

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday July 25, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, July 25, 1984, at 11.10 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir Arnott Cato, K.C.M.G., (President);

His Honour Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E., (Deputy President);

Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman, (Minister of Health);

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office);

Senator St.C. E. Howell, (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and Planning);

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary of the Prime Minister);

Senator H. R. Linton;

Senator Mrs. E. M. Lynch, G.C.M.;

Senator Miss J. Clarke;

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece;

Senator E. E. Greaves;

Senator W. W. Hall;

Senator A. W. A. McClean;

Senator Mrs. G. G. Reader, M.B.E.;

Senator C. D. Seale;

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones;

Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.; and;

Senator C. Jemmott, B.S.S., J.P.

Prayers were led by Rev. Dr. L. A. Crawford.

ABSENT

Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW and Senator D. A. C. SIMMONS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL TO THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The Senate that, in accordance with the advice of the Prime Minister under Section 39(1)(f) of the Constitution, the seat in the Senate held by Mr. Owen Seymour Arthur was declared vacant with effect from 1st July, 1984.

HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
BARBADOS.
24th July, 1984.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I beg to lay the following:

The Special Development Area (St. Barnabas Road) Order, 1984.

Report of the Fire Service for the year 1983.

Report of the Probation Department for the year 1981–1982.

The Report and Financial Statement of the Barbados National Standards Institution for the year 1982–83.

Statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for overseas Governments and Administrations for the period January to May 1984.

Statements showing the sums advanced to the Post Master General for the payment of Money Orders for the period January to May 1984.

The Second Annual Report of the National Sports Council for the year ended 31st March 1980.

The Third Annual Report of the National Sports Council for the year ended 31st March 1981.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1984.

The Road Traffic Regulations 1984.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, with regard to the conduct of public business today, I propose to take Item No. 2, the National Health Service Board Bill first, and Senator Griffith will lead debate on the Land Development Bill as the second item.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, Item No. 2 on the Order Paper will be taken as the first item.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD ACT, 1984

Order No. 2 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of the National Health Service Board.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, when last I spoke on the matter of the National Health Service Board, I took the opportunity then to state generally what kind of service the Board would expect to deliver to the people of Barbados. The Bill provides for the establishment of the Board, and I would draw attention to the fact that I propose to move an amendment to the First Schedule to the Bill as circulated and as passed in the Other Place. That will be done when I reach the Committee stage.

The reason for not dealing with the Bill at the time when it first came to the Chamber was that I was not happy with the provisions of the Bill as it stood at that time; I was not satisfied that the medical profession had enough autonomy over the conduct of its own business. We have since had subsequent consultations with the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, and as a result we have come up with a formula with which we are now more satisfied.

The Board will come into being very soon after the Bill has passed this place and the message sent to the Other Place. I hope that the service itself will start some time within a few weeks after Parliament goes to summer recess. 11.20 a.m.

The Bill provides for a Board of twelve. If I could just draw attention to the amendment as it is now, there will be two public officers, the Chief Medical Officer and the Director of Finance, a pharmacist nominated by the association, two medical practitioners nominated by their association, one nurse nominated by their association, one consultant and one GP nominated by the Minister, and four lay persons appointed by the Minister.

In the amendment which we propose to make in Committee, we propose to establish two committees for the purpose of giving the medical profession some measure of control over their own profession. Otherwise, it would tend to suggest that the discipline of medical officers might fall into the hands of lay people, and that would not be desirable. At the same time, we have ensured that the Board itself, as appointed by the Minister – the entire Board – would have total control of the service which it is expected to deliver to the citizens of this country.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the Minister. I just wanted to make sure whether members had had copies of the amendments circulated to them.

Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: We are now in the process of finalizing work on the regulations which would govern the day-to-day operations of the Board and which will guide the doctors in their care of the patients which will be in their charge, and for which we will pay through the Health Levy.

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

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

Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, first I want to say that it is very clear from the amendments which Senator Trotman indicated that he will be moving today to the original Bill, that the pleas of the Opposition Democratic Labour Party and indeed the medical profession have not fallen on deaf ears. Because when one examines the composition of the Board and the way in which it was proposed that the Board should function, it is very clear that a number of difficulties would have arisen, and these were pointed out – the same difficulties that Senator Trotman alluded to – because there was provision for a Board which consisted largely of non-professional people having absolute control over the medical profession.

We were very concerned about this, and if the Government had not taken the advice that was given by the Democratic Labour Party, the National Health Service would certainly not have gotten off the ground with the doctors who are resident in Barbados. The Prime Minister did say that it was going to get off whether the doctors here participated or not. One would still have to ask whether there was any intention to bring in doctors from overseas to assist in the National Health Service.

Health is of utmost importance to any community. I think that Governments of Barbados have paid some particular attention to this area. I see this National Health Service which is being established as a continuation of a programme of revamping, upgrading and modernizing the health services of this country, which programme was initiated by the Democratic Labour Party. Indeed, if you were to look at the whole thrust of the programme of the Democratic Labour Party, and if you were to read the manifesto thrust of 1976, which was reiterated in 1981, you would find that our concerns were for the provision of a twenty-four hour service with the multi-purpose — you would notice that I am using the term “multi-purpose” — clinics playing a crucial role in this. It is true that you changed the name from multi-purpose clinic into polyclinic. It is just a change in name, but they are for the same purpose.

Laughter.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am quite serious about this. Senator Trotman can laugh as much as he likes, but the facts are there which cannot be disputed. The multi-purpose clinic programme was initiated by the Democratic Labour Party. The only contribution which the Barbados Labour Party has made in this area was to change the name to “polyclinic”.

That was one of the areas in which we were pushing our programme. Certainly, when the Barbados Labour Party came into power, they found the land for the Maurice Byer Polyclinic acquired. They found the funding in place, out of European Development Funds. It was just because of a matter of time that we were not able to get the programme started.

We were also concerned about upgrading and expanding the services of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am sure that you would be aware of the fact that the Democratic Labour Party established the Intensive Care Unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Dr. Haynes was instrumental in this. I think his contribution in that area is well known.

We also recognized that some very special and careful attention had to be paid to the proper functioning of the emergency services, not only as they relate to the

Queen Elizabeth Hospital but emergency services throughout the country. I will speak about this later on.

We had also been looking, and had begun to make special provision for children, the old and the chronically ill. We had also proposed — and one would certainly like to hear the Minister on this — the incorporation of the St. Joseph Hospital into the whole context of our health services. We had a programme to involve the St. Joseph Hospital in a much more integral way in the health services and training for the medical profession, the paramedical profession, nurses and the other people who give the support services to the doctors.

I think that, basically, if you look at the programme which we are now looking at, you will see that the Government is proceeding along a path which was developed by the Democratic Labour Party. There are some differences, however. Even now that we are talking about this National Health Service, the major difference is that the Democratic Labour Party would not have raped — sometimes I am accused of using violent language — the taxpayers in the way the Barbados Labour Party has raped the taxpayers, by the collection of almost three years of a Health Levy; and having collected millions of dollars of our money, we have not seen any improvement in the health services of this country. As a matter of fact, it is very clear to all and sundry that rather than the health services in this country getting better, they are deteriorating — and they are deteriorating very quickly.

11.30 a.m.

We in the Democratic Labour Party are concerned about this. For example, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has been run down. The hospital is in very, very bad shape. It has deteriorated to a point where it is no longer the pride of Barbadians. I believe that the Government ought to do something about that. Certainly if the Democratic Labour Party had been in power we would have done a considerable amount of upgrading to the hospital, refurbishing it and increasing and improving the facilities which exist at that institution. That is our major health institution, and one is appalled at the very bad conditions that exist there.

One only has to go to the district hospitals around the country and see the filth and the very poor conditions which seem to be the order of the day; the lack of repair and refurbishing. I think it is a very sad commentary on the Barbados Labour Party Administration that they could allow our health stock, the buildings and equipment, to be run down in the way that they have been run down. And yet, they have in their hands millions of dollars which they have collected

from the taxpayers of this country! I think it is a shame! I think it shows a difference between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party. We would have upgraded those services; we would have made sure that what we have remained at a high standard, and we would improve them and increase them.

The Barbados Labour Party is concerned with establishing a free National Health Service. It is no free National Health Service. Under the past Administration, we paid our taxes and the taxes were used to run our National Health Service. Under the Barbados Labour Party Administration, we are still paying our taxes, and in addition to that millions of dollars are being deducted on a weekly or monthly basis from our salaries for a free National Health Service. We are paying through our noses for it, and the people of this country are not getting the kind of service for which they are paying so heavily.

I will give you an example of what is happening. This occurred yesterday, and I must say that I object most strenuously to this. I went to the health service at Wilkey to inquire about two vaccinations which I am supposed to get, for malaria and some other thing. I was told that I have to pay \$16 for a vaccination. I object strenuously to this, when I am already paying hundreds of dollars. I am sure it is almost a thousand dollars that I have paid into the free National Health Service — and now they are going to tell me that I have to pay for a vaccination!

This free National Health Service — I call it nothing but a massive rip-off of the population of this country. If you are paying taxes and you are paying a Health Levy, why is it that you have to pay for services which form part of our National Health Service? A similar thing can be repeated in other areas. So do not worry to bamboozle people that they have a free National Health Service. We are paying through our noses for it.

I have indicated that the health of our nation is of the utmost importance, so we have to pay some attention to this particular area. The Government has had, as I understand it, a whole set of problems with the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners. I am told that the Government is not prone to consult with this association, and they do not seem to see eye-to-eye on a number of issues. It is true that the Minister, Senator Trotman, in his introduction indicated that the Government had had consultations with the doctors. I assume he meant the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners. The changes which we are now seeing, the establishment of the Complaints Committee and the establishment of the Disciplinary Committee which will be composed mainly of people who are doctors, might be as a result of this consultation. I do not know.

I still seem to get the impression, based on the statement which was issued by BAMP and in talking with some of the doctors in this country, that there is still some considerable uneasiness amongst the medical profession about the way in which the Board is set up, and the way in which the Board will be functioning. Since it is going to be important that we try to ensure that we have the support of the medical profession in this country as much as possible on this particular matter, I think it would be advisable for the Government to ensure that proper consultations take place, and that the doctors are in agreement with whatever arrangements are being made in this particular regard. In the final analysis, this is something which is being done for us in this country, and we certainly would want to get the best in the given circumstances.

I really am in no position to speak of the amount of money which the doctors are going to be receiving. The Prime Minister is claiming, from what I gather, that some doctors could earn — I think the figure he gave was some \$187 000 a year. I am told by some doctors that this is not true, that this involves the entire procedure of setting up a clinic and the other facilities. I am really not versed in that particular area, but there seems to be some dispute as to what really is the true position there. I am not in any way attempting to fight a case for what could be considered a privileged group in this society, but I think there are certain principles by which we have to operate the society. The Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners is a recognized group, it is a registered trade union looking after the interest of the doctors, so I think they ought to be consulted and be given the status and respect which they deserve.

This brings me to another disturbing feature which relates to a statement made by the Prime Minister in the St. Peter by-election. It has to do with the training of doctors.

I believe that in Barbados and in the Caribbean we have to pay very close attention to the training of our doctors and the other people who are involved in the delivery of health care throughout the region. The University of the West Indies has done a tremendous job in this particular regard, and it is clear that the graduates of the University of the West Indies have gone abroad and have been able to give a good account of themselves. They have also performed well in the Caribbean. It seems to me, therefore, that the Governments of the Caribbean ought to get together with the University of the West Indies and try to discuss and to come to a position where they can improve on the University of the West Indies, particularly in the area I have indicated, the training of our medical personnel.

11.40 a.m.

It is clear that there has to be an improvement in this area, that there is need for a greater number of doctors and dentists, particularly at the present moment. I do not think the University of the West Indies is in the area of the training of dentists, but I gather that with the establishment of the Mount Hope Complex in Trinidad, there is likely to be some arrangement between the Trinidad Government and the University of the West Indies which will take care of that. Whatever, I believe the Governments in the Caribbean ought to get together and see how the good quality training at the University of the West Indies can be expanded and improved for the good and welfare of the people of the region.

It must, therefore, be very disturbing to you, Sir, and I am sure to persons who are concerned about this region, when one hears the Prime Minister making a most irresponsible statement regarding the University of the West Indies. He provided the reason why the Barbados Labour Party Government is so anxious to get the St. George's Medical School functioning in Barbados as being, not if, but when the University of the West Indies breaks up. He claims it is important to get the St. George's Medical School functioning to take care of the training of doctors in Barbados when the University of the West Indies breaks up.

I think that is the most irresponsible statement coming from a person who holds a responsible position in this country. What is he signalling? That he is so sure that the University of the West Indies is going to break up? And what is he doing about it other than helping to further the break up of the University of the West Indies? It is an institution which we have fought hard over the years to establish and to keep going, and you get a person like the Prime Minister of Barbados making that kind of irresponsible statement, encouraging that kind of thing! Obviously he would do nothing. It is very clear he wants to see the University of the West Indies broken up, and we cannot have that kind of line being taken by people who are supposed to hold responsible positions in our community.

The Government ought to adopt a different attitude towards the University of the West Indies. The University of the West Indies is involved in the training not only of medical personnel, but in the training of citizens of the Caribbean in lots of other areas. I really shed a tear as a graduate of the University of the West Indies to think that the Prime Minister would adopt this kind of attitude. It is a very serious thing, and I would like to think that the Government would change course in this particular matter and would be seen as one of the Governments in the Caribbean which would be really trying to ensure that the disintegration which the Prime Minister says is taking place does not take place. We know that the Barbados Labour Party has been involved in the disintegration of the West Indies Federation, but, for God's sake, do not

get involved in the disintegration of another regional institution!

I would like to think that these matters are taken as seriously as they ought to be taken, because in the long run it is the future of the region and the future of this country that we have to have at heart. All of us have to live here, whether we are supporters of the Barbados Labour Party or whether we are supporters of the Democratic Labour Party; whether the Barbados Labour Party would want to see the supporters of the Democratic Labour Party starve and die, whatever it is, or depressed, the point is we have to live here.

As far as health is concerned, I think the delivery of health care has to move above the political level. This is one area where I do not think one can say that political influence in terms of who should be attended to and what services should be given to them is evident, as, for example, in other areas like in housing, where you either have to be a "B" or pretend to be a "B" or else you would not get anywhere. Health, however, is one area we cannot fool around with, and I would like to see this going. I am really concerned about the areas which I have identified, where it is very clear that there is need for attention, where I find that in spite of the millions of dollars which have been collected we have not seen any clear indication that there has been any improvement in our health services.

The Democratic Labour Party is also concerned about the cost of this service, and I believe that the Minister ought to give us some indication as to what he thinks this will cost us per year.

As I said, we want to see the integration of the St. Joseph's Hospital fully into our health services to pay particular attention to the northern parishes of Barbados. The Casualty Department is something which ought to be looked at. At the present moment if something happens to a person in St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Joseph or St. Philip which is an emergency, they have to be rushed to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The case may not be as much an emergency as one would hope, but I would think that by expanding the facilities in these areas — and I am particularly concerned with the St. Joseph's Hospital — the Government could become involved to make more services available to the people of the north, particularly in the emergency areas and at night. This would be a useful development.

11.50 a.m.

This is something which we in the Democratic Labour Party had planned to discuss and certainly to implement. I would have thought that the Barbados Labour Party Administration, having seen that lead set by the Democratic Labour Party, would have grasped it with open arms. They might have won the by-election, but they would not learn. I am quite serious about this. I am really making an urgent

appeal to the Minister to do something about this very quickly.

We know that health care and health services have not only to do with doctors and hospitals, but it also has an aspect which, again, the Democratic Labour Party recognized had to be dealt with, the whole area of preventive medicine, which, from what I gather, seems to be the new thrust in the medical profession. In this concept, you do not wait until a person has contracted a disease and then try to deal with it, but you want to make sure that our environment is healthy.

We should want to make sure that we do a lot of work in providing health education to people so that they can have proper health habits. We should want to make sure that our sanitation services are in good order, and that we have the kind of personnel who would be able to carry out these various tests and keep a check on the environment, which is very important to the whole health services. That is why, again, one became very upset recently when the Government, through callousness, found it necessary to serve quick notices to those people — now, Senator Trotman knows; he talked to me about it — the Aedes Egypti people, or refused to pay them.

The Government, I am told, wants to cut out this service. I hope that there is some justification for that, because you cannot fool around with people in the way that the Government seems to be fooling around with the people, whether they are in our health services or otherwise. You served the Aedes Egypti people with notices or refused to pay them. When they went to collect their wages, they were served with notices telling them that their services were no longer required because there was no money to pay them. What kind of nonsense is that? How callous could the Government be to have a situation develop where people, when they go on pay day to receive their money, are given a notice saying that their services are no longer required. But that behaviour is typical of the Barbados Labour Party Administration!

Quite recently we had a situation where the junior doctors went on strike. This was not probably widely known, but they went on strike because the Government refused to pay them their overtime and other monies which were due to them. That is bad, particularly in a situation where you already had a problem with the medical profession. Those actions could only be designed to antagonise a group of people with whom we do not have good relations. We cannot have this kind of situation developing, and I hope that that is not an indication of the kind of attitude which the Government will be adopting when this National Health Service is implemented.

We in the Democratic Labour Party are concerned about these things. I have indicated very clearly the kind

of thrust that we should like to see. We are not happy with some of the provisions in this Bill, and we are not happy with the amount of money which is being deducted and the poor service which is being given. We want to see an improvement in these areas and, most of all, we want to see proper consultation and a continued relationship between the Government and the medical profession. I hope that that materialises, but, in any event, in a matter of a year or two, when the Democratic Labour Party takes over the reins of Government of this country, we will make sure that we provide a proper health service for the people of this country, and that we have good relationships with the people in the medical profession. The writing is on the wall.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I think my first duty is to declare a special pleasure in hearing Senator Greaves' speech, especially the forceful manner of his expression. We sit on opposite sides of the Table and some of us tend to conclude from that physical polarisation that we really do not share the concerns.

No Barbadian can be without concern about the state of public health. I am frequently on visits to certain areas of the public health services, frequently concerned about that voiceless majority of people who have nobody to speak for them, who suffer because of their voicelessness through no fault of any Government or any Government agency but through a certain kind of sloppiness which is in our whole society.

It is the same thing with our buses. It is not the "B's", or the "D's", or the "X's", or the "Y's" to blame, because no Government could be proud of a deficiency, but there seems to be some virus in the body which prevents us from doing the best we can. It is often unfair to blame the shortcomings of a particular service on a particular Government when it is the people and whatever Senator Greaves' illusions may be about what will happen when his party takes over, I assure them that they will have to deal with the same body of workers that presently exists — they are not going to import migrants.

So far as his comments on vaccination costs are concerned with paying the \$16, I believe I can help him there. Recently a colleague and I had to pay a visit to a country for which Yellow Fever vaccination certificates are required. It was therefore sensible to have the vaccination here before one left, so that when one returned, there would be no problem of his getting in.

My colleague omitted to do that until the last moment. When he went to the public health centre, he was told that he had come on the wrong day and that he could not have that vaccination, for a fairly obvious reason to me, it seemed. It costs a great deal, and when

they break the ampoule, they have to deal with at least five or six people, else the vaccination is wasted. As he was the only one that day, then it would cost a lot of money.

He could either have waited or paid. He chose not to wait or to pay and went to this place. Of course, when he came back, he was stopped by the health people at the airport, and presumably not allowed to enter his own country because he did not have a valid vaccination certificate. Senator Greaves, by paying, I am sure, avoided that embarrassment.
12.00 noon.

I think that perhaps a public service publicity campaign which says what days these things are available might be a useful thing for the health service to introduce.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, can I just elucidate this particular matter? It is nothing controversial, but I think it is important; it will help the debate.

There are days for vaccinations, Tuesdays and Fridays. Presumably what you are saying is that we put people on Tuesdays and Fridays, so that when they break the vaccine or whatever it is, they would have enough people to use it. But in spite of that, I still have to pay the \$16!

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Maybe, to respond to Senator Greaves, the Minister of Health will have a more precise answer than I have, but this is my understanding, and I, who have certainly travelled a great deal have never had to pay for the thing. Perhaps the imposition of payment depends on some assessment of the man's ability to pay.

The third point I would advert to, a point of considerable comfort to me, is how a national debate on a matter as intimate as health, which has frequently in other countries been used as a basis for an ideological argument, has not been so done in Barbados. Frequently I have had to defend Barbados against those leftist people who say that we are sticks in the mud, that we do not have any socialist plan, and I point out the number of things which have been done here, which we have not called socialism; we have simply said that they were good business for citizens and we have done them.

We have got food in schools, we have got school uniforms, we now have a National Health Service. But we have not called this socialism, we have simply called it taking care of our people, and I am very heartened by the fact that we can introduce a measure like this without any reference to its "ism", and I think that says a great deal for what we have going. My only plea is that we

really take care to preserve what we have going, because it is under assault from all quarters.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I am very heartened by the tone of the speech made by the last speaker. I think it brought a sense of decorum to the debate and sort of tempered some of the things that I would want to say, but I could not help speaking in this debate, because a number of issues have been raised by the leading Opposition spokesman, and I believe that we must answer some of them.

There has been talk about the Opposition's contribution to health in Barbados. I daresay we cannot dispute that. I think that Barbados is a developing country that really is second to none when it comes to the delivery of health care and the standard and state of health of the people in this country. If you go to Africa, health care is in a terrible state. If you go to South America you have to worry about the state of the water and all the kinds of problems that we do not experience in Barbados because of the state of health care system. I am not saying it is perfect, because I still think that a lot more has to be done, but the Government is valiantly trying to take care of some of these things.

If I remember correctly, somewhere back in the Fifties this country won a shield, the Kettering Shield, for its standard of health care, and the Democratic Labour Party was not around in those days, but we keep hearing about this partisan approach to health. As recently as 1974 there was a Minister of Health who called for an enquiry into what was happening at the hospital, and he was removed because of the fact that he called for an enquiry. Because the second most powerful man in the country as the Minister of Health said, was making life very uncomfortable for him as a Minister at the Hospital, the Minister was removed. But we do not hear anything about that!

If you go back to the Barbados Labour Party's programme for health long before any of us thought of being in Parliament, 1940 or 1941, when the party first revealed its commitment to the establishment of clinics to deal with serious cases in Barbados, anti-natal cases, child welfare, tuberculosis, cancer and social diseases back in 1940, nobody heard about the Democratic Labour Party then. So there is no point in raising this question of a partisan approach to health care.

In 1961, in our manifesto we proposed four new district hospitals with outpatient departments. In the 1956 manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, we talked about the building of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital — and we built the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This talk about a partisan approach to health care is utter nonsense.

I think we are all genuinely interested in what happens to the health of people in Barbados, and we usually move from phase to phase.

The mistake we are making in this country is to believe that because people are medical practitioners by profession and training that they have the last word on what happens administratively — and I say 'administratively' — in the health care system. I think this is a serious point. Some doctors in Barbados, who are antagonistic to the Government because of their political affiliation, have been making life very uncomfortable for the Government. There is no doubt about that, and they try their cases in the Press and on the political platforms in this country.

I heard Senator Greaves talking about the St. Joseph Hospital and their plan to develop the St. Joseph Hospital as a very important link in the north. If they plan that, I support that view. I do not know why they would want to do it, but we have a good reason for wanting to see a health care facility in the north. For one thing, the Barbados Labour Party built the cement plant which is a hive of activity in the north; the Heywoods complex is a hive of activity in the north; and very soon, within another year or two, we will have more activity in the north which will require serious attention being paid to patient care. There is also oil field activity offshore, which because of the nature of its activity, with the inherent dangers of drilling in deep water, will need to have some type of health care facility which could cater to emergencies, people who may be hurt in deep sea diving and so on. This is very important, and for that reason I am very keen to see the St. Joseph Hospital as an integral part of the health care system in the north.

There is another angle to the St. Joseph Hospital, and this is where the Democratic Labour Party supporters who are medical practitioners must take the blame. Only recently when the St. George Medical School was operating out of the St. Joseph Hospital, they could not come to terms on rent. There is a monstrosity at the St. Joseph Hospital called the Villa Maria Convent, a building that can only be used for educational purposes. A few people were living in it. Indeed, one of the last occupants was one Father Joseph Harcourt Blackett, who lives at St. Joseph Hospital sometimes when he wants to vote in the St. Peter by-election and he lives at the St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Cathedral when there is no St. Peter by-election.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: He lived there on Thursday, polling day, but he lives at St. Patrick's all the time. That is something that will be dealt with later on anyhow.

The point is that the Villa Maria Convent at the St. Joseph Hospital is a monstrosity which cannot be used for anything but for classroom purposes and the like. There are a few people who have been living there, who were moved out by the people who managed the hospital itself to make room for the St. George's Medical School as a result of a rental agreement. But hear what is happening in this country. The doctors at the St. Joseph Hospital, Dr. Erskine Simmons himself, who has private patients at the St. Joseph Hospital, and a few others who are sympathetic to the Democratic Labour Party have been getting behind the scenes pressuring the people at the St. Joseph Hospital not to accommodate the St. George's University. And as a result of this pressure, what has happened is that a hospital which is strapped financially — I can say with great certainty that the St. Joseph Hospital is strapped financially — has submitted proposals to the Government asking the Government to enter into some agreement with them to help them meet the cost of running the operation.
12.10 p.m.

I support that kind of approach because it is necessary, based on what I have just said. But here is a hospital that is financially strapped, which has to beg for money in all shapes and forms in order to run a hospital where doctors who have private patients are benefitting financially, refuses money for rent for a building that is hardly used!

I do not know what the cost of a day's stay at the St. Joseph Hospital is, but I know that it is an exorbitant fee which one has to pay if one is a private patient. It costs a lot of money, a lot more than the QEH. Some people cannot even afford to pay the fees, but they want the prestige of knowing that they are going to a private hospital. The only people who benefit from that kind of arrangement are the doctors in Barbados who have private patients down there. Nobody else! Yet they, in their short-sightedness, encourage the St. Joseph Hospital not to deal with the St. George's University, which would benefit the hospital financially.

The St. George's University has proposed to the St. Joseph Hospital to rent that convent for five years at a fee which would bring three quarters of a million dollars in revenue to the St. Joseph Hospital — \$750 000! — over a five year period. The negotiating committee at the St. Joseph Hospital rejected that because of pressure from the Democratic Labour Party's doctors down there, all like Erskine Simmons, who was not afraid to say on a platform that he is going to encourage his colleagues at the St. Joseph Hospital to boycott the St. George's University. It is pure short-sightedness. I do not know how anybody in their right mind can tell me that they would seek to undermine an institution like that, where they are reaping the benefits.

It shows the level of political nastiness which one has to deal with.

I do not believe that we in this country should be concerned with having everybody in Barbados run to the Casualty of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That is utter nonsense. Everybody knows that the Casualty is full of people every day, as with most hospitals that have a Government involvement. I can say that with certainty, because I have run a hospital myself.

We hear this claim by the Democratic Labour Party that they want to develop the north.

But there is a major effort to finance the St. Joseph Hospital by private sources, where the people in the north would benefit and we get this stone walling. If you have that kind of financing going into the hospital and you have some kind of Government programme which would in effect be a collaborative programme to that of the hospital — I do not know what the Minister's disposition is on this — I certainly can say that I support such an effort if it is going to keep the hospital open.

But that support is conditional. It is conditional upon the fact that the hospital authorities sit down and realistically look at what they have at the complex and determine how best they can benefit from the assets which they have. It is a total waste of assets to have a place like the Villa Maria Convent not functioning; where three or four people live, and where there is this Father Blackett, or whoever he is, up and down the place trying to decide whether — he is also a politician — when he wants to live there and when he does not want to live there, for the purpose of voting. This is a man of the cloth who is involved in this exercise.

If the Democratic Labour Party has a plan to develop the St. Joseph Hospital and improve the conditions there for the benefit of the people in St. Andrew, St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. James and what have you, I am in favour of that, because this Government has been fully involved in the development of the north, Speightstown, St. Lucy, St. Andrew and St. James. We know the importance of having a health care facility in the north which will benefit the people of the north.

I am very concerned when we get to the point where the question of a National Health Service becomes an issue in this country. As Senator Wickham has said, you go abroad and hear people attacking on these things, but we can feel proud of the service we have in this country. We can feel proud of the fact that Barbados is a healthy nation.

There are some things that I do not tolerate, and there are some things which I can support. I support the view, whoever has advanced it, that Barbados has the

kind of ideal climatic conditions and the kind of infrastructure that can cater to the kind of people who are looking for long term health care recuperative facilities.

The state of Arizona in the United States of America has the type of environment and climatic conditions which is conducive to people going and spending the rest of their lives, or two or three years of their lives, to recuperate. Barbados has a similar kind of environment. And when we start talking about looking at encouraging people to come to Barbados, we have to think in terms of not looking at the traditional tourists who come and stay at a hotel and spend four days and five days and spend little or nothing now, because they cannot afford to do it, we must think in terms of the people who will come here, the very wealthy people who want to have this kind of healthy environment to recuperate in, and in terms of the people who are going to come here through service industries and spend not quantity time, but quality time. When I say quality time, I am talking about spending money, because we have the kind of infrastructure which can accommodate that kind of activity. That is important.

As far as the National Health Service is concerned, it is important that people in Barbados can know that any morning they feel ill, they can go to a doctor of their choice without worrying about whether the doctor is going to rip them off, or whether or not he can take care of them, or whether they can afford to pay.

We have been talking about a National Health Service since 1956. We heard a recital about multi-purpose clinics from 1961 to 1976. We had one at Warrens too, the one that was designed to be a crematorium. It started off being a crematorium and this Government turned it into a polyclinic. Yet still, we can hear about their record in health. I feel that they made some contribution in fifteen years. You had to make some contribution in fifteen years. You cannot see it with the naked eye. But it is nothing to come in here and boast about.

I worked in the health care industry in the United States where Barbadian-trained nurses have come in for considerable praise. They worked at Harlem Hospital with me. Young doctors from Barbados obtained fellowships in the United States of America from the University of the West Indies.

Let me get to that now, because we hear from Senator Greaves how the Prime Minister is irresponsible for talking about the University of the West Indies. It is not the Prime Minister who first talked about that. Talk about that man A. Z. Preston, who is the Vice-Chancellor at Mona. He himself has said that the University is falling apart, not the Prime Minister of Barbados. He is in

authority at the University of the West Indies, and he said that it is falling apart.

All we are saying by the establishment of the St. George's Medical School in Barbados is that we may have a cushion. There is a training facility at the University in Jamaica, and the Trinidadians are building Mount Hope at the cost of \$1 billion. Everybody in Barbados seems to sit back and think that when the Trinidadians are finished building Mount Hope, it will belong to the Caribbean. Let us face it honestly. Based on what has been happening in the Caribbean recently, can we safely say that when Mount Hope is finished at the cost of TT \$1 billion, built by Trinidadian funds, that we are sending people down there to be trained as doctors? We should be honest and realistic about what is happening in this country and in the Caribbean itself.

It has nothing to do with whether we want CARICOM or not. We stated emphatically that we wanted a federation, we have pushed for it, and we were the leaders in it.

12.20 p.m.

There is no way somebody can come and say that we want to break up any federation. We have been in the forefront of integration in the Caribbean. Anybody who really knows the history of what happened in 1962 could not seriously take Senator Greaves points. Look at what has happened and be realistic. Senator Greaves is supposed to be one of the leading lights in this country — supposed to be. After hearing that anybody would have to turn their face in disgust.

We have been pushing for integration in the Caribbean. The Prime Minister just went to Nassau. He set the tone at the Nassau meeting by his conciliatory approach because we want the Caribbean back together; and because he set the tone, people started to come around. We cannot with the greatest political will — I do not care if the Dems talk, I do not care who talks — have a CARICOM integration or federation unless all of us get together. You cannot have a courtship of one.

I have sat down around many tables with CARICOM Ministers who came to terms on certain matters; and when they leave, you find them doing something else. Barbados is always keeping its word. So this nonsense that we are breaking up a federation is to be ignored.

Let us look at the serious issue of looking after the health of the people of Barbados. The point is that some of the doctors who have their own political axes to grind do not want to deal with the Barbados Labour Party. They do not want the National Health Service implemented simply because it would mean a turn away from the Democratic Labour Party in 1986. That is the

problem — it is a question of sabotage. I am not afraid to talk about the doctors. All of a sudden you are hearing in Barbados doctors saying that they are experts in medical education. I am an accounting graduate and I would never dare to tell anybody about accounting administration or accounting faculties. I do not know anything about it. But we hear some of them telling you that they do not want to deal with this person and that person because in their minds it is not right.

I have looked at all the professions, not only the medical profession. The one answer analysts come up with all the time is that doctors make the worst administrators, because they can only deal with dead bodies or sick people. That is where their focus is. This is a big question in health care in the United States now, where the whole concern has been to revise the approach to medical education. Hitherto, you taught people how to examine bodies, diagnose cases and make prescriptions for improving somebody's health or taking care of somebody — never once looking at the broad spectrum of administration, approach to people and of preventive medicine and all the other social aspects of dealing with an environment. All of these things one had to learn in other faculties.

I want to talk about the University of the West Indies and the St. George's Medical School. Everybody knows my position on the St. George's Medical School at this particular time. I believe that it has a place in Barbados, and I will fight tooth and nail to ensure that it has a place in Barbados.....

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: They can say what they like about Senator Griffith on that issue. I believe so because I have been able to get and examine information on the St. George's Medical School, information which has been supported by the investigators in New York State where the school is registered. The Opposition MP for St. Michael South Central even went into the United States of America and accused the people of having Mafia contacts. The State investigators have denied that there is any truth in that. The St. George's Medical School has a clean bill of health. But yet people down here are saying that it is a bad school and has Mafia connections.

It is not important to us that the people who are going to be responsible for registering the students when they go back to the United States are saying that the school has a clean bill of health and that it is a properly run organization. No! We can hear from the Dems down here that the school has Mafia connections! I have heard Senator Greaves with that foolishness in here too. I doubt if he would know what a Mafia person would look like if he saw one. You get all of these foolish, childish accusations and outlandish statements in here from so-called

responsible people in public life. What Mafia connections? Do you mean if the United States Education Department put out its investigators to check out schools in Mexico, the Caribbean and Israel and they come and say that the St. George's is one of the best run schools and has a clean bill of health, no underworld connections — that we in Barbados must say that it has Mafia connections? For what purpose? To what end? What are we getting from it? Political mileage?

Senator Greaves should have an interest in seeing that the St. George's Medical School is established in Barbados. If the school is operating out of the Villa Maria Convent, it will create 100 jobs in the north, and Senator Greaves would benefit by that, because in the same way he got most of the jobs at Heywoods and at the cement plant, he will get most of the jobs there. Senator Greaves is aware of the fact that there is one girl who is virtually unemployable who he has carried to three different places in St. Peter and he got a job for her each time. The last place she was working was at the cement plant. So to try to deny the people of the north — and this is the indictment — the siting of an institution which will generate 100 jobs is tantamount to criminal activity. I make no apologies for saying that.

Do not let us get into this issue of whether or not there are standards. St. George's Medical School students sit ECFMG exams. I have talked about this in here before. This is the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates in the United States of America. Every student who graduates from a university outside of the United States of America, as long as it is not under the United States administration, has to take the ECFMG, whether or not they are U.S. citizens, and no matter where they are coming from. Look where St. George's placed. Second behind the university in Tel Aviv! We are not going to let any university come in here without examining the curriculum. We should stop making these things an issue in Barbados. We should look at what the benefits are, both economically and socially. We are talking about unemployment in Barbados and we are talking about an institution that is going to create 100 jobs. We are talking about the St. George's Medical School which has a very significant role to play in the continued development of the health care in the north of Barbados, based on the fact that there is a thrust to improve significantly the economic activity in the north — Heywoods, the cement plant, the road from Greenland to Checker Hall, and the oil field operation which is going to come on stream. All of that makes it important and imperative for us to see St. Joseph as an integral part of health care facilities in the north and, of course, the National Health Service.

Since 1956 we have been pushing and pushing for a National Health Service. Now here in 1984, twenty-eight years later, we still find the nihilist talking about putting stumbling blocks in our way!

Mr. President, I thank you.
12.30 p.m.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill, because I feel that it is terribly necessary for the people of Barbados to have a health service that is available to all of them on call.

I have been working in the health services of Barbados since 1951. I worked with the Child Health Committee and we were able to bring the infant mortality rate of the children registered in our clinic from 139 per thousand live births to one per thousand live births in 20 years. That was from giving the children inoculations and teaching the mothers how to cope, how to feed their children, and selling them milk and vitamins at cost price.

There will be teething problems for the National Health Scheme. I think we need a lot more public health education. People do not know what it means, people are confused about it. They need more education, and not education geared towards the doctors — education geared towards the man in the street. Today patients do not have any loyalty to one doctor, or very few of them do. They go from doctor to doctor. They go to one on Monday, on Wednesday they are not feeling any better so they go to another one somewhere else, and by Friday they are feeling really ill, so they go to somebody else. They say the doctor's medicine did not do them any good, but the thing is that each doctor is giving them the same medicine, because they would naturally give that medicine to start treatment of what they thought the disease might be.

I want to see the children's homes and the day nurseries covered by this medical scheme as soon as possible, because I feel that they deserve better than they are getting at the moment. We have doctors attached to the children's homes. Some are getting excellent service and some are not getting good service. One of the doctors informed the matron of one of the children's homes the other day that he "was not looking after any little almshouse niggers". This is the kind of thing that really upsets me, and I feel that the time has come when people in Barbados must realise that these children deserve a break, and I am here and I will fight for them. I have been fighting for them for the last twenty-five to thirty years, and I am going to continue doing it. Children do not vote, but Gwen Reader does, and she will continue to vote, and her vote will be used for the children of Barbados. I mean it.

In relation to medical health education, I think that the radio and television can be much more used to describe what will happen, how it will happen, where to go, what to do, how to register with your medical practitioner, what you are to do about it, how you will be looked after. I also feel that we need more medi-

cal health education, dental health education, veterinary health education. Only recently there was a case of a sick animal that gave the children in a household a disease because the parents did not know enough to call in a veterinary surgeon when the animal took ill. This is going to continue until we have more education in this field.

What is worrying me in Barbados today is political polarisation. Nobody can get up and say that something is good because it was the other party that started it. Who cares? It is the people of Barbados that matter, not the political parties. Political parties come and political parties go, but the people of Barbados remain. Let us put these petty differences behind us and realise that it is people who count. The old people out there who are worried and upset, who do not know where to go or who to turn to, the children who are being abandoned daily, children who are being brutally ill-treated; these are the people who matter.

I have already said in this Chamber that there have been a lot of children recently taken into care. At the end of the last financial year, instead of having some 900 children in day care, we had approximately 1100; instead of 200 children in residential care, we had 259 children. We are having an influx of children, and some of these children are in the most pathetic conditions. We need good psychiatric help for them, we need psychological help for them; we need more educational psychologists.

As the chairman of a secondary school, recently it was brought to my attention that three girls came into school in a state in one day. One had been raped by her father the night before, one had just found out that her father and grandfather were one and the same person, and another one had jumped through a window to get away from her elder brother who was going to rape her. How can children learn under these conditions?

We have got to do something to stop political polarisation and go back to family life, to teach people that they cannot treat other people like this. It is absolutely necessary to do it now, because our teenagers are disaffected, they are alienated from society, and they are going to give us a lot of trouble unless we do something to stretch out a hand to help them now. I do not mean tomorrow, I mean today. I am really worried about what I am seeing.

We in the Child Care Board are taking in children at a much older age than we were taking them in before, because the children themselves are phoning in to complain about brutality at home. We have to research every single case that is reported to us. We must do something about it.

I would like to say one little thing about St. George's University. I do not know much about it, I am not an educationist, but I had a letter from a niece of mine living in California who worked in a hospital alongside a black girl who had been turned down by four United States universities although she had straight "As" on graduation. She had been turned down to work as a doctor because they said she was too sympathetic to people. She has applied to St. George's University and has been accepted. Please may it go on if that kind of thinking will prevail there.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, I thought that the by-election in St. Peter was finished, but after listening in here today it seems to me that we have actually brought the political platform in here. That does not particularly worry me, because I do feel that this issue of the National Health Service is not a nebulous one. Even though Senator Griffith said he did not think it should be an issue, I feel it is a national issue. It is something that affects the people of this country, every one of us. Therefore, it is of importance that we should look at it in that light.

12.40 p.m.

It was interesting to hear Senator Reader talk of political polarisation. She is not alone in her fears. We have seen ample evidence of it where people, because of their views expressed or not expressed, being victims of abuse, even the Press, and by people in high places. This not only makes people go into a shell, but it makes people completely afraid to let one hand know what the other is doing.

We see it in here in this our rather august Chamber. We see where one Government Senator has indeed said that there is no such thing as an independent Senator. It only goes to show that people react when they feel unsure and they react in a very negative way. Senator Griffith was in here, it was said by Senator Simmons. I do not agree, having been an independent Senator myself. There have been times when I have said that it seems as if there is 19-2 situation. I have said that without any apologies. I said that on a particular occasion when I felt it was merited. But I do feel that such talk will scare people on the outside of this Chamber from entering into any debate of national significance.

It is rather important that we should understand that the ultimate goal of a health service is that the patients of this country must have the optimum benefit from that service, and that can only be derived, in my opinion, if there is mutual confidence between the doctors, nurses and all of the people who are concerned with the delivery of health care. Because of that, I feel that we should look beyond our political partisan views, and in

a case of national importance, as this is, seek to get what is best for the people of this country.

For a long time, Barbados has had the best medical service in the Eastern Caribbean, and for a very long time it has been somewhat free. This concept of free medical care did not begin this morning. It is a fact that for a very long time at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, you found that if you had to go into a public ward and you had to have an operation, however big it might be, you got it. If you were knocked down and were rushed to the Casualty, they could not send you out, and we have seen cases where even a company director, people of great means, have queued up to get their free medicines and medical care.

The question to be answered today is: should we upgrade the existing service or should we change it altogether? As it stands with the National Health Service, it seems as if you have a situation where instead of going to the hospital, you would go to your GP, because, looking at the Statement of the Minister, it seems as if the polyclinics would be out of business within a short while. So I think that we have to realize that this mutual thrust must exist, because if it does not, you have to forget the whole thing.

The last time we met here, I think it was June 20, to be exact, when this Bill was before the House, the Minister got up and, not for the first time in this Chamber, read a rather lengthy statement, and there were cheers all around. It was felt on the Government benches that there was a master stroke, a stroke of genius, and all I can say for them is "bravo". But it had to come before the House again and it has today.

When the Minister read the statement, I am sure that he was in receipt of a letter from the doctors telling of their fears and objections to certain parts of the Bill. It is quite obvious that that is true. If it is not true, perhaps the Minister could say so, but when we look at the amendment today and compare it with what was before the House that day, it seems to me that the arguments of the Democratic Labour Party and, indeed, the doctors, have borne some fruit. We have seen in the composition of the National Board that rather than to suggest that you should have one pharmacist from three submitted, two medical practitioners from four submitted, one nurse from three submitted, two of four medical practitioners appointed by the Minister, you find that we now have a pharmacist appointed by the Minister after consultation with the Barbados Pharmaceutical Society, that is proper; two medical practitioners appointed by the Minister after consultation with the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners, again proper; one nurse appointed by the Minister after consultation with the Barbados Registered Nurses Association and two medical practitioners appointed by the Minister, one of whom must be a consultant at the hospital.

The point I am making is that the Minister, after consultation with these various people, will appoint one or two to the Board, as the case may be. We had the distasteful situation in which you had to submit three names and one would be picked out. And in the Other Place, when the Prime Minister was asked why that was so, he is alleged to have said that sometimes these associations put up idiots, and even referred to the Chamber of Commerce. The nurses and doctors obviously have informed the Minister that the proper way of going about it would be to have some consultation, and I think this is very important. Commonsense seems to have prevailed, and the Minister is now able to come to the House with a Board, the composition of which we can take and digest.

The former piece of legislation here had six persons appointed by the Minister representing community interest. It is interesting to note that now we have four. I think this is the bone of contention. There are lots of people in Barbados that represent community interest, and our position is that when you have six people like that comprising half of the Board and going on a Board like this, there can be some measure of yardfowlism, as is seen on other Boards. I say this without fear of contradiction, and I am not getting up here today and being severely critical of the Barbados Labour Party in this respect. Because of that we have objected, and no doubt the doctors objected to it too and the Minister has now seen the wisdom to reduce that number from six to four.

When you think in terms of community interest, a community-minded person who wishes to become a Director of the Hospital must go and study Hospital Administration for four years. He has to know all about hospitals, polyclinics, general practice service, special service and public health. I believe that the Minister of course would be trying to get the type of people on the Board who he thinks can be of optimum benefit to the country by dint of their hard work but the situation is that if he is allowed to pick six people just like that, that would be myopic and I am pleased to see that that number has been reduced from six to four.

12.50 p.m.

Another thing worthy of note is that there is now a Disciplinary Committee and a Complaints Committee, because I think one has to understand that in a service like this there would be many complaints against doctors, and it is obvious that you would need to have a Complaints Committee and a Disciplinary Committee, duly comprising people who understand the situation thoroughly, which would give the doctors the confidence that they really would get a fair hearing. I feel that this is a step in the right direction, and I am quite sure that the consultation that the Minister referred to that he had with the doctors, which seemed to have been very cordial according to him, would have brought out these things.

From the statement I noticed also that he did say that: "unfortunately it did not take place, as BAMP informed the Ministry that it could not continue discussions with the NHS because of another dispute not connected with the NHS." Perhaps the Minister could elucidate a bit further and let us know what this dispute is. If this dispute was the St. George's Medical School, that is completely connected with this, because I believe that that is one of the major concerns as far as the doctors are concerned. Perhaps he could elucidate a little on that.

I have talked to a few doctors and I have talked to the Minister himself. When I asked a question about the doctors at the hospital when I think there was a dispute to do with conditions of service, I think it was the same Minister who told me that the matter was in hand and he had reasons to believe it would be solved. I took his word, and I think perhaps he was right. The penalties about which the doctors were a bit unsure and were hoping would be removed, the conditions of work for junior and senior doctors at the hospital to which I just alluded, would be things that the doctors would have discussed with the Minister. Perhaps the Minister can now let us know what transpired during that meeting.

I believe that a doctor/patient relationship is a serious thing. In Barbados you find that people are very special about their priest and their doctor, and we have to think in terms of a change which seems to be moving away from a system which worked quite well.

The spokesman on the other side said that as far as he was concerned, people can now have a doctor of their choice, it was not a rip-off, and that the doctors seemed to think that it would be a means of turning away from the Democratic Labour Party in 1986. That seems to suggest that this could be a political gimmick. I was not aware that the doctors were against this situation because it would be a turning away from the Democratic Labour Party. I did not believe that politics entered into it to such a degree. If it has, one would have to look and see the real reason, because I think that Senator.....

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: On a point of elucidation: I said the DLP doctors.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, what is a DLP doctor? Does a doctor have "DLP" and "BLP" marked on his chest? It is the same thing that Senator Reader was talking about. It is nonsense to have this polarisation and talking about a DLP doctor. What is a DLP doctor?

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: They are only DLP doctors until you get sick. Why do you go to them then? If you were to fall down in here now and there was a DLP doctor outside, would you tell him not to touch you? That is nonsense! That is the same thing that Senator Reader alluded to. What is Dr. Hoyos? Is he a BLP or DLP? So they are all categorised?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us have some order, please.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: The disorder emanates from over there.

(Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH: That is all right.)

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: It is all right that it emanates from over there! That is most disrespectful to the Chair. I wish that sometimes you would send that boy outside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not let us make it worse. Senator Hall, that is not a proper way to speak

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I have no difficulty with the half an hour. You should know.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are not listening to what I am saying. I do not think it is a proper way to speak of a Minister as that boy over there.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I did not hear you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Would you kindly withdraw the remark you made about the Minister as a little boy?

SENATOR W. W. HALL: If I said that, Sir, I withdraw.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us not have anymore of the cross talk, and please continue your speech.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I will continue. Senator Greaves merely said that the development of the St. Joseph Hospital was important. It was not idle gossip. He did not say it because he felt he should go on meaninglessly. He said it because it is part of a policy, and I will refer you to the Democratic Labour Party manifesto of 1981. When it came to hospitals on page 22, it said:

"The Barbados Labour Party has done little during its term of office for the development of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Shortages of key staff, shortages of equipment and supplies, inadequate maintenance of plant and machinery have all resulted in very low morale among the medical, nursing and other staff at the hospital. The problems of the Casualty Department have grown worse.

The Democratic Labour Party promised that it will:

1) improve the management services of the hospital, and introduce forward planning for the replacement of machinery and equipment;

2) completely restructure the Casualty Department by increasing the availability of medical staff, and by restricting its services to determine serious accidents and other conditions requiring immediate medical attention. These measures will reduce the time one has to wait for medical attention at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. At the same time a separate out-patient clinic for the treatment of non-emergency illnesses will be developed on the hospital compound;

3) recognise the wonderful work being done by the religious order of Nuns, the Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother through the St. Joseph Hospital. Discussions will be pursued with the Order so that the hospital may be aligned with the national hospital system, and so that full hospital services will be provided for the northern part of Barbados on a twenty-four hour basis through an input of resources.

The next DLP Government will guarantee the continuing independent status of the hospital, and non-interruption of the services being currently provided by it, by the professionals currently practising there, and or by other interested groups;

4) pay the full costs for medical treatment abroad in cases where it is medically determined that adequate facilities and resources are not available in Barbados; and

5) re-organise the District Hospital Services."

It can be seen from that that Senator Greaves was only expounding on a matter of great concern to and a matter of policy of the Democratic Labour Party, so it is not a matter of just getting up and filling an hour or anything like that.

In this Bill you have to be a citizen of this country to come under the aegis of this Bill. We in recent times have declared our intention to fight on behalf of the people of St. Vincent and at least Grenada. We have sent troops to St. Vincent and Grenada.
1.00 p.m.

We are prepared to die for them — they are our CARICOM brothers. But in this Bill, if you are telling me that one has to be a citizen, it seems to me as if they will be left out in the cold.

Barbados has always been a sort of New York for the rest of the Eastern Caribbean. Many of our brothers

and sisters have been able to come here and get treatment. I dare say that there is a scarcity of eye specialists to begin with, and there are some lab tests that cannot be done in these islands, so, obviously, they come here. I should just like to ask the Minister what is his position on our CARICOM brothers in this respect, bearing in mind that we have been rather closely connected with them. As I said before, we are quite prepared to fight for them and die for them, and I do feel that perhaps some consideration should be given to them in this area.

Sir, ...

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: On a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: At the risk, Sir, of giving Senator Hall a chance to speak some more, I just want to draw his attention to the Bill which he should have read. The Bill does not say that the National Health Service is restricted to the citizens of Barbados.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think that is what he said.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I beg your pardon, Sir. He said it three times. I was waiting for him.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I should like it clarified for my own purposes.

My impression was that he said that he wanted to know whether you were going to charge people from outside, while you made it free for Barbados' citizens. That is what I understood. Was that what you said?

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Yes, Sir. I think that your interpretation is right, Sir. It can be put another way. It is not as ambiguous as the Minister feels. It just needs the right interpretation. Yes. If it is free for Barbadians, it is obvious that you are charging the people from outside.

I am only asking what is the position? Perhaps the Minister might now elucidate, if he can.

Mr. PRESIDENT: He will do that in his reply.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: All right, Sir. I shall continue. A lot of money has been collected, through the Health Levy, in this island, and the average man is asking, what has become of it? The Government, of necessity,

therefore must be very anxious to proceed with haste, even if indecent, on this very serious issue.

For a long time, we have been hearing of the National Drug Service and what have you, and it has really been bogged down. There has been a paralysis of analysis. That is what they have had. Having said that, I think that the Government, in truth and in fact, is rather anxious to move on.

I daresay, that we need to think in terms, first of all, of the cost. We have to look at the methodology. We have to look and see exactly how smoothly this change can be implemented for the satisfaction of all the people who matter, the patients, and indeed the doctors, who will no doubt have a big say in this situation.

I feel that the cost would be rather astronomical. There is a saying: "Why buy a cow when you can get milk free?" When you have a free situation, you have to realize — I think the Minister realizes this — that people will tend to abuse the situation. Not that it is wanton abuse, but this is what happens.

In the Casualty today, you will find — as everyone in Barbados knows — that there is an over flooding of people going into the Casualty with little things that could easily be looked after. I think I heard the Minister allude to this sometime ago when he said that he was going to make sure that the Casualty was a department which would look after serious cases and cases of emergency.

In the big United States of America, the Blue Cross and the Blue Shield insurances recognized that people were claiming on their insurance policies for little things like a little headache and falling off a couch. They were flooded, because people would do this regularly. Do you know what they did, Sir? They decided that they would only insure people for emergency cases, and, as if by magic, the emergency departments were nearly empty. That goes to prove that you will find that when people feel that they can get something just so, they will abuse it.

When a man who comes to a doctor with a headache, and he comes continuously with the same headache, the doctor can only of necessity believe that there must be something wrong with the fellow and order an X-ray or perhaps a blood test. So you have to look at it in the sense that people be educated about this. Senator Reader is right.

A big National Health Service and the average man in the street knows absolutely nothing about it! The same thing happened with the Abortion Bill. There is a serious lack of the appreciation that there must be some public awareness in these matters and that the people in

the street must understand clearly what the Government is trying to do.

You do not just come and put the full weight on the people. When a serious national issue like this comes up, people should know what is happening. Unless you do that, you are not going to make sure that the service is properly run.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have one minute left, Senator Hall.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Let me say this in that one minute. The cost will escalate, because you would need more personnel and back-up services. You would definitely need more back-up services for the man who goes to a doctor and he has to get consultant treatment, he either has to wait for a very long time at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because of the amount of people waiting there, or he then does exactly what Senator Griffith said — he goes to someone else and pays. That is exactly what happens now, because there are cases where people believe that it would be quicker to go to the same St. Joseph Hospital, and they will by-pass the QEH. There will be a serious case for back-up services, and it would escalate the cost of the scheme.

I have not got time to develop the argument any further, but I do feel that this is a serious issue. It is one that affects all of us, because I dare say that the honourable ladies and gentlemen in this Chamber will be part of this. I do not believe that they will be still having their private little doctors, their private consultations and expect the poor people to go out there and go into this. I believe that we will be seeing the honourable ladies and gentlemen of this Chamber in the scheme.

I believe that we need to look at it carefully, and in implementing any change, we have to understand that we can either upgrade what we have got or come for something new. But if it is new, we have to understand that you have to make sure that it is not a piecemeal situation. It has to be as comprehensive as possible, because it involves all of us.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think it would be convenient to suspend the Sitting at this stage.

The Sitting will be suspended until 2.00 o'clock.
1.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

SENATOR MISS J. CLARKE: Mr. President, I rise to support this Bill, because I honestly feel that is a progressive piece of legislation which will be of benefit to the people of this country.

I take the points made by Senators Wickham and Reader with regard to the fact that we do not have to see everything in partisan political terms, and I think the time has come when, whatever our political feelings or affiliations, we must put the country first and stop these adversary tactics, which do nothing for the good of the country. Having said that, however, I must say that I find it strange that Senator Greaves would seek to give the impression that all credit with regard to this particular approach to health care should redound to the credit of his party. I think we must understand that if he wishes to take credit for everything that is good that happens in this country, he must also be prepared to take credit for every bad thing.

I believe that he has allowed himself as usual to ramble. In the process he has defeated some of his points which might otherwise have been of particular worth. I find it unacceptable that he should on the one hand seek to imply that the Prime Minister is irresponsible in his statements and then proceed to be just that himself. Because I consider that his statement to the effect that the Government refused to pay overtime to junior doctors is a very irresponsible statement. I am sure that Senator Greaves is well aware of the fact that there would be difficulties in terms of administrative approaches and efficiency from time to time, which would have to be the underlying factor relating to any delay in the payment of overtime to any workers in this country. I believe that he has forgotten that it was his party which branded the Civil Service as "an army of occupation."

The other statement which he made which I find irresponsible is a statement to the effect that the Barbados Labour Party presided over the disintegration of the Federation. I do not think that was either true or necessary. If by this he means that because a Barbadian happened to be the Prime Minister of the Federation and therefore by that token he presided over the disintegration, that is well and good. But I do not think that that was what he was implying at all, and I think it was a very unfortunate statement for any person in public life to make.

I believe that part of the difficulty relating to this particular piece of legislation relates to the fact that, unfortunately, we now have the tendency in this country, to blow every issue out of proportion. So any difficulties which may have been encountered in the negotiations between the Medical Association and the Government have been triggered and blown-up. I do not really believe that this is good for the country in any way that a thinking person could believe in what is good and proper. I

believe that in negotiating any new approach you will find difficulty, but it is possible at the negotiating table to overcome these in one way or another.

When we consider the statement delivered by the Minister on the last occasion that we met, it seems obvious to me that, by and large, the negotiations with the medical practitioners were cordial, but that there were some differences on which there was not an immediate meeting of the minds. The fact that we have been able to resolve most, if not all, of these few differences suggests to me that the usual good commonsense for which Bajans are well known has prevailed. I think this is a reflection of the sensitivity on the part of the Government and the Medical Association and is not due in any way to any pronouncements made by the Opposition.

Anytime there is a new procedure being implemented or a new approach being adopted, it is only natural that the individuals involved will view this with some suspicion. I believe that this is what happened with regard to this piece of legislation. From time immemorial the doctors have practiced on an independent basis, and I believe that they would have been cautious in their approach to the concept of a regularized National Health Service. Be that as it may, I believe that they themselves recognize that the motive of the Government in bringing this piece of legislation is a good one, and that it is intended to do just what Senator Reader is calling for — to ensure that good health care is available to all Barbadians, regardless of their social status.

As I see it, we had the situation where the doctors were wary because this was something new. Some of them may have felt that it would be indicative of a loss of their independence. Some of them may also have felt that it would in turn mean a loss of revenue, because they were not certain as to whether the system of remuneration would generate the kind of revenue to which they have become accustomed. This is my supposition. I may be completely wrong, but I believe that these are natural areas of concern which could have affected the doctors' position.

We also had the matter of negotiations being clouded by the introduction of other issues which had absolutely no bearing on the National Health Scheme. I think this is most unfortunate. I think that we must try as people, whether professional or otherwise, and as Members of Parliament, to keep our heads anchored in such a way that we do not get carried away by listening to people who wish to blow trivialities into mountains for their own special reasons.

I was interested to hear Senator Hall in his contribution refer to the situation with regard to residents of the Eastern Caribbean. Although there was an intervention, I am not quite sure that I understood the point he

was making, but I hope that he was not suggesting that we should provide free health care to the citizens of the Eastern Caribbean. By all means, we can make our facilities available, as we have been doing for sometime, but I hardly think it would be proper for us to give them access to the National Health Service in the same way as tax-paying Barbadians, whether past or present, have access.

I do not think that this should be a concern, because as far as I am aware, there is nothing which says that citizens of the Caribbean, whether near or far, are excluded from our facilities.

Finally, I would like to say that concern about taxes collected to provide this service is to be expected, but it should not be viewed as a means of collecting taxes for the sake of collecting taxes. Although there have been various predictions as to what the scheme will cost, I am sure that, in reality, there is always the possibility that these predictions may not prove to be completely accurate. I am also sure that such revenue as has been collected will be appropriately used in providing health care. Hence, I do not think that we need have fear that the money that we have contributed will be diverted into any other area of activity in this country.

I therefore wish without hesitation to support this Bill. I hope that any reservation which the medical profession may still have as regards the successful implementation of the service will be dispelled and that the medical profession, as well as Barbadians generally, will approach this in a positive manner and recognize the good which can derive from such an approach to the provision of health care.

Thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Howell.

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bill, and I want to start by congratulating Government for bringing such a measure — as far as I am concerned, not a moment too soon. I speak not as someone with any great knowledge or authority in this field, but as a Barbadian who has spent several years living in England where such a Bill has been in force. It was in force when I first went to England, and any such legislation, based on my own experience, will always be of benefit to the people of any country, in particular the poor people of that country.

2.30 p.m.

I am also in agreement with those speakers who made the point that this Bill goes beyond party politics. Nevertheless, legislation introducing a National Health Service has

always met with a lot of opposition from the Opposition party in the respective country.

I do not believe that is any good saying that we can upgrade that system in order to provide an adequate service. That, to my mind, would take far too long. We would not know exactly where to go, and therefore I strongly support this fresh start by the Government. As I have said, although both of the parties would agree that Barbadians as a whole would benefit, there is bound to be some opposition. Otto von Bismarck had it in Germany in the 19th century, the first country to introduce what we now know as a national health service, and Mr. Aneurin Bevan had it in England in 1948 after the second world war.

In this country, the medical profession was consulted. There were consultations, there were several meetings; but it must be understood that in legislation such as this the doctors have a special interest and will fight to put their case, even though in the final analysis no one can say no more than that even they themselves do have the health of the people in this country at heart.

To my mind, free medical care with a doctor of your choice is a gigantic step. It is a step that is to be congratulated. It is all right saying that we have a system that is working well. I do agree that our present system is working well; to me, someone who has lived in a country with a national health service in operation, it is not working well enough.

I recall when I first returned to Barbados in 1977 getting my Secretary to make an appointment for me to visit my doctor on a Saturday; having spent half the day in Chambers, and felt very strange going there at 1 o'clock in the afternoon to walk in before a whole waiting room, and you did not have to look very hard to realise that they were poor people. This would not have happened in England where a national health service is in operation, and it would not happen here either when this measure has been given approval by both Houses and assent by the Governor-General.

You can get the best service if you can afford to pay for it. But no matter how rich you are, no matter what is your social status in this country, I believe that a man or a woman not feeling well on a particular day should be able to go to a medical practitioner of his or her choice and feel assured that he or she will get the best medical service, whether or not he or she has a cent in his pocket. That, to my mind, can only benefit the people of this country, and therefore I do not see any reason why all this partisan debate should have been taking place in the first place.

The whole point is that it is a good thing. That is why the Democratic Labour Party would claim that they

thought about it first. If it was not good, the chief spokesman would have said so, but he did not say so.

Consultation has always been the stumbling block whenever a medical health service is introduced in a country. I have already given what I consider to be one of the major reasons for that, but in a system where the Westminster model of democracy is firmly entrenched, consultation is one thing, but to be dictated to is another thing. There must be consultation in order that you get the proper inputs from the people who will have to work the system, and the people who do have some experience as to what to expect when the system is actually implemented, but in the final analysis, it is for the Minister in charge of the appropriate Ministry, in this case the Health Ministry, to listen to the doctors, listen to their consultations, then to report to Cabinet, and then implement Government policy.

Consultation should never under our system stand in the way of things that are clearly for the benefit of the people of this country as a whole. I am all for consultation. There are times, however, if they are taking too long, and in this case where the matter is not strictly medical but administrative, that I feel the Government in my view should take the initiative.

The people in the street do not appear to know a lot about the scheme, and my Government must take some blame for that. Be that as it may, sickness does not really pick out the day when the polyclinic or the district hospitals are open, sometimes one has to postpone the care, or one has to make the choice of taking a child to the doctor at night with the only \$40 in the house, or you toss it up and take a chance and wait till 9 o'clock the next morning when the polyclinic is open. That is gambling with your child's life. If you have money in your pocket, you do not have to do that. In a small society like ours you may well be in a position to get on the phone and call your doctor friend who will come out at midnight and look after your child, and even though you can afford to pay he may say that is all right. The poor people do not readily know such people, and therefore I firmly believe that the sooner this measure is placed on the Statute Book the better, and that by and large all Barbadians are going to benefit from this.

I would like to see this measure when it is implemented work to such an extent that the snobbery of going to private hospitals and so will be done away with. I well recall living in England when Mrs. Barbara Castle was Minister of Labour and she took in with an illness where she was going to be inoperative for six weeks. She could have gone to Harley Street, she could have gone into any of the private London clinics, but she went into an ordinary hospital, no pay ward, under England's National Health Service. She said that her Government started it, and you must believe in what you

preach; and when she came out of the hospital she said that the treatment she received was among the best she had ever had and if she had paid for it, she could not have expected better.

2.30 p.m.

I would like not only to see this Bill come into an Act, but its implementation to reach a standard such as that which Mrs. Barbara Castle, the Labour Minister, boasted about.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I am going to respond to a couple of points raised by the Opposition benches.

Senator Greaves, the chief spokesman for the Opposition, spoke at length about the great work which his party did while in office and he seemed to suggest that with the leaving of the corridors of Government by his party, the public health plant in this country has been on a downhill slide.

The truth is that Senator Greaves has got it slightly wrong, because, in fact, notwithstanding the talk about non-partisan politics, it was the Barbados Labour Party Government that built all the health centres in Barbados. It was the Barbados Labour Party Government that started the hospital, the same Queen Elizabeth Hospital which he talks about now. It was the Barbados Labour Party Government that built all the polyclinics — never mind they started something at Warrens. So when we are talking about the stock and the health plant of this country, I do not want to hear anything from Senator Hall or Senator Greaves about what they did. I want them to show the record.

Senator Greaves also seemed to charge that for the last three years, while the Health Service Levy was being collected, in some way or the other the Government was ripping off the people of Barbados. Only on the last time we met I spoke at length on the implementation of the Drug Service, which came into force in 1980. The Drug Service covers specialized people in Barbados fully, and it also gives assistance to the general population of Barbados. The money which finances the Drug Service is the Health Levy. He pays his taxes and he pays his Health Levy to run the Drug Service, and he pays his Health Levy to run the National Health Service, which will start very soon. I suppose he was trying to get into the act.

He talked about the almshouses which are in bad condition. Does he want to know why the almshouses are in bad condition? Because they are overcrowded! When the Democratic Labour Party came into power, they closed down six of the infirmaries in Barbados and overcrowded the others, with the result that the present

accommodation is totally inadequate for the people who have to live in those places. They closed down the existing infirmaries without making any provision to accommodate the people at the other places, and then he comes in here and talks about their being rundown and overcrowded! They are overcrowded because of his party's policy, their poor record in health!

He talks about the Aedes Egypti programme, which he says is in danger. He would not know about that because it was the Barbados Labour Party that started the Aedes Egypti programme in 1954. He came in late. We started the programme because we understood at the time that there was a need to have an Aedes Egypti programme in Barbados. It does appear at present that there is not the same kind of need for that kind of programme as existed in 1954, therefore, the programme has to be tailored to suit the needs of today. We are not going to continue in 1984 with a programme that suited the needs of 1954. That is their style. It does not suit us. We have to change with the dynamics of the situation.

Senator Greaves said that the Government was not too willing to consult with BAMP and the doctors of Barbados — but he had not told that to Senator Hall. So Senator Hall came in, not knowing what Senator Greaves had said, and then said that the whole problem with the Health Service was that it is moving too slow, there was too much talk, obviously with the doctors. One Senator is saying that we moved too fast and did not consult with the doctors, but when we move slowly, through the task force system working with the doctors for three years, the other said we moved too slow. They are confused!

He talks about putting CARICOM back together and he wanted to make his manifesto a document of the House. I am sorry he did not bring it, because I wanted to show you what they have done to Barbados on the front of that thing he has in his hand. They have Barbados all over the place — broken up. Not only CARICOM was broken up, but they have broken up Barbados too. You do not want to lay it now?

Their contribution to the health services of Barbados in fifteen years, according to Senator Greaves, was to acquire the land in St. Peter for the Maurice Byer Polyclinic and to improve the QEH by the addition of the Intensive Care Unit. We built the hospital. We are extending the hospital in this term of office, because we understand that we have to upgrade the stock, at a cost of \$7 million. Work will soon start. They have not added on a door since the QEH was built.

He also seems to want to take some claim for providing some kind of ambulance service in Barbados. I saw in this morning's papers that in 1975 when they started the ambulance service they had one ambulance and forty-five workers. They must have been driving

one another up and down, from hospital to hospital. Forty-five people for one ambulance and they are boasting that they have provided an ambulance service in Barbados! That is the kind of programme they carried on!

The one thing of merit which was raised in debate was the question as to why doctors at the hospital were not paid two months ago, and why the public health inspectors were in so much confusion over pay. I have no intention of taking any ministerial responsibility for that. It is ordinary, straightforward Public Service inefficiency, and I am not a part of that. I left the Public Service in 1969, so do not point to this Minister about any non-payment of doctors. I told the doctors that I was on their side of the table. I am making it clear.
12.40 p.m.

When people work they should get paid, and if the Public Service Commission or whoever runs the Public Service cannot organise their business to get the people paid, that is their business. This Minister is not taking any responsibility for that kind of inefficiency. If a public officer in good faith makes mistakes in my Ministry, I am willing to carry that, but I am no part of incompetence, so let that be understood. Do not ask me about it. I support the doctors. If they do not get paid, they should not work either.

Sir, Senator Hall came in, running fast, bowling slow and bowling late, and raised some question about which persons will benefit under the system. The Bill carefully says that all persons resident in Barbados will be beneficiaries. This is in Clause 4(3) on page 3 of the Bill. A person is not eligible to be a beneficiary unless he is resident in Barbados. It is nothing to do with being a citizen of Barbados, so when we make the grandstanding speeches about carrying soldiers to St. Vincent and Grenada, let it be understood that people who live here are all equal. We do not have one kind of rules for citizens of Barbados and another kind of rules for people born in St. Vincent or who are from the Grenadines and happen to live here. If you live here you have the same rules; the law is the law for all of us.

Immigrants are not second class citizens of this country. When some time ago there was some talk of amending the Immigration Bill, I noticed that some technicians wanted to say that one of the penalties we should be able to use against immigrants was their deportation if they breached the law. I opposed it because I said the law is for all of us. If a man comes here from Hong Kong and we take the serious decision of making him an immigrant of Barbados and he lives here, if he commits a crime he must be charged the same way as a man who was born in Barbados, and if he comes from Timbuctu and lives in Barbados, he must benefit from the Health Service in the same way as the

person who is born in St. Lucy. There should be no difference, and I want to make that point quite clear.

Some time ago, the spokesman of the other party used to walk around advising people that they owned the houses in the housing estates and they should not pay rent. That backfired on them and caused confusion which is still existing in Barbados. Now you hear them saying not to pay for the immunisation, it is your medicine; but I do not have to worry because it will be his yellow fever, not mine. It is that same sort of ignorance that went on with the houses. But we are going to make sure that if he gets yellow fever, he does not come back to Barbados with it. It will be quarantined in his stomach.

Senator Griffith spoke on the St. Joseph Hospital, so I am not going to get too deeply into that, except to say that the negotiators for the St. Joseph Hospital are not bad politicians. They waited very carefully until the by-election in St. Peter was going full stream to start trying to negotiate with me about what assistance we were going to give the St. Joseph Hospital. I had to explain to them that I would raise that matter on the 20th July, and on the 20th July their lawyers called to find out how much assistance the Government cannot afford to give, because the truth of that is that at present the Government is in no position to give any money to the St. Joseph Hospital.

We are going to improve the stock we have, we are going to keep on working on the \$7 million project at the QEH, we are going to keep on working on the improvement of the Casualty. There are already improvements there and there will be further improvements, so we cannot afford to give the St. Joseph Hospital any money. They can work out their problems with the school. Whether they want the school's money or not, that is their problem, but we cannot afford to give them any money. Those persons who have been assigned to plea their cause can tell them that they are not going to get any money from Government, because we have no money to give.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I was just asking if the Bill could not be taken in parts, instead of clause by clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It could be, Senator Jones, but on this occasion the Leader of the House would wish it to be taken clause by clause.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I would like to move that it be taken in parts, Mr. Chairman.
2.40 p.m.

The question that the Bill be taken in Parts was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We concluded Clause 4 in the first Part.

The question that clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Parts II, III, and IV inclusive were called and passed.

The First Schedule, as amended, was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Sir, before you put the motion for the First Schedule, as amended, I want to point out that we have a small problem on the circulated amendment. Page 3, paragraph 5, line three reads:

"The Board may

- (a) appoint such other committees comprised of its members"

That should be, "consisting", Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "Consisting".....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: "Consisting of its members".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The proposal is that in the amendment to the First Schedule which has been circulated, that is, paragraph 5 of page 3:

"The Board may

- (a) appoint such other committees comprised of" that "comprised of" should read, "consisting of".....

So with that proposal, change "comprised of" to read "consisting of".....

(Senator A. W. A. McCLEAN: That is better, but it should be, "from among its members".)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to move an amendment to that amendment to the amendment?

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I should like to propose that we delete the proposed

words, "consisting of" and substitute therefor the words, "from among".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While I am prepared to entertain that, it is really amazing how often you go around and around.

The simplest thing to do would have been to say, "comprising its members", and simply leaving out "of". But I will take your point.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: But it is only some of the members that you want now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We want to say, "appoint such other committees from its members".

Is there general agreement with that proposed amendment, in the interest of clarity and precision?

If that is so, then would the Government be prepared to accept that?

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "From among its members".

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the First Schedule, as amended, with a correction now reading, "from among its members" be the First Schedule to the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I want to speak on this, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just let me make the proposition.

It is proposed that the First Schedule, as amended, by the deletion of the words, "comprised of" at paragraph 5 on page 3 of the proposed Amendment to read, "from among its members" be the Schedule to the Bill.

Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have very serious reservations about this amendment, and I propose to vote against it.

Page 3, subsection 5 says:

"The Board may

- (a) appoint such other committees from among its members for the proper performance of its functions under the Act;

- (b) delegate to such committees any of its functions that it thinks fit;

(c)"

This is the area that we on this side, I am speaking for Senator Hall and myself, cannot agree to.

"with the approval of the Minister, co-opt to the committees persons with such specialist knowledge as it thinks fit.

(6)"

This is it.

- "A person co-opted under sub-paragraph 5 (c) has the right to vote."

I think this is very unusual. Normally speaking, as I understand it, people who are co-opted to a committee do not have a right to vote. They are co-opted to the committee, as this subsection here rightly points out, because of their specialist knowledge, presumably to give advice to the committee. But here, you are going to get the Minister, who already will have the Board laden down with his hand-picked people, to co-opt to the committees persons.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, it says "The Board" will co-opt.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: ".....with the approval of the Minister," I know how these boards operate. Do not worry to bamboozle me with that. It says "with the approval of the Minister". If the Minister does not approve, the Board cannot appoint. That is my point. That is a serious thing. If you are co-opting a person to a sub-committee, I am submitting that that person has no right to vote.

We are going to vote against this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator McClean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think that in relation to this provision, what is envisaged is that you will have specialist sub-committees. It might be indicated that the expertise required on this committee might probably go beyond the expertise on the existing Board, so the Board, in its wisdom, might determine that you want to go beyond 5 (a) and have appointed to the Board — the term "co-opt" is used, but the person will become, to all intents and purposes, a normal member of the Board — someone with specialist knowledge in that area.

What is indicated here is that such a person will be permitted to function on the same level as any other

member of that sub-committee, not of the Board itself. Presumably, decisions taken at the level of sub-committee would have to be ratified by the Board anyhow. So when he is going wrong, the Board in its original composition can deal with that matter.

I do not see that any great danger can come from allowing someone with specialist knowledge in an area voting in a committee, dealing with things within his specialist knowledge. That is why they put him there in the first place.

If it seems as though something remiss is happening, the Board in its original composition still exists to veto anything done by its committees. I do not think that the danger alluded to is a real one.
3.00 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I knew the Opposition would find an excuse to vote against the Bill. I was waiting to see what would happen. It was going too right. The Democratic Labour Party cannot help but vote against this type of legislation. When the Tenancies Bill came here to give the poor in Barbados an opportunity to own their house spots they voted "no" and now they want to vote "no" again. They could not vote "no" on a second reading. They had to find what they thought was a mistake to find an excuse to vote "no".

The paragraph which he is voting against is the result of the kind of consultations which Senator Hall said we should have. The doctors said that they wanted that provision put in and we are accommodating all the doctors in Barbados. They are voting against the doctors this time.

The question that the First Schedule as amended be the First Schedule to the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to, Senator Greaves dissenting.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Second Schedule be the Second Schedule to the Bill.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill as amended was reported as having passed in Committee, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Bill as amended has now been passed. The Clerk will take the usual steps to send a message to the Other Place.

LAND DEVELOPMENT DUTY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Land Development Duty Act, 1984.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Bill is in the name of Senator Griffith.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Thank you, Mr. President.

There are two amendments to this Land Development Duty Bill, Cap. 78. Initially as was pointed out by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, there seems to be some deficiency in the present legislation, since there was no machinery established for bringing to the notice of the Commissioner any transactions relating to the sale of land in special development areas.

In January the Cabinet approved amendments which would in effect provide for the transfer of responsibility for the administration of the Land Development Duty Act from the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to the Commissioner of Land Tax. The Bill then also provided for the prohibition of the recording of the conveyance unless there was a certificate signed by the Commissioner of Land Tax in respect of the land; that is whether or not it is in a development area, and if so, that the Development Duty has been paid.

When the Bill was introduced in the Other Place the Minister of Finance noticed that there were some other provisions that should be made, and provision was made for amendments in two respects – (1) to make better provision for inflation and (2) to allow for the Property Transfer Tax.

This Bill in effect will have to be sent back to the Other Place once the amendments are agreed upon in the Senate.

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

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I support the amendments to the Bill. However, there are a few points that I would like to make.

I have been made to understand that the Speights-town area has now been deemed a special development area. I imagine that this has come about because of the establishment of Heywoods and the construction of the by-pass road. However, I believe that at this time of the

development in the north it would be a mistake to include Speightstown as an area under this Act. I say this because if we take a direct look, we will note that the Speightstown By-Pass Road, even by its name, implies that you do not go to Speightstown. Furthermore, when you come on the Speightstown By-Pass Road, the entrance to Speightstown itself is so concealed that it would appear as if you were going into a cul-de-sac. It is not well lighted at night and there is a lot of growth of hedges and trees around, so you do not get the impression that there is a town that way. If we are going to have development, and if we are going to have better shopping in Speightstown, which will be done by the tourists in our country that stay at Heywoods, I think that the entrance should be a lot better.

I travelled last Wednesday night to attend a meeting in Speightstown, and I found myself at another meeting. I by-passed Speightstown somehow. I heard Senator Greaves and I beat a hurried retreat.

The Heywoods complex is also so constructed that the entrance and the exit are on the by-pass road, and furthermore there is quite a shopping complex within Heywoods. As a guest staying there you would not want to go into Speightstown; you would do your shopping in Heywoods and then leave for Bridgetown. You do not know where Speightstown is.

More importantly, if Heywoods is going to be successful, and I believe it will be, it is necessary to have the development of Speightstown. I think it would be wrong to increase the cost of development through this Act.
3.10 p.m.

Any vendor selling his land in Speightstown will take into account that he has to pay a high special Development Duty, and therefore, he will increase the cost of the land. I think that as an incentive for development in Speightstown the Government could announce that, within a period of three years this Act will come into effect down in Speightstown, so it will give you a breathing space to do the development now to get Heywoods going.

I have been hearing a lot about the thrust in the north, and if we are going to have the thrust in the north, we must allow the private sector to go ahead. The Government has given the lead by the road and Heywoods, and I think it is now left to the private sector, but we of the private sector cannot develop in a very high cost area, and Speightstown does not have that very many people, so the designation of this area under the Act will make it too expensive to carry out development.

I hope that the Government will take another look and decide to leave Speightstown out of this for a little while.

I thank you.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I think the point raised by Senator Seale in relation to Speightstown and the consequences of declaring it a development area is not entirely on all fours with the way in which I believe the thing will unfold. I do not see that the provision for indicating whether there will be capital gains associated with developments in terms of putting in new roads and other infrastructure in and of itself will necessarily increase the property values in Speightstown. Property values in Speightstown will tend towards what is appropriate for Speightstown under the existing circumstances. It may or may not be that the by-pass road will enhance property values in Speightstown. If it does not enhance those values, then the properties will not become liable to pay tax under this Act. If it does so enhance them, then they will pay.

Evidently people who are going to buy property in Speightstown would relate to what is reasonable in all the circumstances in terms of what they are going to do with that property. My feeling is that Speightstown itself will not be heavily influenced in terms of appreciation in property values by virtue of the new road, because the road actually by-passes Speightstown. Someone visiting the area for the first time perhaps would not be aware that Speightstown exists in its present location, and I would anticipate that that area is going to develop. You might get a wider Speightstown; you might get development closer to the by-pass road rather than down the coastal part of Speightstown, unless of course you do something about the access to Speightstown itself so that people would be aware that there is somewhere down there to go.

On the one occasion I was down that side recently, it was only because I had an idea where Speightstown was before that I knew Speightstown was down there. It looks as though you are by-passing maybe a beach or no place at all. But I do not think that by declaring it a development area would necessarily prejudice its chances of developing, because the people will have to relate to the value of property probably in the Speightstown location *vis-a-vis* land elsewhere in the immediate vicinity.

I thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I do not think there is anything controversial to react to in the statements made. I just want to point out, though, that as a result of the Government's thrust in the area we have found that business activity has increased, and if you get business activity increasing in the general area, obviously the value of real estate as it relates to businesses will increase.

I do not see the point made by Senator Seale as to whether Speightstown is a town that cannot be identified.

There is still a lot of work to be done in the Speights-town area, and it will be done. I can say with certainty that on the drawing boards of the National Petroleum Corporation is a plan to put natural gas in the general Speights-town area, another area which has a considerable business population, and in other areas in St. Peter. I just want to make that point.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to Clause 4. I would just like to point out that the existing Clauses 4 and 5 have been renumbered Clauses 5 and 6, and there is a new Clause 4 which has been passed to members of the Senate. Instead of five clauses now, the Bill would have six clauses.

I beg to move that the new Clause 4 be Clause 4 of the Bill.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6 were called and passed.

3.20 p.m.

On motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Senate was resumed and the passing of the Bill as amended was reported as having passed in Committee, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH the Bill was read a third time and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, 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.
3.25 p.m.

CONTENTS

MESSAGES

- Message from Governor-General re vacancy of
seat held by Senator O. S. Arthur 409

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

- Senator the Hon. O'B Trotman 409, 410

The Special Development Area (St. Barnabas
Road) Order, 1984.

Report of the Fire Service for the year 1983.

Report of the Probation Department for the
year 1981-82.

The Report and Financial Statement of the
Barbados National Standards Institution for
the year 1982-83.

Statements showing Money Order Transactions
through the Crown Agents for overseas
Governments and Administrations for the pe-
riod January to May 1984.

Statement showing the sums advanced to the
Postmaster General for the payment of Money
Orders for the period January to May 1984.

The Second Annual Report of the National
Sports Council for the year ended 31st March
1980.

The Third Annual Report of the National
Sports Council for the year ended 31st March
1981.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise
Receipts for two months ended 31st May
1984.

The Road Traffic Regulations 1984.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

- NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD
ACT, 1984. 410

Senator Trotman, 410, 427, 431; Senator
Greaves, 410, 415, 430; Senator Wickham,
414; Senator Griffith, 415; Senator Mrs.
Reader, 419; Senator Hall, 420; Senator
Miss Clarke, 425; Senator Howell, 426;
Senator McClean, 430.

- LAND DEVELOPMENT DUTY (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1984 431

Senator Griffith, 431, 432; Senator Seale,
431; Senator McClean, 432.

- SUSPENSION. 424

- ADJOURNMENT 433

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

CLARKE, Miss J.
GREAVES, E. E.
GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.
HALL, W. W.
HOWELL, St.C. E.
McCLEAN, A. W. A.
READER, Mrs. G. G.
SEALE, C. D.
TROTMAN, Hon. O'B.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.