancouver. You apply from outside, and the same law applies in Barbados.

You apply from outside and that is the position; so if that is being mischievous, I do not know, but that is the position from here on. If you are in Barbados and you apply for a work permit, you will leave while it is being processed, and the law will be amended to make sure that it remains that way.

The other specific raised during the abuse of last week was the deportation of some Indian, and we are told that this was cited as one of the cases of malpractice in the department, the deportation of a man from Grenada called Makdah. The name was mentioned, so we can trace it easily.

Now the straightforward history of Makdah, Mr. President, is that Makdah's grandfather was a citizen of Barbados. About three years ago Makdah gave his grandfather legal custody of his child and sought to have permission for the child to stay in Barbados with the grandfather, and that was granted.

Some time after, Makdah sought to become a resident of Barbados and his application was not approved. He then got very clever and sought to become a citizen of Barbados, and one bright officer recognised the changing around of names, because Indians have ways of putting their names in different orders and seeking to confuse you.

The man was called in and it was discovered that what he was trying to do was to use his grandfather's documentation to become a citizen of Barbados, and he was aided and abetted by two persons who swore affidavits before a Justice of the Peace saying that they knew him as a person residing in Barbados since 1970. In cross-examination he admitted he had never come to Barbados before he made application and he was deported.

So rather than compliment the young public officer who recognised the wickedness of this man, we hear that the Immigration is wrong to deport Makdah. If we cannot deport a man who seeks to get Barbadians to swear false affidavits, a man who seeks to use his grandfather's documentation to become a citizen, whom can we deport? But there is this kind of foolishness that we have got to tolerate in this country.

Over the past few months, we have been doing a continuous public relations programme to enlighten the public as to what we are doing and what we are not doing in immigration. At present, several amendments to the law are being drawn up; they will come to Parliament in the very near future for the purpose of strengthening what we consider the weaknesses in the law.

At present, it is the practice to have the names of all persons who become citizens published in the *Official Gazette* so that the mischief makers can easily check the *Official Gazette*, if they do not want to make mischief, to see who are citizens and who are not citizens. One only has to open the Gazette to check and see who have become immigrants and who have not become immigrants, one only has to check the *Official Gazette* to see who are granted work permits and what the permits entitle them to do in Barbados.

It is very difficult to understand how, in the face of all the information which we make public, that idiots can walk around day and night talking foolishness about what happens in immigration. I am not referring to the Senators in here, Sir; they are gentlemen, nor to anybody in the Lower House. But we have got to tolerate all this kind of foolishness in immigration.

At present, we are preparing a new Travel Documents Act to which some publicity has been given to before, to make it clear who can be granted passports in Barbados and who cannot be granted passports, because now that the matter has been researched, except for the provision of Section 22 of the Constitution which says that we cannot interfere with the movement of people in Barbados, there seems to be no legal authority for the granting of passports to anybody in Barbados. Somehow, the lawyers are of the opinion that the granting and the not-granting of passports is a pure ministerial discretion. But we do not consider that that is proper and we want to get that regularised. That is one of the problems we inherited.

The country became independent in 1966, the Citizenship Act was passed the next year, in 1967, but they never saw fit to pass a Passports Act, so passports are given on the basis on which you were granted independence without any real legal base, and we hope to have that corrected. (Asides)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, the Chair protects you all the time from interruptions, and you are trying to interrupt all the time. Let us have some order. There is a Standing Order against interrupting a member when he is speaking. Please observe it.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Back to the question of Indians for a minute. We also hear

that there is a list of Indians who entered Barbados illegally. Now, Mr. President, would you believe that Immigration Officers took their time to go through the records to find out which Indians had not left Barbados as scheduled? A list of these Indians was prepared and the Cabinet was notified of the number of persons and there was great publicity of the matter. As a result some Indians left and others sought to get their stay regularised.

Some time after, a revised edition of the list was done, and that revised list prepared by the Immigration Department was made available to the Muslim Society and the Hindu Society, and they were told as far as we were concerned in Immigration, "you had these Indians hiding somewhere in Barbados, we would like you to have them regularised or get them out of Barbados."

Then, that list was taken up and used as evidence against the very department that prepared it. That borders very closely on dishonesty. What kind of honest thinking person could take up a working document by a department and then suggest that it is a magic document somebody sneaked into somebody's hand about some secrecy about Indians? It was prepared by Immigration, and we made it available to the Indians so that they would know that we knew whom we were looking for. Then it turns up as a magic document about people who were sneaked into Barbados. But enough on immigration, Sir. There are other matters to deal with.

Mr. President, I do not like to make sport at people. Some time ago when Senator Hall, a great sportsman of yesteryear, sought to get his name associated with playing facilities for that part of Barbados which he sought unsuccessfully to represent, I warned him then that he was on a bad wicket and batting late, because the representative of the people in Belfield had already made representation. (Asides) I heard that, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Proceed.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I told him then that the representative for the people of Belfield had made the necessary representations to the Ministry of Lands to acquire the necessary facilities, and that the people of Belfield would get their facility. His problem is that when the facilities at Belfield are provided later this year, he is going to be in trouble.

He does not want to go to Belfield and play on the pitch because the fellows would say that he is playing on Vic Johnson's playing ground. He does not want to stay away because the fellows will say he does not come by us now that we have a cricket pitch at Belfield. He is in a

confused state about what to do. Well, that is not my problem, that is his problem.

You see, Sir, he makes a lot of sport in this place, like yesterday he got up and said he had a master plan to take the children in Barbados off the road by taking them to play road tennis — but that is the kind of representation you get from down there.

Senator Greaves, Sir, queried whether or not there was going to be a swimming pool at St. Cecelia when the housing area is completed and I would not have thought he would have been interested at all in swimming because he cannot swim. But Senator Hall, the spokesman, Sir, came in here again and questioned whether the swimming pool should have been gone through with.

Now, how can you rectify this? The representative of the National Sports Council, big spokesman, and he is wondering whether people in St. Cecelia, the low income people, the people from terra firma should have a swimming pool. They will get a swimming pool, too.

On the question of apartheid in sport, Sir, I just want to say that we make a lot of big speeches about the "Dirty Dozen", and I do not recognise any team from Britain as the "Dirty Dozen". I see it as a full and accredited team from the MCC, and we had better get that straight. But I can see, Sir, that within the next two years, we are going to see two sets of cricket being played in the world and England will be in both. I just want to say this about the apartheid business — we talk about the cricketers who go to South Africa but I still notice that the local Press still give the tour in South Africa as much coverage as almost they gave to the Shell Shield. Now, what kind of foolishness is this? It is the "Dirty Dozen", it is wicked, it is blood money — but the local Press gives it as much coverage and publicity as other tours. Now, either we are making sport at the people for whom they are writing or we are absolute idiots in Barbados in the news business.

Senator Hall also talked about the B.M.C. He talked a lot. When Senator Hall was speaking, I was reminded of Shakespeare's Caesar. A fellow went to a public meeting and he came back and asked Casco what happened, and he said, "Cicero spoke." And he said, "what did he say." And he said, "Cicero spoke." He said, "What did he say, he spoke in Greek?" and the fellow said, "whatever he said, it was Greek to me." And when Senator Hall was speaking it was Greek to most of us, he just spoke and spoke and spoke.

That part of it, Sir, that was not Greek was when he spoke about the BMC selling rum at the airport. What is wrong with a Government Corporation that is in the retail business having one of its shops at the airport?

One of the objects of the BMC is to have an influence on the prices in this country. It is tried in Bridgetown through the supermarkets and it is done at the airport through the Duty-Free Shop. It is put right beside the Duty-Free Shops and therefore has some influence on the prices which the other Duty Free Shops will charge to tourists and they tell me that in the meantime they make a piece of change for the Government so that they do not need the big subsidies they used to need under the days of the Democratic Labour Party.

Senator Hall will even have us believe, Sir, that when the BMC was losing money in 1971 — 1974, when the BMC was putting lots of the taxpayers money down the drain that it was endemic, Sir. That is what he said, Sir. He even got mixed up, Sir, in saying that the BMC was created by his own party. I do not know why he does not check his party history.

The other Senator, Sir, was a bit concerned about the housing projects. He was worried about what will happen to Lammings and Maynards and all of these things as if it is anymore of his business. But, nevertheless, Sir, the housing projects at Lammings and Maynards will be continued and the one at St. Cecilia will also be finished.

The one which got the most knocking, even from Senator McClean, was the West Terrace Project. The question of having a full scale movement of the land at West Terrace to put houses was not done because somebody woke up and had a bad dream. The professional advice on that was the correct way to put houses there was to do it that way — that that was the best way to do it and the cheapest way to do it. I am not an engineer, Sir. I am not prepared to argue with engineers who have their professional integrity to defend, but if they say so, we are prepared to take the advice of those persons who know what they are doing.

A general matter of interest, Sir, is what people call the National Plan, the proposal to preserve part of the East Coast for a park. It seems to have got out somehow that there is going to be one big massive park stretching all across the East Coast of Barbados. I do not know why Senator Greaves thinks so. What is happening is that the East Coast is being examined with the view of having some of it reserved, but it is not going to be a massive park stretching from St. Lucy to the Crane — half of Barbados would be a park. There is a study being done at present and it is expected that by the end of the year that will be completed.

On the question of Education — Sir, I will go quickly now — Senator Hall refuses to take advice. I was trying to tell him, Sir, when he was on his feet, that the Charges of Debt was not the highest spender in the

Estimates. He shouted down some loud asides to tell me that he knew what he was doing and it was clear to me, Sir, that Senator Hall did not know what he was doing and it was clear to me, Sir, that Senator Hall did not understand that if one wanted to know how much money was being spent that he only had to add the Current Expenditure that he is looking at to the Capital Expenditure, and he could easily find out how much money was being spent in this country. But Senator Hall would not wait to learn — Senator Greaves could have taught him that, even Senator Greaves could have taught him that, Sir — and he was trying to make sport at me even without trying to find out what he was talking about.

On the question of a reduction of the allocation for universities and higher education, there are two things to that, Sir. One is that it is not considered that as many persons will be given leave this year to study some of the subjects which have been taken before and therefore we do not need to pay for it. Secondly, in terms of higher education grants, persons are being encouraged to use the Students Revolving Loan Fund. So in that case, it is not a cut back as such, but there is a shifting from the grants on to the Students Revolving Loan Fund.

Senator Greaves complained about the flooding of the roads. The flooding of roads is now a matter of work attitudes. People in this country have been taught, with the assistance of Mr. Greaves party, that manual work is something to be looked down on, that it is for slaves — the cutting of canes, the digging of wells. The result of that, Sir, is that there are no well diggers available for the Ministry of Transport and Works. In fact, the few wells which are being dug and cleaned in Barbados are being dug and cleaned by foreign labour, because we have gotten so sophisticated that we don't dig wells anymore, so we flood the roads. But that takes a whole re-education of people, if we are going to do that.

To the question of cotton, cotton never came on big in Barbados and never should have started again. Even when other people stopped planting cotton, the A.D.C. was still fighting with it because the Government thought it should push diversification of cotton. The equipment is still at Spencers, I am told that you cannot get people to reap cotton and therefore there is no point in planting something you cannot reap. You cannot reap it mechanically because the cotton which we grow here will not grow at an even height, the way they expect it to grow in some countries which use mechanical harvesting. So therefore mechanical harvesting is out.

But Senator Hall who spoke at length, Sir, also tried to suggest that the other areas of agriculture were not producing anything. He tried to suggest that since the present Administration was in office, that agriculture has been going down and down.

Now in 1975, Sir, this country produced 1.1 million kilos of carrots. In 1981 it had gone to 2.1 million kilos of carrots, almost 100 per cent increase. In 1975, Sir, we produced 422 000 kilos of beans. That has gone to 510,000, that is 2.205 per cent increase. In 1975 we produced 718 000 kilos of cabbage and that has gone to 1.3 million kilos in 1981. Cucumbers have gone from 900 000 kilos to 1.8 million kilos and that is the general trend of production in Barbados. But we can feel free to come in here and make wild statements that agriculture is going down and there is nothing to show for agriculture.

Senator Greaves raised the question of the derelict vehicles. Just let me inform the Senate that arrangements are being made to move the car museum to a place in Cave Hill where proper arrangements will be made for the storage of these old cars, and take them off President Kennedy Drive. So what is now the eyesore will be no more. Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, its half past six in the evening before Budget Day and I am not likely to indulge in any lengthy reply, even on a day when a number of questions might have been posed, and when a number of alternative suggestions might have been put forward.

I am closing at the end of a long debate which has been characterised by the efforts of one Opposition Senator to prove and he did it successfully — that he could speak half an hour longer than the other — without at any point saying that if you want to emphasise this, it ought to be reflecting your expenditure, perhaps at this level; and if you want to de-emphasise that, then I can understand why there is the cut back, there, and we would suggest so and so.

None of this language came from Senator Hall or Senator Greaves for the entire eight and a half hours in which they spoke many a word. Further in that content, Sir, it should not be difficult for me to fit my reply neatly in the half hour which I propose, Sir.

I listened with interest to Senator McClean's contribution and the fact of the matter is I, like Senator McClean, do not like high interest rates and there are a lot of things, I don't like, and I am talking here about the policy of the Government and the policy of Government as we have seen it put into operation.

The simple fact is that I understand the Government being nervous enough when certain indices appear, and that what Senator McClean may regard as undue heed is paid to the advice of the World Bank or the IMF. I

understand very well the points he made but he must see the other side and that is the examples of Jamaica and Guyana staring us in the face. The Government, at least the Barbados Labour Party Government, is going to err on the side of caution rather than follow a line which in other circumstances it would have taken.

Sir, I believe that that is a total response indeed to what Senator McClean was arguing, because it really comes down, not too much to the technicalities of economics of which the Senator would know far more than I would have begun to learn, but it comes down to the broad lines of economics and the approaches which people are prepared to take, against the background of not only given economic circumstances, but political circumstances.

Senator McClean, in the course of his comments, also took time out to deal, rather effectively, I thought, with Senator Greaves' approach to the output of the Statistical Department. I don't understand, Sir, why Senator Greaves, or anybody else, should consider that the Senate is an appropriate forum to cast doubt on the performance of professionals, when the Senator knows it is the performance of professionals.

It does not seem to me, Sir, to make any sense to say that merely because I feel it in my gut that unemployment is not as low as the statisticians say it is, then the statisticians are wrong and unemployment is higher, because that is all that Senator Greaves said. Perhaps, if he had a gut the size of mine, one could pardon him, but he is too small a man to be trying to pit that against the wisdom of statisticians.

Again, we have had that whereas Senator Hall was concerned — rejection of published data not a questioning of the basis on which the data is compiled, but an out of hand rejection to published data, as though he had some secret information that permits him to throw it out the window and to advise all of us that it ought to be treated in that way.

And so, we have Senator Hall's discursions on teenage pregnancies among girls at school, and we have discursions on teenage pregnancies generally, and then we have the comments about immigration coming from Senator Greaves and we have the comments about drugs and the police coming from Senator Hall. I am making these references, Sir, because from those two Senators, we have had to put up with eight and a half hours of comment, unsubstantiated in almost every detail. Senator Hall, in fact, at one point was so enthusiastic about what he was saying that he actually crossed the line, but that is behind us.

Both Senators regaled us with some stories about the 1981 General Elections and I listened with interest,

because I was an unsuccessful candidate in 1966 and in 1971 and I know of the difficulties of getting people registered, and I know of walking in and seeing a politically hand-picked presiding officer and hearing him tell a woman when she said to her husband that she should vote for me, started asking the woman whether she was sick, whether she was incapacitated and a lot of nonsense, which he had not asked before agreeing to have her husband vote for her, which, in my view, is fraudulent behaviour. So, I am not talking about anything which I cannot prove either.

So, I mean, to come in here and to talk as though because you lost, the election is corrupt — I mean I have never said that the Election in 1966 nor in 1971 was corrupt. You went out there to win a seat, you failed to win a seat, you might have got beaten badly, you might have failed narrowly. It does a lot for your ego if you do not get beaten too badly, but at the same time you lose. There is no second place in this. You win or you lose.

But, it does not do the name and the reputation of the country any good just because you lost to come back in here and talk foolishness, about you must do this about the electoral process, and you must do that about the electoral process.

A lot of people, Sir, a lot of people who won has supporters who were unable to cast their vote, but we behave as though everyone who was unable to cast a vote was going to the polls specifically to vote for us. How do we know it? Even if the man was canvassing for you, you cannot tell who he is going to vote for.

Roy Ward Prescod ran in St. John, Sir, they said he had 22 canvassers and he got 21 votes. I know good, old Eric St. John to be walking into a rum shop and hearing a man with a serious bet, "I bet you Eric St. John does not get 100 votes" and when he looked, the voice was the voice of his chief canvasser and the \$20 in his hand being wagered was his \$20.

So, we cannot come in here and talk, Sir, as though we are political infants. If Senator Hall were to do it, I would believe that there was reason for it. I could understand that if Senator Hall believed that everybody who did not vote in St. Michael West Central was going to vote for him. I would understand that. Next time around, he might find out, it is not so easy, you do not even lose by a busload. (Laughter) You lose by a lot of votes. You lose by a lot more second time, sometimes.

But, I think, Sir, we have to get off this business. You run for a seat and you do not win, you run and you win. In each case you can find that there are people who did not have the opportunity to vote because the perfect system has not yet been arrived at.

Generally in Barbados there is absolutely no doubt that elections are not fraudulently conducted. There is absolutely no doubt, and far and away if you see the percentage terms, the very, very minute minority that this is not true of. Far and away everybody gets a chance to get out there and cast a vote.

But, one of the things that happened in 1981 was of particular interest to me because from the platform of the Democratic Labour Party people were being told, "Do not go in there and vote with that pencil that you see in the booth. If you vote with it, they are going to know how you vote." So, some of Senator Greaves' people went, did not want to vote with it and confused the poor presiding officer so he could say that you cannot mark with a pen. (Laughter)

I was agent for Mr. Bolden in St Joseph, Sir, and I had a great laugh. One fellow came in just as I was visiting, making my rounds, and he was making a big thing about, "I know they cannot know how I voted because I am going to vote with this" — and he produced the pen.

If they go and tell the people foolishness and then — all the same, I do not believe, Sir, that the margin by which the Senator lost can be explained entirely in that way. I think he lost by a few more votes than those who might have believed that they should have carried their own pen and mark with. I think Senator Hall might have had a better argument if he argued that one, Sir, not Senator Greaves. (SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Did he get beaten bad?) Fairly bad, I mean after winning twelve, Sir, he got capsized by a fairly tidy margin.

I know what it is to take licks so I can welcome him to my little company and say, "Do not feel too bad, Sir." (Laughter) So, do not come in here and argue that somebody stole it from you or they would not let the man vote with his pen. They should not tell him to go and vote with the pen. They should not do that.

The other thing, Sir, that they were quarrelling about — by the way Senator Greaves when he made a point about Government publications was not quarrelling, and I am very glad about that, because he succeeded in making a very good point.

It is something that has been giving us concern and in fact we had asked within the Ministry, either within the Printery or GIS, I do not quite remember which one, to see what we could come up with by way of a plan for providing a facility on the premises at Bay Street where we can properly store Government publications and run a shop at the same time so that you should be able to get Government publications easily.

It is a point which has a great deal of merit and I, Sir, have had to revise something I was going to say because I was reminded that when Senator Williams was speaking, after half an hour, I think it was Senator Greaves who said that it was the first intelligent point he had made for the morning and I am very glad to find that after eight and a half hours, I have found an intelligent point made by one of the two Senators on the Opposition Benches, so things are not all that bad, Sir.

The gentleman had a problem with CBC — he had two problems, one had to do with political bias. I understand the problem about political bias. He is not the only person, Sir, complaining that he sees Carmeta Fraser's face on the television too often. I understand the point about political bias. Carmeta is always on, but she is not really on as a politician, so I do not really think he should quarrel so much.

Now, when the Leader of the Opposition has a Press Conference, you see him, you see his face, everything. I know, Sir, these are things that — (ASIDE) Yes and the Member for St. James South in the Other Place. But all of them, Sir, get on in one way or another, whereas we remember before 1976, nary a chance. The Leader of the Opposition, whether it was Sir Grantley Adams, whether it was Mr. St. John, whether it was the present Prime Minister, CBC would not even come to your Press Conference. Now, Sir, when President Taitt of the Democratic Labour Party is delivering his address, CBC's cameras are there.

So, the only thing that he could be talking about as a political bias is the amount of exposure that Carmeta Fraser gets. I cannot see what else he can be referring to. As far as I am concerned, Sir, she can get the exposure because she gets it in the name of women's organisations and they seem quite happy to have her exposure. So, why should it worry us?

The other thing that he was quarrelling about, Sir, was foreigners. I believe that he had been reading something put out, published by a very interesting object called Desmond Bourne in Sunday's Sun, and Senator Greaves allowed himself to be misled into keeping that kind of company.

The fact of the matter is that we can talk what we want and we can regard ourselves as the fount of all wisdom, but in the same way that when the Gleaner was looking for a journalist with certain qualities they chose Carlton Proute, who is back with the Gleaner after having gone through radio stations as Manager of RJR and so on, and in the same way that all through the Caribbean one has been able to find Barbadian journalists, when you are looking for journalists or broadcasters with specific areas of competence and you advertise for them,

and there are no Barbadian applicants for the post who are qualified to fill the post, in that same way one would expect that the appointment of a qualified CARICOM person would be made.

If that does not conform with Senator Greaves' thinking, well then that is just too sad. But I think we have to get away from the little nastiness which people of Desmond Bourne's type are better qualified to execute on an on-going and a daily basis, particularly as they know nothing else.

A question which has excited Senator Greaves has been the cut in the vote called Conferences and Delegations, and I thought that when the Senator was making his point that he would have concentrated on the general point, that in so far as the cuts would not preclude Government's going to such conferences and on such visits abroad as were in the economic and other interests of this country to attend, the cuts could be supported, and therefore I thought his question would have been directed towards establishing whether this was the case.

But instead, the Senator's motivation seemed to have come entirely from the fact that within a vote of this size it was very likely that the tripartite delegation to ILO would not be accommodated. In short, the Senator was very concerned about whether the BWU, which I am sure has ample funds, would be able to get its way paid to go to the ILO Conference. We cannot conduct Government business on that basis. If we have to feel the pinch, why then should the Senator feel his organisation should not feel it?

There is in Kuala Lumpur a conference concerning youth affairs, which is a conference that the Government of Barbados has always been represented at, and usually by a delegation of three headed by a Minister. The matter is virtually my responsibility and therefore the thing was sent to me for a decision. In the circumstances, I did not think that the 40 odd thousand dollars that it would cost was going to be a justifiable expenditure, and therefore I directed that the other CARICOM countries be contacted to see who was going and who would put our point of view. We are not arguing about that, we are not quarrelling about it, therefore why should the Senator quarrel over a matter of whether BWU will have its way paid to the next ILO Conference?

As regards CARIFESTA, Sir, some points were made by Senator Greaves, and then points were made by Senator Wickham. Senator Greaves wanted to know about the inventories and so on. I have, unfortunately, to inform the Senate that the Ministry which handled CARIFESTA affairs, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Accounting Officer have not yet been able to get to our Ministry — and they have only had since September 1, I think it was. I did not know it would take

so long myself, but the truth is I thought that on September 1 they would have sent the Appropriation Accounts and inventories over to us. I am speaking on March 30, and I can say that unless they came into my Ministry this afternoon, the Appropriation Accounts on the Ministry of Culture's votes have not yet come from down there in Jemmotts Lane, so I cannot give Senator Greaves the assurance that the figures which I will now give him, which he asked for, are absolutely accurate.

It does appear as though the cost of CARIFESTA is something of the order of \$16.69 million. The business of inventories I know is on people's minds, because Mr. Carl Moore has talked about missing equipment. We do not know whether equipment is really missing, and whether that equipment, if any is missing, was missing at the time of CARIFESTA, or since then. All that we in the Ministry of Information and Culture are able to do, in the absence of the public officers being able to give us the inventories and Appropriation statements, is to compile our own inventories, and we have taken the necessary steps to do that, so that when we assume official responsibility for the theatres we will do as we have so far managed to do for equipment. We have our own inventories for equipment up to now and we will be able to say that this is what we know we took over. That is all we can do, we cannot do more than that.

As a matter of fact, it is not something I am pleased about and therefore I may as well tell the honourable Senator that I have a file in front of me which shows that a vote which came into our control from September 1, shows expenditure under that vote going on, I believe, right into December, if not January, by the Ministry of Education. How they manage it I do not know. The vote is passed to another Ministry, the Accounting Officer is now another Permanent Secretary, yet they managed to be spending money out of that vote, and in fact they have been paying somebody who was employed to work with CARIFESTA too. I thought CARIFESTA was finished on August 3. But that is a matter for the Auditor General, to tell the truth. But it is a place in which, without legal authority, a Permanent Secretary is known to stop people's salary, so we do not have to worry, there may be more in that yet.

The next point I want to answer concerns the question asked about cut-backs in employment in the school meals service, and I am asked to point out that the number of participants for meals has dropped from 35 000 to somewhere around 20 000 to 25 000, and it is proposed to reduce the staff by 37 servers and 21 school meals assistants. It will obviously make no sense to keep ten people to do the work of six.

On the National Insurance Office, there was a specific question on the loss at the end of March. There were eight temporary people who came to work from January 1982. They came to work on the Card Exchange

Programme until the end of March. At the end of March their programme is finished and therefore as the work ends they go back off having been employed for a specific project.

Senator Greaves wanted to know about IDC. There were about three questions he wanted answered: when the IDC promoted Barbados abroad what did they do about trade unionism and so on. Now Senator Greaves knows very well, and I got the feeling when he was talking that he was still making what is an old criticism of the way the IDC promoted Barbados, but he knows very well that even before the party which he represents in this Chamber ceased to be responsible for running the affairs of this country, IDC had stopped advertising Barbados by reference to cheap labour and that kind of thing.

What happens now is that the union situation, particularly the Barbados Workers' Union, is used as a strong selling point in IDC promotions as indicative of the fact that the climate is a good one for investment, particularly since we have a phenomenally low rate of work stoppages. And the union, of which Senator Greaves is an officer, is featured in that publicity as being a responsible organisation, which is, in large part, responsible for the kind of work atmosphere existing in this country.

The second point he wanted answered had to do with the approach of IDC to factories, bearing in mind obligations to workers and so on. IDC builds its factories in accordance with ILO specifications, and when somebody leases a factory from IDC, then, as Senator Greaves would know, there are responsibilities which that person as an operator of the factory must exercise. Whether they do or not is a matter really directly relating to that person, and not to the IDC.

The third thing he wanted to know was about plans for industrial development activity in the north. I believe that Senator Greaves already knows, but might have forgotten, because it was very well publicised that there is to be an industrial park at Six Men's, and that the first factory ought to begin being built in April. As for other industrial developmental activity, I believe that Senator Greaves, of course, is aware that the Cement Plant is currently being worked on.

The other thing which the Senator mentioned, which I will not at this stage wish to allow to pass — and at one point I felt like interrupting him but I didn't — is this: Senator Greaves brought into this debate, without being too specific, the immigration rumours.

I would like to suggest that there is an example in the honourable Member's own party which might

well be followed in this respect, because I am not accusing any honourable Member of bad faith, but really the rumours I have heard about immigration are rumours which originated with the Democratic Labour Party. They like telling a story and then coming out and giving it wider circulation wherever you are and so on.

What I would really suggest to Senator Greaves is that if he does not want to do it himself, he should get a colleague or a friend to follow the example of Mr. F. G. Smith, Q.C. — go on a platform and say it. The Smiths have a way of saying things on platforms that people, who want to find out whether it is true or not, could well emulate. Say it on a platform, do not clothe it in any nice talk and come in here with it. Both Smiths have proved how true what they are saying is, and there are others who can prove it too, without indeed inflicting certain kinds of things on the ears of this Honourable Senate.

To Senator Hall and his films. I have known Senator Hall for many, many years and I am amazed, absolutely amazed, to find that the Film Censorship Board is not composed of prudes by any means, at least not by Senator Hall's standards. I do not even know what goes on in film censorship, but generally there is no outcry. I do not see much criticism about the way in which the Board seems to go about its business.

A large number of people give a lot of time to going and viewing these films and they obviously take their duties seriously, and generally they seem to make decisions which are in keeping with what the community regards as reasonable standards.

I really cannot understand how Senator Hall could say that just by putting something on it and saying "Adults Only" is not enough, as though it is the duty of a film censor to exercise the rights of a parent. If a parent, whether Senator Hall or anybody else, decides to ignore the "Adults Only" restriction and takes his whole family into the Drive-In to see an X-rated film, that is his exercise of his parental responsibility, and really no film censorship board or any other board of censors will ever be able to deal with that particular problem.

There is one point I want to make about that, because we must remember that we are not in this country any more than in any other country, able to determine the taste of people, or indeed successfully to put anybody in a strait jacket when it comes to what a person wishes to see or what a person wishes to listen to, or what a person wishes to read. Those are very individualistic choices. What we can do, Sir, is to seek to ensure that we know, purely on the viewing of a number of things, that it is not just simply beamed into people's homes and that kind of thing.

There are just one or two other points which are capable of very direct answers. Senator Wickham asked a specific question about contributions to national organisations. The list is fairly long. What I will do, Sir, and I do not think it matters so much for the record, is merely to let Senator Wickham and other Senators know that I have a list here which I believe is a full list, and which I will pass to the Senator and which can be generally looked at.

Senator McClean wanted to know about the \$65 million concerning the commercial banks, and I wish to inform him that that total provision is local. The other domestic financing includes statutory boards, the Insurance Corporation, other non-commercial authorities, in addition to the Barbados National Bank. Senator McClean mentioned that the limit for Treasury Bills is \$100 million. (Asides) I am sorry, Sir. It is now \$325 million. He was referring to the increase.

The Chief Management Accountant and Project Analyst posts are vacant, and a number of posts which normally would be filled, either there will not be such active steps to fill them this year or the fact is that it is unlikely that they will be filled in the coming year. And what Senator McClean has seen, in terms of certain apparent deficiencies in the Estimates, really reflects the fact that it is not believed that one or two of them will be filled in this coming financial year. If, in fact, they are filled in the course of the year, what will happen is that they will just become an automatic charge on the Consolidated Fund so that it does not matter if they are there or not.

There are just one or two other questions. As to Senator Greaves taxation policies, I believe that Senator McClean gave the answer. I have been drawing out something of a little table here myself, in which I noted that the relationship of incomes on profits as direct taxation to indirect taxation in the 1982/83 Estimates is 52 per cent and 48 per cent as opposed to 55—45—55 direct and 45 indirect in 1981/82, which is not so different from 56 per cent direct taxation in 1975 as against the 44 per cent indirect taxation. But we must not behave as though, all of a sudden, that there is such a shift in the tax burden that whereas the Democratic Labour Party thought it inequitable or whatever, to do something and now it is being done.

I think, Sir, that where it is a fact that people need tax relief, they have to be given tax relief. If your earnings increase rapidly particularly as has happened between 1976 and now, the case for tax relief becomes more urgent, because otherwise you will reach a crippling tax bracket much too early in the scale of earnings. And I believe, Sir, that that is the point with which Senator Greaves basically agrees, and with which he will find it

much easier to agree now he knows that the relationship between direct and indirect tax in the 1975—76 Estimates is really no different from what it was in last year's Estimates and this year's Estimates. I think the knowledge that that relativity existed under the Democratic Labour Party regime will make it easier for the Senator to agree. But he must not try and elevate it into any great theory.

I am trying to answer everything in a short time. I believe, Sir, that most of the points have been mentioned. Senator Seale called for \$20 million for tourism promotion. Now, it sounds good to me. The only trouble is that tourism, like everything else, competes for the dollars we have.

I believe that the real burden of the point should be in the type of promotion done and whether, indeed, those responsible for promoting tourism has seen anything like the ads which the Jamaicans are putting out in the New York markets, for example, and whether we do not need to brush up our whole marketing strategy. I am not sure whether the question about how much money we spend is really a point.

Mr. President, I have looked up and down my list and I have, deliberately, to leave some things out because of constraints of time, and the only point remaining is for me to thank Senator Hall for that section of his speech which related to improvements in prison comforts. I found it very enlightening, Sir.

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

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1982

The Second Order was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1982.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, the Resolution seeks to provide for staff adjustments due to regradings plus the creation of posts at the Fire Service, mainly to do with the Emergency Ambulance Service.

The Police Department will get the Traffic Wardens which we have been speaking about for so long to assist in the parking in Bridgetown.

The Ministry of Education will have some of the temporary staff converted to permanent staff and there are just one or two other posts in terms of redesignations, etc.

I beg to move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. President adjourned the Senate accordingly.
7.15 p.m.