

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

THE SENATE

Monday, March 26, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Monday, March 26, 1984, at 10.20 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. N. A. Barrow, (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate)

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

Senator StC. 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 D. A. C. Simmons

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.

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

Senator O. S. Arthur.

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

ABSENT

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE AND MOVED BY A MINISTER

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that Standing Orders 45 (2) and (3) be now suspended for the day's sitting so that the Bills on the Order Paper may be dealt with today.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir I beg to give notice of the following:

Estimates 1984-85

Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I propose that the order of business for the day should be as follows: Order No. 2, Order No. 4, Order No. 5 and Order No. 1. We are still not ready to proceed with Order No. 3. Senator Trotman will take charge of Order No. 2, Sir.

SEVERANCE PAYMENTS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 2 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President over the last few months we have had some debate, and we have had comments in the Press, regarding the non-payment of National Insurance contributions into the Fund after they had been collected from workers. We have also had debates over the question of unpaid taxes and matters of that sort.

The Bill before us this morning is slightly different. We are not, in the Bill before us, really trying to penalize anybody for not doing their tax collection. It is more a matter of encouraging employers to remember that the people who they employ must be taken into consideration before other payments are made.

We had a problem where persons were severed in this country, including from some statutory boards, and then were not given their severance for several months. The Government considers that this is an absolutely unacceptable position. We cannot afford to have people being laid off from employment and not getting their severance. We have to understand that in the case of low paid workers, very often the workers have commitments to business houses and other domestic commitments which have to be met, and they cannot afford a break in payments. Therefore, if a person is laid off at the end of one week, there is no good reason why good management could not arrange for the person to go home with their severance at the same time, thereby cushioning some of the shock that unemployment would have on the person's loss of earnings.

Section 2 of the Bill therefore puts a time limit on the period for the payment of severance, and subsection 2 of that section sets a penalty for not paying within the prescribed time. The Minister of Finance, from time to time, will make orders setting the rate of interest which the employers would have to add to their actual payment of severance, if the employer does not pay the severance within two months — or four months, should the Board so decide to give an extension.

Section 4 of the Bill, also puts some minor penalty on employers who do not do their personnel work efficiently. Section 4 says that if an employer owed the National Insurance Board money, whether it be for National Insurance, Health Service Levy, the Severance Fund, Training Fund or the Transport Levy, and he was eligible for a rebate of severance payment, the Board should deduct the funds owing to the Board from the rebate, because it would be senseless to pay the man a rebate when in fact he owes the Board under other heads of levies. The Government, therefore, is going to ensure that, in the future, persons who are in arrears with their payments do not benefit from rebates when they sever workers in the future.

The Bill also makes provision for the recovery of severance payment and the interest on severance payment.

It is now recoverable, as a debt due to the employee, in civil proceedings before a court of competent jurisdiction.

Those basically, are the terms of the Bill, and 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, I should like to make a few comments on this amendment to the Severance Payments Act. I really saw the Bill for the first time a couple of minutes ago, but I believe that this amendment to the Severance Payment Act, particularly the portions relating to a time limit on the payment of severance payments and the payment and recovery on outstanding severance payments, has been a long time in coming.

I think sometime previously I gave the historical perspective to the whole idea behind these two aspects of the amendment which are now included in this legislation. I just want to remind honourable Senators that, as far back as 1974, when I was in the other Chamber, I introduced a Resolution in that Chamber, which was passed without division, calling for the imposition of a time limit on the payment of severance payments, and, further, that any money due after a particular period should bear a rate of interest.

Indeed, I went further to indicate, as I have done on subsequent occasions, that not only are these two things required to make severance payments more humane in terms of the application of the Act, but what is required is a complete revamping of the severance payment legislation. There is this need because there are a number of areas which are somewhat grey, and which need to be clarified. We need an Act which is more comprehensive than it is at present.

I think that our researchers will be aware of the fact that the Democratic Labour Party in its Manifestoes of 1976 and 1981 had promised that we would have reorganized the severance payment legislation to make it more simple, with particular emphasis on the two areas which have been indicated here. The Government, I am submitting, has moved very closely on these amendments because they had the benefit of the Resolution, which I indicated was passed in 1974, when they came into power in 1976. They further benefitted from comments on the severance payment legislation which was solicited from the Barbados Workers Union, which were submitted in 1977, if my memory serves me right. So whereas I am happy to see that these amendments are now coming, I would say that they are really coming somewhat late, because in the interim, a number of workers have suffered as a result of the loop-holes which existed in the legislation, and which were exploited by the employers.

As Senator Trotman has indicated, the Government and the statutory corporations of the Government have been among the offenders. I had occasion to refer to the National Housing Corporation, where it was agreed three years ago that the workers at the National Housing Corporation who were severed — it was agreed by the Board — would be paid severance pay. But the then Minister, Mr. Delisle Bradshaw, refused to allow the Board to pay severance pay to the workers. He refused consistently, and it was only when there was a new Minister, Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, that the Minister gave his permission for the money to be paid out. That is an incontrovertible fact.

We have a situation where we have Ministers of Government talking about one thing, making all sorts of pontifications, but when it comes to implementation, some of them are the worst offenders in these areas. I know what I am talking about.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, on a point of order: I am anxious that we should not be misled. I am not accusing Senator Greaves of wanting to mislead us, but it is a matter of settled Government policy that although the Severance Payment Act does not apply to Government employees and workers in these statutory corporations, such as the one referred to, whenever there is severance of workers, they should be treated in the same way as if they were subject to the Severance Payment Act. Therefore, it is not within the capacity of any Minister to refuse severance.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, Senator Barrow and myself have no quarrel on that. As a matter of fact, this Government policy was settled by a Cabinet decision as far back as 1972. But, over and over, if you check the correspondence between the Barbados Workers Union and the National Housing Corporation on this particular issue, you would find that we had to be constantly referring to this, and the Board was indicating that it was powerless; that it had submitted the matter to the Ministry and it was awaiting the approval of the Minister. The Minister consistently refused to give his approval. That is what I am talking about, but I know that this has been settled Government policy since 1972.

If you take the Sanitation Service Authority.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: If Senator Greaves will give way — I do not propose to speak on it; it is a matter of elucidation, if he does not mind — if it is a matter of settled Government policy, one would have expected that the application of the policy would be automatic. Therefore, it is a matter of executive action at bureaucratic level. How does a Minister therefore get into it? That is what I do not understand.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: That, too, I do not understand. But I understand the Minister has to approve

the funds. Anyhow, the matter was subsequently settled. I am only looking at the application of a policy.

Let us look at the Sanitation Service Authority, which laid off bath attendants recently. I am not at all saying that severance payment is the answer to a laying off situation, but at least it provides some means for persons who are laid off to get some kind of money to tide them over a difficult period, because being unemployed is a very, very difficult situation; and particularly in these days in Barbados, when it is so difficult to get a job, severance pay is of particular importance. But I will give credit where it is due.
10.40 a.m.

The Sanitation Service Authority did a very noble thing. At the time when the people came to the last day they gave them a paper setting out very clearly what their benefits were and calculated severance pay, gratuity, pension — the whole works. This was a couple of weeks ago. I do not know if they have been paid yet, but the point is that I believe that this is the correct procedure that should be followed, and I would hope that other statutory corporations would do the same thing.

I see Senator Linton hiding behind Senator Reece, because I know that the National Conservation Commission a couple of weeks ago laid off some seventy-nine workers. I am not too sure yet how many of them are entitled to severance, but I hope that Senator Linton would get his Board to pay those people who are entitled as soon as possible, if they have not as yet been paid.

The point I am making is that this is a very serious matter. As far as severance payment is concerned, I have been harsh on employers, whether they were employers in the private sector or whether it was the Government, because I think it is a matter of principle to which we ought to adhere very closely.

In the private sector, we have a number of employers who continue to exploit the loopholes which exist in severance payment legislation. Let me give you an example — Sunset Crest. I am going to mention this particularly, because an especially disturbing development has apparently taken place. It has to do with National Insurance and the kind of people who sometimes have to give advice to people who go to these various Government departments for advice.

Sunset Crest has laid off almost all its staff. I think this must have been in May or June last year, and up to this day no worker from Sunset Crest has received severance pay. They claim that they cannot pay. The result is that the Barbados Workers' Union, acting on behalf of the workers, has had to file claims with the National Insurance Board. Those claims were filed within

the statutory period, the period which is allowed for claims to be filed. Can you imagine that within the last two weeks the National Insurance Board has been calling in all of these workers individually and giving them the same forms which have been filled out, and filled out properly, by the Barbados Workers' Union on their behalf, and telling them that they have to write to their employers claiming severance pay? Can you imagine that, Sir, when those forms have been filed almost a year ago?

I really do not understand what is happening in the National Insurance Department. There is utter confusion.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Ask who? Tom Adams? He does not administer the National Insurance Department. I think that there is a very serious breakdown in that department at the administrative level, and something has to be done about it, because, in the meantime, people are suffering.

Do you think that it is fair for any worker to have lost his or her job in May or June 1983 and up to this day not receive any compensation, any of the severance to which they are entitled? Do you think that it is right for claims to have been filed over a year now and the National Insurance Board or Department, whichever it is, cannot make a determination about the amount of money which people are owed? Do you think it is right that after having filed, and filed correctly, applications for severance pay, we now have a situation where the National Insurance Board is making workers file applications again and asking them to write their employers asking for severance pay? What kind of nonsense is going on there?

I think there is a level of incompetence and inefficiency in that department which ought to be put right immediately, because it is causing untold suffering to people who are severed, and who are pushed amongst the swelling ranks of the unemployed in this country in these very difficult days, with no alternatives for other jobs in sight.

Not only is there need for a complete revamping of the existing legislation, closing up the loopholes and making it easier not only for workers to understand, but to be able to claim severance pay, it would seem to me that there ought to be more mechanisms existing within the context of the National Insurance Board for the determination of applications. I really do not recall how many tribunals they have sitting now — I think there must be about two or so — but if there is need for an additional tribunal, get the additional tribunal so that these things can be speeded up.

This is an honest plea from someone who has to be dealing with this matter every day, with people calling

us asking about severance pay. Sometimes there is a level of cynicism which seems to be developing amongst the workers. They are due severance pay, the application is there, but they get the feeling that, although it is due, they are not going to get the severance pay. I think we should remove that. It is purely an administrative blockade which seems to be preventing the National Insurance Department from functioning in any effective and efficient manner.

I have said already that we need to computerise the accounts and all the information which is in the department. I have heard that this is accepted and that there are plans moving ahead for this. I really hope that this will go ahead without delay.

I welcome the two provisions, which, as I said, I have been in the forefront of pushing for almost ten years now. I am glad to see that my concerns have borne fruit, and I hope that, in addition to this, we will see an attempt being made to do a complete review of the severance payment legislation.

Thank you.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I rise, Mr. President, primarily to reply to one point which was made by Senator Greaves *vis-a-vis* those workers who were recently laid off by the National Conservation Commission, but, before replying specifically to that point, I would like to make a general comment on this severance payment legislation altogether. I have said, on more than one occasion during the last seven years I have been in here, that it is one of the most difficult Acts on the Statute Book.

10.50 a.m.

I read last week where the Minister of Labour stated that new labour or industrial legislation will be presented to this Chamber during the next few months or so. I hope that, included among that labour or industrial legislation, will be something to do with the Severance Payments Act. If possible, I would like to see a complete repeal of that Act and a re-enactment in a very much more simplified form.

I think the last Democratic Labour Party Administration, in its haste to, I believe, show that it was seeking to do good for the workers, confused three things in that piece of legislation. They confused the question of notice to persons about to be dismissed, the question of severance for such persons and, for good measure, they threw in one section about wrongful dismissal, Section 45 of the Act, I think, which states that damages for wrongful dismissal would be calculated as though it was severance. That complexed conjunction of different legal principles has given rise to serious difficulties in the courts.

I would like to see an Act dealing simply with the question of severance. I understand that one is coming to deal with the question of wrongful and/or unfair dismissal, and the quicker we see that, the better it will be for all of us. Some of the difficulties that we are now encountering with regards to the implementation of the Act, such as the incident that Senator Greaves mentioned regarding the National Insurance Department asking the workers to write to their employers demanding severance payment, can be obliterated. Perhaps, the union could play a greater part in assisting their members in making their claims whenever severance is due.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: Without elucidating what is it you want to say?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I indicated to this Chamber that that is a service which the Barbados Workers Union provides for its members. Indeed, in the specific case that I mentioned, Sunset Crest, I stated that the Barbados Workers Union had filled out all of the claims correctly and sent them in to National Insurance. But in spite of that, National Insurance has called the people in, and asked each one of them individually to write to their employer claiming severance.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Even if I accept that, part of the confusion regarding that arises because the Act, even if the tribunal makes a determination on the matter, still requires the applicant to ensure that he is taking all reasonable steps to recover what is due and owing to him from the employer before the Fund is required to pay out. So, even if a judgment is given by a tribunal, it is normal for the employee or his representative to write to the employer demanding payment. In my experience, where this is done, either by the employee or his representative, then the Fund is never reluctant to make payment.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of elucidation: I have already indicated that the Barbados Workers' Union had also written to the employer. All the steps have been fulfilled. We have been in this longer than you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. We cannot have a number of second reading speeches. A member says that he thinks the union can do more and Senator Greaves has pointed out the road that the union has followed in the past. Can we leave it at that?

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Fair enough. I am not arguing about that, Mr. President. I am speaking generally. In my experience, these things were never really done by the union, even though the union may insist in here and in the papers that they have been done. As a matter of fact, when the employees do come to their legal represen-

tatives, we find that a lot of things which are required by the Act are never done; therefore, it calls for a greater rapport between the union and the National Insurance Department to overcome a lot of the difficulties. However, I am not, by saying this, seeking to minimize the difficulties that employees meet in seeking to recover severance payments due from employers.

To turn to the specific question raised by Senator Greaves, *vis-a-vis* the National Conservation Commission. The National Conservation Commission received correspondence from the union — he can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe some of that correspondence was signed by the good Senator — asking us to hold dialogue on the question of the retrenchment of the persons who were severed. Senator Greaves knows that when the Heywoods Project came to an end, the National Conservation Commission was forced into a position where it had to lay off a large number of its workers who were employed there. When those workers were laid off, they each received a letter, and, enclosed in each letter, was a cheque representing all holiday pay which was due and owing, and all other payments except severance payments. Also, in the letter the workers were told the exact amount of severance to which they were entitled, and they were further told that as soon as the National Conservation Commission had funds, they would receive their severance.

The National Conservation Commission applied for a supplementary provision to meet the payment of severance. I believe, it has been incorporated in the Estimates and I can state, with some degree of accuracy, that the workers who were severed about four to five weeks ago, will receive their severance payment as soon as the National Conservation Commission is put in funds.

In the same way as Senator Greaves gave honourable mention to the Sanitation Service Authority as following that procedure, I think he ought, in fairness to the National Conservation Commission, to recognize that the National Conservation Commission has been following that procedure at least for the last seven years, the period I have been a member of the Board.

Thank you.

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Sir, once again, Government must really be commended for introducing this piece of legislation. Through it, it can be clearly seen that this Government is again in the forefront and doing all it can for the workers in this country.

After all of the rhetoric had been stripped from the speeches in this Chamber and in the Other Place, no doubt, in the final analysis, the record speaks for itself, and I know of no Administration which, within such a short period of time, has done so much for the workers of this country. I am heartened, however, to know that

Senator Greaves, in speaking on this matter indicated that he would support it. I cannot really see anyone in this Chamber speaking on an amendment to the Severance Payment Act and voting against it.

Rome was not built in a day, and the present Administration could not do everything it would have liked to do within the last seven years; there are certain constraints. A person of Senator Greaves' experience really has my sympathy, because I can understand someone in his position dealing with the problems of workers who are unemployed at a time when it is not unique to this country — unemployment in the entire world, the developed and developing countries, is rising. Every Administration has its problems with unemployment, and it is really difficult for workers, and those who are advising them, when they are faced with the stark reality of being put out of work, while, at the same time, months and sometimes years can pass without them getting the money, to which they are rightly entitled, to cushion the effects of unemployment.

11.00 a.m.

But that is not to say that the administration is slow — I think he said it was an administrative problem. I do not know if that is what it is, purely and simply. I think what is required in this country, and successive speeches from the Other Place have indicated that it would not be long before it is coming, is legislation which would bolster the present Severance Payment Act, because a lot of people are of the view, and it is being done fairly successfully, that they can hide behind the fund. Some employers have been in the habit of laying off workers and then saying that they do not have any money. Sometimes they pick on the workers for all sorts of trivial reasons and dismiss them, and then find themselves caught.

I think that the sooner this country introduces unfair dismissals legislation, the quicker the whole thing would begin to work much smoother. But no amount of amendments can be done to what is really a badly drafted piece of legislation to make it work harmoniously. You would have to repeal it and introduce new legislation; and, really, you can always find ways of getting around legislation, no matter how carefully it has been drafted.

If Senator Greaves has been pushing for this amendment with his Resolution or whatever, since 1974, then it is only fair to point out that the last Administration must take some blame, because they also, it would appear, from his calculations, had some three years to do something about it, and they did not do anything about it. So it may not be as straight-forward as it appears.

As I had said earlier, Rome was not built in a day, and it took us seven years to do a number of things. We just introduced in this Chamber a Shops Act, also another

piece of legislation trying to give some protection to the workers. Various people ask about my own interest, but everything cannot come at the same time.

Asides.

SENATOR St. C. E. HOWELL: You did not vote for it. The point is, I do not know if it is really fair to get up and try your best to level criticism when it is not all that easy to do. Some criticism must lie there, because the present Administration first came into power in 1976, which means that the last Administration had three years. So it cannot be as easy and straight-forward as Senator Greaves would like to have this Chamber believe.

Government should be commended for once again bringing a piece of legislation to protect the interest of the workers, and long may it go on to bring legislation of this nature before this Chamber.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Seale.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. President, I wish to support the amendment. I see it as fair and reasonable that people be paid their severance pay as soon as possible after they are severed. My experience has been that I have always paid it out the same day that the person left.

However, there is one little amendment that should be in the Bill. It is that the National Insurance Board should be made to pay back the employer in just as quick a time as the employer has to pay the employee, because my experience with the National Insurance Board for getting refunds for severance pay is that we generally have to wait something like a year. I would like to see an amendment which says that the National Insurance Board will have two months in which to pay back the employer his share.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, there are two things I wish to reply to, both raised by Senator Greaves. First of all, the question of tribunals. It seems to me that the whole question of tribunals at the National Insurance Board are taken too much in a part-time light. Tribunals meeting to decide on severance have to be given more priority — I agree with Senator Greaves entirely — and indeed the Board should do something about ensuring that enough tribunals are appointed and that the tribunals meet regularly, not once a month or once in two months. It will not do, and I am not any part of defending any inefficiency when it comes to people's severance.

The other point relates to the matter with National Housing, which he sought to drag one of my colleagues into. My understanding is that at the time when the National Housing Corporation decided to pay *ex gratia* payments to the employees who were being laid off, the Corporation did not have the funds to pay the workers and, therefore, the Minister had to seek supplementary provisions. In the interim, there was a change of Ministers and it gave the impression that one Minister held it up and the other Minister made the payments. My advice is that there was a delay in getting the supplementary.

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

Clauses 1 to 7 were called and passed.
11.10 a.m.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill reported as having been passed in Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGEFIELD, ST. THOMAS

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cane Garden, Bridgefield, St. Thomas, for providing recreational facilities.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, this Resolution has to do with the withdrawal of land to be given to the Government by Cane Garden Limited. In 1975, Cane Garden Limited made an application to the Government to subdivide land at Bridgefield. At the same time, they made an offer to donate this portion of land to the Government for the purpose of establishing some playing facilities for the youths of Bridgefield. They were not granted the Town Planning approval which they sought.

The Solicitor-General, however, continued to ask what was happening about their offer of land. Last year, they eventually made up their minds that if they could not get the Town Planning permission, then they would withdraw the offer of land to the Government. That does, in fact, make the whole thing look very bad, because it

now looks as though what they were saying to the Government is, "If we get the approval, you get the land."

On 17 March last year, attorneys-at-law wrote to the Government stating clearly that because of his client's present financial resources, he could not now continue with his offer to donate the land. The Government therefore decided to acquire the playing field compulsorily, so as not to disrupt the people at Bridgefield who are accustomed to using the land, and who, in fact, have no other place to play at any short distance from their homes.

It is a very unfortunate business. I believe that if at that time the company had simply said that they would sell the land to the Government, it would have been bought. But it was all clouded in this area of an offer for playing fields in exchange for Town Planning approval, and the whole business does look a bit messy. It is regrettable that we have to come to Parliament under these circumstances with this acquisition, but that is the position.

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

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

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I rise just to ask of the Minister one question, which may be of some interest to the Chairman of the National Sports Council and the member who sits next to him.

I have asked on several occasions about certain recreational facilities. I am in support of the acquisition of land for recreational facilities, and I do admire the Government for going all out to provide the youth of this country with these facilities wherever it sees fit and desirable.

But I should like to know if the Minister has any information on that file from which he is reading regarding the provision of similar facilities for the residents of St. Philip South. I wonder, too, if the Chairman of the National Sports Council could assist us with clearing the piece of land at Gemswick for recreational purposes.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: On the same file?

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I do not know if that is the file dealing generally with the acquisition of land for recreational facilities. But if it is, and it has the

information related to St. Philip South, I should be happy to hear that, Mr. President.

I should like the National Sports Council to assist with the clearing of some land at Gemswick, St. Philip.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Honourable members always use these land acquisition Resolutions to have excursions all over the place. We have a Bill coming up today on which you can roam far and wide, and I see no reason why you should get into this.

Laughter.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons. Or, perhaps, have I said what you were going to say?

Laughter.

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

RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL OF LEASE OF
LAND AND BUILDINGS AT WEYMOUTH,
ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 5 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve of the lease of land and buildings at Weymouth to the Police Sports Club for recreational purposes and the development of a Sports Complex for members of the Royal Barbados Police Force.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, the Police have been at Weymouth now since 1973, and one cannot help noticing the work that they have done on the premises at Weymouth; in fact, they have probably the best club facilities in Barbados at present.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I am not a betting man. I believe that the work which has been done by the police is illustrative of what a club can do if it is willing to make some effort to help itself. Notwithstanding any comments from any other sports clubs, I really believe that the police have done a very excellent job. I believe they have done well in cricket, they have been performing quite well in the premier division, and all in all, I would say that the Police is one of the better organised sports clubs.

This Resolution seeks parliamentary approval to lease the land to them for ninety-nine years. The understanding, of course is, that if at any time the

Government should wish to reclaim the land, the police would be compensated for any improvements they have carried out on the land whilst they are there.

The fee will be \$100 per annum, and we can say that the Police now have a permanent home for their sports club.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.
11.20 a.m.

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1984

Order No. 1 was called – To move the First Reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1985.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I rise to move the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 1984–1985. The Estimated Revenue for 1984–1985 is of the order of \$596 131 000, and Estimated Expenditure of \$565 392 000. Additionally, Capital Expenditure is estimated at \$181 500 000.

What this means is that we are able this year to budget for an excess of almost \$31 million on Current Account, and this is a reflection of the fact that, except for certain areas, particularly Tourism and Sugar, some degree of economic recovery is evident in our economy. This is carried forward into the Government's finances, where revenues have recovered to the extent that there is projected for the year of 1983–84, the current year, which is almost at an end, a surplus on Current Account of some \$27 389 700. This will be the first Current Account surplus since 1980–81.

Current Revenues for 1983–84 rose 13.2 per cent, and Current Expenditure 6 per cent. Total revenues for 1983–84 are expected to be \$444.8 million, or \$47 million more than was expected. Current Expenditure is expected to be some \$529 million, which is \$13.5 million more than was expected. All of this points to a return of healthy Government finances, which has been possible only by keeping very, very tight control over the levels of Government's expenditure.

It has been observed in the course of the debate in the Other Place that that surplus is likely to be eaten up as a result of negotiations with the unions. Indeed,

the fact that we have had to hold strain over the past couple of years obviously means that when there has been some upturn in Government's revenues, this likelihood will shortly become a reality. Having to hold strain has also meant that salaries, particularly at the senior levels in the Public Service, have fallen considerably below salaries in private industry and in businesses in Bridgetown. That I believe, will have implications for the capacity of Government to attract and keep staff of management quality unless there is some fairly substantial adjustment. But all of this is a matter for the negotiators, particularly since whatever we do, we still have to do within our own means.

I mentioned that we have had to achieve this by way of very tight management of Government's finances and, evidently, throughout all this, we have been looking over our shoulders at the state of foreign exchange. We also have been looking, not over our shoulders but rather indirectly, at the employment situation, because when Government cuts back in Capital Expenditure, which it has been forced to do within the last couple of years, it means that we are cutting back on projects with direct employment generating capacity, and that in itself does have an effect on the level of employment in the country.

I believe we have a labour force of about 107 000 persons, if we look at the figures of people who pay taxes. We will find that the National Insurance statistics are another indicator as well. Indeed, the surveys of the Statistical Department, which are run from time to time, also are indicators, and the picture is that we are at about the same level of unemployment now as we were in 1977, which is some 15 per cent.

This has been done from the days when we were looking at statistics and seeing the increase of persons at work was such that we must be below 10 per cent unemployment, only then to discover that a number of persons who were not seeking employment before had, in fact, shown employment. So the numbers had fallen in unemployment, but these were not the only numbers that fell — the numbers that fell were also those among voluntary idle. This is something that happens in an economy when there is an increase of employment opportunity — people get hope in finding jobs and therefore they are looking to join the labour force. When employment opportunities are contracting, people tend sometimes not to look for jobs because there is not that great hope of finding a job. The result then is that they become numbered among the voluntary idle. But what we are facing here is the decline from that level of employment to a level we last experienced in 1977, and unemployment is a serious matter.

It is, therefore, very clear in this year's Capital Estimates that since the need for the stringent measures of the last two years would have been ameliorated some-

what by what appears to be a recovery in the international economy, and since we are already feeling, luckily, some of the stirrings of that recovery, Government must return to its role as a principal generator of employment opportunities by capital works projects.

11.30 a.m.

I am making the point about returning by way of Capital Works projects, because I believe that all of us in here accept that if we come with what used to be known as crash programmes, not only are these just short term palliatives, but very often they cause long term injury because of some of the bad practices which such programmes tend to introduce.

I am not meaning to reflect on the way people in any other country manage their affairs, but any of us who have been to Trinidad in the last few years know of the phenomenon known as Jude, what is really in the nature of a crash programme, which is financed by a levy. So you work and you pay money to support Jude, and the gentlemen and ladies who are part of the Jude programme go to work in the morning at 7.00 or 7.30 and by 8.30 or 9.00 they depart from the scene. If they then have a genuine job to go to, they go; if not, the rest of the day is theirs, and a lot of money is poured into that hole. It is a way of spending money without doing anything to increase economic activity.

In my view, that certainly is not the way to spend money. If a Government spends its money in that way, the result is not going to be all that different from if an individual spends his money in that way, and there are certain equations which we can make between the State and the individual. What we must do is to emphasise the role of the Government, not as the employer of first resort, not as an institution that, no matter how ridiculous a situation may be, it feels that it has to provide employment without being critical as to the type of employment it provides, but as having a responsibility to create employment opportunity both directly, by its Capital Works programmes, and indirectly, by incentives and the general investment climate which it does so much to promote. This really is the thrust of economic policy in terms of employment at this stage.

Mr. President, the same policies which tend to keep inflation low are the same policies, it would appear, that tend to create some level of unemployment. The corollary of this rate of unemployment which has been seen in these couple of years seems to be the fact that the rate of inflation was halved in 1983, and is currently running at something like 5 per cent. You will find that, although nobody believes it, Trinidad and Tobago reports an unemployment figure of some 11 per cent, compared with our 15 per cent. At the same time, however, their inflation rate is 17 per cent. That in Jamaica is 16½ per cent, and that in Guyana is 15 per cent.

From the Income Tax Department returns on the 1982 year, the total assessable incomes in Barbados known to that department were \$742 825 552. That involves some 58 585 persons. Remember that ever since this Government assumed office, there has been a steady application of the policy of removing those who do not earn more than \$8 000 a year. I think that is what it is at present, but systematically we have looked at a certain level and taken it off the tax roll, with the result that some 40 000 persons will not appear in the tax rolls as taxpayers.

The same returns indicate that in a country where the per capita income is U.S.\$4 000, very few people earn really outstanding incomes. In relation to those that seem to earn outstanding incomes, if we regard \$100 000 a year as such an income, and I gather the figure there is only 72 persons, one of the remarkable things is that so many of those persons are not self-employed. That indicates the level to which top management salaries outside of Government have evidently moved. That is one of the things I was referring to when I talked about one of the things that would impact on the negotiations with the unions.

The point that it always holds as an instruction to us, is the fact that very few people have that kind of income, which reflects a certain spread of incomes in this country. This is one of the things that has saved us from the kinds of social problems which are commonplace in certain countries, and countries in the Caribbean, where there is a gulf between the haves and the have-nots. I have certainly lived in a Caribbean country where the difference between those who obviously had high incomes and those who were at the other end of the ladder was so amazing that, indeed, one wondered what real contact there was between the two worlds.

Those are situations which are bound to breed serious social discontent. We therefore have, as a matter of policy, to ensure that such gaps are avoided in this society, although we have at the same time to do it not by regressive policies of taxation, because if we do it that way, then, in an economy in which we are heavily dependent on the private investor, we will indeed defeat our own objectives by destroying the initiatives of the would-be entrepreneur.

11.40 a.m.

Sir, it also appears at this stage that we have put behind us the period during which real output has been falling. The figures which are being refined will indicate whether real output was substantial in 1983 or whether it rose by a small amount.

While sugar and tourism as I referred to earlier, have not been up to performance standards — sugar for a long time, and tourism more recently, — there is a growth in

the nontraditional exports that has accounted for a great deal of the economic recovery. It is the manufacturing sector, the non-sugar agriculture, which for example, grew to almost 20 per cent in 1983, and the 48 per cent rise in oil production, notwithstanding that the impact of this has been blunted somewhat by the fall in the price of oil.

The construction industry, which is one of our most important employers, has, at least, stabilized, although if you live where I live, you wonder if stabilized is the word, because I have never seen houses go up so fast in my life. Just by driving around the country, one can see a great deal of recovery within the construction industry, and that, depending on when the figures on starts were filed may reveal that there is already a substantial recovery in the construction industry. Whatever, it is quite obvious that there is a lot of construction activity, and in the capital works programme, Government itself will be priming that particular pump.

It is not my intention in introducing this Bill to do a great deal in terms of analysis of projections, because these are bound to be discussed at greater length very shortly. What I am trying to do is to lay a sufficient foundation for the debate and, at the same time, to stand ready to answer questions and to deal with issues which emerge in the debate, when, ultimately, I rise to reply. Accordingly, I am only going to refer to one or two other matters.

One point relates to the fact that there are some who spend a lot of time screaming about certain things. The level of foreign reserves at mid-March was Bds. \$226.6 million, which still has to be looked at closely, because half of it is still tied up in the CMCF. Also, since it represents some three months of imports, without the foreign exchange earning potential of the economy operating stronger than it is at present, it does mean that Government would still have to go carefully.

The other thing which people tend to make comments about is the National Debt. This currently stands at \$857 million, of which the domestic component is \$509.3 million. What is important about the National Debt is the foreign component, and this is \$348.3 million. The debt service is less than 10 per cent — international people regard that as modest — and the level of foreign debt is some 14–15 per cent of the GDP.

Those who know about these things indicate that there is no cause for concern. I know nothing about these aspects of economic matters. Indeed, I would say I know as much about these economic matters as Dr. Haynes, but I am more hesitant than he is to speak with authority on these matters. I leave that for Senator Arthur and Senator McClean.

There is no other information of this detailed and boring nature which I believe it is necessary for me to give in the introduction of this Bill. I should perhaps point to the fact that in the Capital Estimates, there has been an allocation I believe, of \$60 million for the Ministry of Finance, which will be the largest single allocation and it must be borne in mind that the Ministry of Finance is responsible for Government investment, and therefore provisions for such companies as Government may own wholly or in part, whether it be Caribbean Airways, the Arawak Cement Plant, the Barbados External Telecommunications Company, of which the Government has a 25 per cent interest, are provided for in that \$60 million.

I should add — because at the outset I forgot to mention it — that, in relation to the External Telecommunications Company, I believe there is a Resolution which should come down, today or tomorrow, which will authorize the borrowing in relation to this. At that point I can say more, if it is necessary. In any event, only last week or the week before I did speak at some length on the Bill relevant to this matter.
11.50 a.m.

One other matter that would be reflected in the Estimates will, of course, be the emphasis on road development programmes. Major road works have to be carried on at the same time that work is being done to maintain and in some cases improve, because the level of maintenance has not really been kept up as it should have been, the existing road works.

An increase for the Defence Force will be found. This is to enable the employment of more persons in the Force, particularly the Coast Guard side of the Force. The Defence Force, after all, is one of the avenues of employment for young people, and one of the areas in which young people can be given an opportunity to learn skills.

I hope, I have not forgotten any other major areas. There is a substantial increase in Housing, which I also expect will be the subject of some debate. Such areas as honourable members have specific interest in, I am sure, will emerge in the course of debate, and Senator Trotman and I will stand ready to respond to such points as are raised, since we have tried to divide the subject areas among us.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, it is usual at the time of discussion of the Annual Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure in this Chamber for honourable members to take an opportunity to review certain developments within the economy over the past year and

try to look at certain trends and indicators for the year ahead, or maybe for the next two to three years hence. This is the approach which I have usually adopted and I do not intend to depart from it on this occasion, except to say that I will spend the first few minutes referring to some of the statements and matters which have been raised by Senator Barrow in his short introduction to these Estimates.

Senator Barrow indicated that there are signs of recovery in the economy, and this he attributes to the rise in Government revenues. He indicated that with the exception of tourism and sugar, which incidentally are very key areas in our economic activity, there were signs of growth in other areas. It seems to me, however, that rather than looking at the rise in Government revenues as an indication of some kind of recovery, what has actually happened is that the rise in Government revenues has resulted from the imposition of higher taxes in all areas of economic activity. You only have to look to see where Government revenues have risen as a result of the imposition of taxes to recognise this.

It is significant that Senator Barrow has not made any reference whatsoever to the tremendous difficulties which are being experienced in the manufacturing sector. I would certainly have liked to hear from Senator Barrow some indication as to what that particular sector of our economy is performing, but there has been no mention of that. It is also significant that apart from just a passing reference to sugar, the fact that it is not performing, no mention was made by Senator Barrow about the performance of non-sugar agriculture. I think that all of these things about which we ought in an introduction by the Honourable Minister, who has the responsibility for introducing these Estimates and therefore setting the tone for the debate, to have had a better survey. But that is just by the way.

He then referred to salaries which are paid at the higher levels of the Public Service and compared them with salaries in private enterprise, indicating that there has been some difficulty to attract persons at the higher levels in the Public Service, and therefore the Government proposes in negotiations with the trade unions to change its approach to negotiations this year and, presumably, give a higher increase to those persons in the Public Service at the higher levels than they have been getting in the past.

Just for the record, Senator Barrow has omitted to mention that the Ministers, the Prime Minister and Parliamentarians would also benefit from this, and I am just wondering.

He then mentioned the question of unemployment. He indicated that the work force, and I am presuming that he is referring to 1983, stands at 107 000 persons. I asked for the Economic Survey of Barbados for 1982;

that is the only one that is available. The 1983 one, if Senator Trotman is not aware, is not yet available — it will not be available until the Budget. The 1982 survey shows that in that year there were 115 100 people in the work force.
12.00 noon.

In 1981, there were 114 300 people in the work force. So in 1981 we had 114 300 people in the work force, in 1982 there was an increase to 115 100, but in 1983, and I am taking this as the reference point that he is using — even if it is 1984 it does not really change the fact the work force has dropped to 107 000. I think that we deserve an explanation for that.

Indeed, I am wondering if the difference which we see between a higher figure in 1982 and a lower figure in 1983 is not due to that number of people being abandoned in the category of the voluntarily idle. I suspect that that is the reason. So to say that unemployment in Barbados is at the level of 15 per cent, as Senator Barrow and the Government seem to be saying, is, in my view, misleading, when one takes the total picture into consideration.

It is made worse when one considers that our calculation of unemployment does not take into consideration the severe seasonal employment which exists in this country, neither does it take into consideration the serious under employment existing in Barbados. One only has to look at the manufacturing sector and tourism to see the large numbers of people who are working three days a week and, in some instances, two days a week. That is the kind of consideration which one has to bring to bear when we are talking about unemployment, and not just glibly pass it off as a mere 15 per cent. I dare say that based on information which has been published, based on an understanding of the impact of the category of the voluntarily idle, based on the seasonality of employment in Barbados, and based on the level of under employment in this country, if you take the total situation we have to be in excess of 22 per cent unemployment.

How often within the last year have we been hearing about lay-offs around the country and in all sorts of areas? I can recite a whole range of areas where people have been laid off, going back to the beginning of last year, but for which we have not had figures in terms of our Economic Report, which would give an official indication of the trend in unemployment.

Starting in January 1983, Cave Shepherd laid off twenty workers; the Hilton Hotel laid off three; Jason Jones, six; Russell Knit Barbados Limited, fifty; the Barbados Marketing Corporation, twenty-eight; Imperial Optical, three; Aero Services Limited, thirty-eight; Trident Gloves, twelve; Citibank, twelve; St. James Beach Club,

one hundred and twenty; W. B. Hutchinson, three; Corrugated Cartons Ltd., six; Gypsy International Ltd., one hundred and five; Barbados Knitting and Spinning, sixty — I have to pick out the big numbers now — Elias Industries, one hundred and twenty; Mico Garments, one hundred and fifty; BMC, on June 27, seventy-five; on July 3, a further sixty by the Barbados Marketing Corporation; Golden View Hotel, twenty-eight; Accra Beach, thirty; some teachers in the Government Service, September 1, sixty; Pine Hill Dairy, twenty-two; in the construction sector, Adams Construction in August and September thirteen and twenty-one.

I can go on and on. Cable and Wireless, twenty-nine this year; the public baths, seventy; the Agricultural Development Corporation has indicated that seventy will be going. Transport Board has indicated that four hundred will be going, the National Housing Corporation, more than one hundred. I have not talked about Soil Conservation; I really can go on and on.

When you take these factors into consideration — and these are not all, these are just some that I have picked at random to indicate that it is not as sweet and easy as Senator Barrow has tried to make us believe, when he attempted to compare the unemployment situation with a previous point in time — I am saying that the unemployment figure in Barbados is higher than 15 per cent. It must be in excess of 20 per cent regardless of what figures you can produce.

Sir, unemployment is a very, very serious matter, and one would like to see the Government addressing its mind to alleviating this particular cancer. It is a cancer which is eating away at this society on a daily basis. If I had time, as I had before 1983, where I could talk at length, I would go through this file just to give you an idea of the kind of layoffs that have taken place in this country over the last year. This is a file of clippings, we have been keeping them. But this is in addition to those which do not reach the newspaper — that is the point — we have the information.

When this is compounded by the fact that when people are laid off they experience difficulties in getting benefits from the Unemployment Scheme, to which they contribute for this particular purpose, then you can see what I am talking about. Yet, we have a situation where the Prime Minister can boast in New York to the effect that the Government has so much money in the Unemployment Benefit Scheme that, if people know how much money was there, they would be very upset.

The Unemployment situation concerns all of us in this country. It is a matter of social, economic and, indeed, political interest, and can have repercussions at all of these levels. Therefore, we have to devise programmes to ensure that our people who want work can have

work, that easier provisions ought to be made for those who find themselves unemployed to be able to benefit. The Democratic Labour Party, of which I have the honour to be a member, wants to see something positive done about tackling unemployment in this country.

It is always good when you can remember things; indeed, when you can refer to the records of statements which people make. The Barbados Labour Party came into power and made all sorts of promises about the creating of new jobs. One area which they talked very much about, and which indicated that thousands of jobs would have been created is in that area, of offshore banking. I remember that distinctly. I remember, too, when it was drawn to the Minister's attention that many jobs cannot be created in that area, he indicated the number of clerical and secretarial jobs which would be created, and he expressed the hope that when these jobs were created, the Barbados Workers Union would not want to go and organize those workers. I want to know what has happened to the creation of jobs, as promised, in this particular sector. Surely, that was an area where the Barbados Labour Party seemed to have captivated the imagination of the people of this country. But, alas, nothing has happened – and unemployment is rising. We need new initiatives in this area.

12.10 p.m.

In looking at the distribution of income in Barbados, Senator Barrow stated that there were about 72 persons who were earning in excess of \$100 000 per year. I assume that he may have been working on figures filed with the Inland Revenue Department. I would not bother to question that. I want to refer to a very significant point which he made.

He stated, and it is true, that incomes in Barbados are still relatively modest, but that the distribution is probably a lot better than in some other areas of the world, even though I would say, for us who are involved, on a daily basis, in trying to re-distribute income in this country, we still are not satisfied with the distribution levels. But he was making the point, and I am capsulising what he said, that there was a significant bulge at a particular level, where people who were earning in excess of, let us say, probably \$8 000 a year.

Of course, presumably the Government would want to take credit for this, but I would want to say that whatever movement there has been upwards in incomes in this country can be attributed directly to the role of the Barbados Workers Union and no other institution, Government or otherwise. This is because at each twist and turn when we seek to get an increase in wages for the people, whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector, the Government comes out, particularly since this Barbados Labour Party came into power, on each occasion, and staunch against it. It is only

apparently when they have something to gain, personally or otherwise, that they will speak in complimentary terms about it.

This is the kind of dishonesty that I do not like. When we are out there struggling to redistribute incomes and increase the earning capacity of the people of this country, we are held up to be villains of the piece. It suits the Government now to come and talk about how incomes are distributed. But we are not waiting for any compliments from the Government, because the Government will not be able and cannot tell us what policy to pursue when it comes to these matters, as much as they would like to do. Indeed, if you heard the Minister of Trade talking a couple of weeks ago, you would have heard that the union has to contain its demand for wages, otherwise we will not be able to attract industries and all that sort of jazz, as far as I am concerned, that you hear coming from the Minister. But I want to say that, as long as we are involved in the area of negotiations, we will make sure that we get the best deal for the workers, so that we can have the kind of distribution of income in this country of which everybody can be proud.

Senator Barrow, in referring to the public debt, seemed to be quite happy with it. He said that he is not an expert in these matters, and I am not an expert either, but I am concerned when I see that revenues in this country total approximately \$596 million and we have to provide about \$106 million to service the debt which we have accumulated, most of which has been accumulated under the Barbados Labour Party's Administration. As a matter of fact, if you were to make a calculation, you would find that what we are asked to pay is 18 cents out of every dollar in revenue which we collect to service our debt. I am only raising some practical difficulties. I am worried about that.

That is the direct debt. But the Government has guaranteed loans, which, if you take our total debt into consideration, must, of course, be brought into the whole scheme of things. Loans have been guaranteed for the sugar industry, Barbados Light and Power, and various statutory corporations.

I believe that we have to watch the debt with which we are saddling this country. We are going to reach a point where it will become a very serious problem. A couple of years ago, it was pointed out to a certain sector in this country that they were pricing themselves out of the market, and little heed was paid to it. We in the Democratic Labour Party are warning the Government that we ought to tread very carefully in this area of debt, and we are expressing some concern about our ability to continue to service this debt.

12.20 p.m.

I am waiting, with interest, to hear or see a review of the Barbados economy in 1983 which I understand has

been done by the World Bank. Unfortunately, I was not able to get my copy before I came here, but I am told that they have some very serious comments to make, and they issued a warning to this country on this same point. But, as I say, like Senator Barrow, I do not pretend to be an expert in this area. I think I am a practical person and I raise practical issues. I hope that the Government will take some warning.

A number of issues which have arisen during the debate of these Estimates in the Lower House, some of which have been referred to here this morning. Since they have been raised in the context of the Estimates, I believe that I have a right to refer to them, because I think that they have something to do with our society, how we see social issues and how we relate to developments taking place within our society.

I am talking now in the context of the supposed well-being of the people in this country, and the claim that people are not as badly off as the so-called "prophets of doom" say. They refer to the members of the Opposition as being prophets of doom; we cannot point to certain developments without being accused of being prophets of doom. Be that as it may, we will continue to point to these areas, whether they have social, economic or political implications.

The Prime Minister, in referring to the supposed well-being and the kind of money which people have at their disposal, indicated last week that people were spending some \$600 000 a week on Let's Go To The Races. He seemed to suggest that this in itself was an indication of how well off people were; that if people could spend that kind of money on Let's Go To The Races, then people are not as badly off as the Opposition, or maybe other institutions in the country, like the Barbados Workers' Union, have been indicating, that things in this country are not as rosy as the Government would want us to believe. We live here and we know different from that, and sometimes, because of the statements they make, we wonder if members of the Government live in Barbados.

This expenditure of \$600 000 a week on Let's Go To The Races seems to be exciting the Prime Minister, and he is using it as an index of the well-being of people in this country. I have a very simple response to that. It is that people are so desperate, they see very little ahead for them to look forward to in terms of jobs, in terms of the ability to cope with the financial situation, that they decide they are going to take a chance in the hope that they would win some money to make ends meet. I am serious about that. You only have to get near to people to realise what is happening.

What is even more depressing about the whole situation is the kind of elevation which seems to be attributed under the Barbados Labour Party Administration

to gambling. What have we seen emerging in this society since the Barbados Labour Party has come to power? Instant Money, Let's Go To The Races, Wheels of Fortune, *Nation* Bingo, one-armed bandits, casino gambling! Do you think that these are the kinds of developments we want to see in this society? These are things which have to be mentioned, things which have very serious social and economic implications for the people of this country.

Sir, after having referred to some of the issues which I see confronting this society, the issues of unemployment and debt in particular, I want to move to some more specific areas. I want to touch on a number of them, although I recognise that my time is limited.

Head 13, page 4, Services Commissions. We in the Democratic Labour Party are very concerned about the way in which the Commission seems to be functioning. They have a constitutional position in this country, and that position, in our view, seems to have been usurped, and the Commission appears to us to be only a figurehead Commission. That is how it comes through to us and to thinking people in this country.

You, Mr. President, without being personal, have been a member of a Public Service Commission, and I think that you can see the vast difference in the functioning of Public Service Commissions under the two Administrations. I honestly believe that there is too much political interference by the Barbados Labour Party Administration in the Public Service, and indeed, in the functioning of the Public Service Commission. Look how the Barbados Labour Party Administration has been able to use, for example, the special leave provision in the General Orders to harass and frustrate members of the Public Service. Senator Barrow would know about the Government Printery and the Government Printer.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: Am I being accused of harassing somebody?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I said you would know about the Government Printer.
12.30 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order! I am appealing to members to let us keep the level of the debate and the tone of it as it has been before, not allowing personalities, snide remarks and such things to mar the even tenor of our progress, please. Continue.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Thank you, Sir. I hope that the members on the other side would take your strictures to heart.

I am saying that the approach of the Barbados Labour Party Administration, where they have misused

the special leave provision in the General Orders, is something about which all of us should be concerned.

If you were to read the General Orders, 5(27), and 5(28), which sets out very clearly how this provision should be used, the intention is clear. But one can see this dangerous development where special leave is now used, not to facilitate officers if they have to go overseas, if they belong to the Regiment or the Cadet Corps, or the Boys Scouts, or if they have to go to represent Barbados or the West Indies at cricket or any other sporting event, or if they have to allow officers selected by recognized unions to attend trade union training courses or conferences, and, of course, "in such other instances as may be considered reasonable by the Chief Establishments Officer" — not for any of those reasons — but we see that public officers are being penalized under this particular section.

I say that without any fear of contradiction. That is what is happening, and the result is that we have a Civil Service that is swiftly losing its appeal to its members. The members of the Public Service are scared stiff! They are unable to use their initiatives, because if they use their initiative, they could be sent on special leave. It is as bad as that.

I am taking particular pains to deal with the Civil Service because I believe that it is an institution in this country which has to be protected, and which is fundamental to the general continuity of good government in Barbados. To indicate the importance of a Public Service, which is functioning well, to a society, I could refer you to countries like France and Italy, which, up to some years ago, have had frequent changes of Governments. Parties in those countries have come to power two and three times a year, but they were able to maintain countries which are not the worst countries in the world, and, indeed, if you look at the recovery of France over the last couple of years, it has become a major power in the world.

Such recovery has been as a result of a Public Service which is there to continue the operations. Whether Governments come or Governments go, they are the link, and I am saying that if the Barbados Labour Party destroys the confidence of the Civil Service, as they have been doing, then this country.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: I really do not think that the honourable Senator can be allowed to mislead the Senate any further, and it is not a matter of any accident; it is quite deliberate.

He has talked about the use of special leave, and has accused the Government of abusing special leave. He has, in fact, referred specifically to me as knowing about the Government Printer, who was in fact sent on special

leave. But he is misleading this Chamber in view of the fact that he himself knows that where people who are sent on special leave because of incompetence, and with whom the Public Service Commission subsequently deals, that has absolutely nothing to do with any harassment by any politicians, and I believe that there is a Standing Order against Senators misleading the Senate.

He has only given one example of what he calls "abuse of study leave", and that example, I am in a position to state, has been misrepresented to this House, so this House has been misled.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I said nothing about study leave.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Special leave, Sir.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I repeat, the special leave provision in the General Orders is being abused. What happened with Codrington at the Transport Board?

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Was he not on special leave?

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, can I be allowed to.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. Are you rising on a point of order?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Yes, Sir, because the whole question of misleading the Senate arises again. If a man is on secondment, and if he is on leave from a Board, that has nothing to do with General Orders. What is the point? I do not get the point.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If honourable members make statements in the Chamber, they are responsible for the accuracy of what they say. I just want to warn honourable members; so if there is any question of misleading the House and making grossly inaccurate statements, the members themselves will have to accept the responsibility. A member is responsible for what he says.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: And I am responsible, Sir, for saying that the Barbados Labour Party Administration misuses the special leave provision in the General Orders.

Sir, let us move on to the Chief Establishments Officer. If I have to be critical of a Chief Establishments Officer, I want to say that I am not speaking about an individual, I am dealing with the office. I just want to make that clear because I will be saying "the Chief Estab-

lishments Officer," but I am not referring to any individual.

Just to protect myself, since people are now calling for the Rules, I will tread very carefully here. Let us look at Head 14, Establishments – General Administration, Explanatory Note, page 5.

12.40 p.m.

The subhead provides for the function of the office of the Chief Establishments Officer, whose chief responsibilities are set out there. I think it is useful to see the functions of the Chief Establishments Officer set out, but I would really have to question the effectiveness of the office or the effectiveness of the officer, not now as an individual, but as the holder of the office, because what is coming through very clearly is that the Government, in its approach to matters which are set out here – the initiation and review of policy relating to pay and other conditions of service in respect of the Public Service – has adopted a very high-handed approach in these matters, and does not allow the Chief Establishments Officer to function as he ought to function in the context of these guidelines which are set out in the explanatory note to this Head.

I just want it to be very clearly understood that I am not talking about the holder of the office, but the person who holds that office appears to me, to function no differently from a postman; he carries messages and he brings back messages. He cannot function in that way. There must be some confidence reposed in the holder of that office, and, indeed, in the officers in that department. They must be given some kind of latitude to be able to sit down, discuss, negotiate and settle matters relating to pay and conditions of employment with which they have to deal on a continuous basis with trade unions. But this is not happening. You have only got to look at the large number of outstanding issues which have been placed before the Chief Establishments Officer, in some instances going back to the Seventies, which have not yet been resolved because he cannot get the guidelines from the Ministries or from the particular Minister who might be in charge of the particular Ministry.

I could mention areas, to give you some examples, where there have been outstanding issues. Senator Trotman knows a lot about them, because I believe he has been dealing with them for some time. There are areas, for example, like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the Records Department, the Waterworks Department, Q.E.H. maintenance, Customs Guards, School Meals, Nursing Staff. There have been numerous requests for transfers, and there are requests relating to matters of promotion which go back for years and which have not been dealt with, simply because no proper guidelines are given to the office to settle these matters.

It does not seem as if he is allowed to exercise the kind of initiative or authority which is necessary in

this particular area. It is a very serious matter, because you are getting a lot of frustrations building up in the Public Service over the inability of the department to function in an effective manner. I think something ought to be done about that.

Do I have to mention that there are people who have retired from the Public Service for some years now, who, because of the inability of the Establishments Department to function, have not yet had their pensions settled: people at the Port Authority, the Water Authority and, I am told, the National Sports Council. Let us bring some sanity back to the situation; allow people to function and use their initiative. You have to give them guidelines and parameters within which to operate, and when they have exhausted these guidelines and an agreement has not been reached, maybe they can come again. But there is no such thing happening in the Public Service now, and this is creating a lot of problems.

This is 1984, and the unions have submitted negotiations to the Government to review pay and conditions in the Public Service. But what has happened? Do you think the Chief Establishments Officer has sat down with one of the unions yet even to discuss the proposals to find out a rationale for the proposals which have been submitted? No such thing has happened, no discussion has taken place up to this point in time – but you hear that the Prime Minister, meeting one union the other day on other matters, mentioned that there will be an increase.

The Chief Establishments Officer has not been involved yet. What is his function? Am I to understand that the Prime Minister is usurping the functions of the Chief Establishments Officer? Or is this a new deal in industrial relations which is being introduced by the Government? If the Prime Minister wants to negotiate, let him say so, so that we will negotiate directly with him, but do not have a Chief Establishments Officer here with these functions and then attempt to usurp his power.

Mr. President, we ought to be able to sit down and discuss these matters of pay and conditions of employment with the person who, under the arrangements in the Civil Service hierarchy, is responsible for this, and if, as the tradition has emerged, we cannot reach agreement after the discussions, then of course the usual thing can happen. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, it is expected, would then become involved and would try to get a settlement, and if we cannot get a settlement, you know what happens. But the point is that there is a system, and you cannot attempt to destroy the system as is being done.

Another matter which relates directly to the Public Service, the Service Commissions, Personnel Department and Establishments – it is all connected – is training, and I see a trend developing. I think that in training in the Public Service the Barbados Labour Party Administration has a very poor record. They have murdered training in the Public Service, and we are going to feel the effects of this before long. It has been established that if you neglect training for two years, you will easily have a ten year gap. Senator Trotman should be aware of this, and this is the third year of your policy, which has been introduced into the Public Service, of not training. This is three years in succession that little or no training has taken place.

12.50 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: Again we are being misled. Either the honourable member is misleading us deliberately, or is confusing study leave with training leave. Training leave is leave given for the purpose of training along lines decided as a matter of policy. Study leave is when people apply for leave to go and study. In fact, I can look straight into the gallery and see that, of four public officers, one of them has been on training leave for the last two years. What the honourable member is saying is just not true. There is a distinction between the two, and if the honourable member knows it, he must be something of a trade unionist.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The record of the Government in the area of training is bad, and I will include study leave, which is part of training preparation. This is a very serious development. Were it not for the foresight of the Democratic Labour Party years ago, we would not have been able to staff the departments and agencies which developed in this country within the last ten or fifteen years, because the Democratic Labour Party had set a priority on training and study leave. We were able, for practical purposes, to staff our foreign missions and various agencies which had developed in the country because of a progressive policy of training which was initiated by the Democratic Labour Party.

All of those matters, when taken together suggest that the Public Service in this country has undergone a battering, the likes of which it has never experienced before, but I should like to indicate, on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party, that we will make a pledge to develop a new charter for public servants in this country, a charter which will restore the integrity of the Public Service and which will inspire confidence in public servants.

Sir, let us move on to Head 17, Immigration. I see that Senator Williams is very anxious for me to get to that. There is no clearly defined policy on this question of work permits, and I want to get some guide-

line from Senator Williams, who is now the Parliamentary Secretary in charge of Immigration. Work permission which they are granting continues to be a source of concern for Barbadians.

I am aware that there is an Advisory Committee, which has been set up and which is supposed to be functioning, to advise on a number of matters relating to immigration. Indeed, Senator Trotman addressed that Committee, and I had the privilege of being present. I do sit on meetings representing the Barbados Workers' Union on that Committee from time to time, and I am aware that a Negative List has been produced, which I believe is in the hands of the Ministry, which has in a way given an indication of the areas of employment for which work permits should not be granted. But if you were to look through the *Official Gazette* where information is published about work permits and permission to reside and work in Barbados, you would find some interesting things, carpenters, gardeners, managers, a hotel receptionist, a sales clerk – all of these were permitted to work in Barbados.

Aside.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: December 1983. You would have gone already, I believe.

These are things which worry me. I would hope that there is a good explanation, because it would seem to me that if we have a work permit policy operating, these things would not happen, and it is generally understood that you grant work permits to people who have skills which are not easily available in Barbados. I do not know that it is difficult to find a hotel receptionist in Barbados when there is the Hotel Training School turning out people up there who cannot even find jobs. I do not know that there is any shortage of secretaries in Barbados, when there are all of these secretarial schools here – indeed when some of the secondary schools and the Community College are turning out secretaries. I do not know that there is a shortage of carpenters in Barbados or workers in the various categories which are listed here as getting work permits. I want to know the reason for this. This concerns me, people who monitor these matters, and those who have a special interest in them.

It also seems to me that something has gone wrong with training as it relates to work permits. Work permits are granted to people who may have skills which we may not have here, but which we would want to encourage those persons who possess the skills to pass on to Barbadians. I get the impression that very little of this is done, and I would want Senator Williams, who now has the responsibility for that area, to give us some indication – although I know what is the state of the policy – as to the effect of the policy, and whether it is not

being side-stepped and people are re-applying for work permits, as I suspect. You know it has been happening, and you had better come good.

I think we ought to be very, very clear on this, because it is a policy which, to me, seems not to be achieving its objective, unless the objective is to use the work permit route to enhance the revenues of Government. Maybe then, it is achieving its objectives, because the Government does haul in a sizeable revenue from this particular area. The immigration and the whole work permit policy seem to lack some consistency, and that is what bothers me and that is what bothers the Democratic Labour Party.

I want to ask a question which is of particular relevance here at this point in time. Senator Simmons seems to have anticipated that I am coming on the Coney Island. What I want to find out is, what kind of policy does the Government have when they can give permission for two Coney Islands to operate in Barbados simultaneously? There must be an explanation for that. The people of Barbados deserve an explanation.
1.00 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, I am asking you to pause so I can say something. It is my understanding that there are certain legal proceedings in respect of these Coney Islands, and I would like to remind you that we must keep off of subjudice matters, lest we prejudice proceedings. I will be glad if you do not do it.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I was talking about the Government's policy towards the granting of permission for two Coney Islands to operate. I am not saying which one has the right to be in Barbados or not, I am not interested in that at all. All I am interested in is, how come the Government has found itself in a position where two Coney Islands are in Barbados? This has foreign exchange implications for this country.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right, enough on that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: There must be answers, and those answers have to be given.

Mr. President, can you give me an indication on how much more time I have?

Mr. PRESIDENT: You will be allowed to speak for another fifty minutes if you want, but not continuously. Have you any idea how much of that fifty minutes you intend to use?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I could use more than fifty minutes. I would like to use another two hours.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have no doubt, but you will not get it. I am trying to find out when you would like the suspension, because the last thing I want to do is to interrupt a member in the heat of his address. If you want to speak until 1.30 p.m., we can then suspend, and you can have another twenty minutes after that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No, Sir. I will stop now. We can take a break for lunch and come back.

SUSPENSION

Mr. PRESIDENT: I gather that most members seem to think that 1 o'clock is an appropriate time for the suspension. We will suspend the sitting until 2 o'clock, after which Senator Greaves will have fifty minutes more.

This sitting is now suspended.
1.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I want to move on to Agriculture. I just want to make some brief remarks on agriculture, because I understand that there has been a fairly exhaustive debate in the Lower House on this aspect of Government policy. What is clearly emerging is that, in the area of agriculture, what we have been getting from the Government is a lot of talk. Nothing much has been happening to move agriculture forward in this country. It seems as if the Minister is concerned about this, because he has promised — certainly the Estimates will reveal this — that he wants to go back to first principles in an attempt to begin to put the house of the Ministry of Agriculture in order, by making provision for an institutional study of the Ministry after so many promises.

After eight years of Barbados Labour Party Administration in the field of agriculture, we are now getting an institutional study of the Ministry of Agriculture. There must be something fundamentally wrong. What are the new initiatives which are coming out of the Ministry of Agriculture? What kind of leadership is being given? It seems to me, that, rather than providing an atmosphere where there are incentives available to produce, one finds that they are disincentives. There is dissatisfaction in evidence among the agricultural producers. There are problems in the area of marketing, as has been alluded to in the Chamber just a few weeks ago when we discussed another matter relating to Agriculture.

It seems to me that there has been such a lack of policy in the Ministry that, despite Government's

boast, no evidence of new lands coming back into Agriculture is seen. As a matter of fact, only recently one has heard that the Minister himself has announced that three Agricultural Development Corporation plantations will be closing, and will be handed over to the Ministry of Lands and Housing, maybe for housing development, or to be added to the pool of lands which the Government has.

Let us get a clear policy on this. One of the things we have to be constantly reminding the Barbados Labour Party Administration about is their big song and dance of the land which has been taken out of agricultural production. I want to know how much has gone back into production. All did not go into housing, and I want to know how much of the lands are for housing and, if the Barbados Labour Party is concerned, how come three of their plantations are closing down? We now find that they are going out of production. Senator Arthur is Chairman of the A.D.C., so he can let us know what is going on in that particular area.

In agriculture as a whole, it seems to me that there are a lot of problems in that area. No initiatives are coming which would seem to be moving agriculture forward, and there is a state of confusion in that sector.

2.05 p.m.

I want to move very quickly on to some other areas. I will keep my eyes on the time, because I know I have until 3 o'clock. I will move on to Education.

I do not believe that there has ever been a point in the history of Barbados when we have experienced so much confusion in Education; total confusion. Let me point to some of these areas. In the first place, the Government appointed a Commission to make recommendations on education, I think it was headed by Sir Alexander Hoyos, and my understanding is that they were to examine all aspects of education. I believe that Senator Wickham is the Deputy Chairman of that Commission.

I am not sure whether the Commission has handed in its final report, but certainly what seems to have emerged is that in relation to some of the issues which the Commission was supposed to be looking at, and to be making recommendations on to the Ministry — I have to speak from an impression — before the Commission could finalise its discussions, one found that the Ministry was going ahead with its own policy — zoning and the introduction of the General Paper — and this is in spite of objections from both teachers and parents.

There is a pig-headedness which seems to inform and instruct the Ministry of Education in whatever it goes to do. We have a new Education Act which has introduced a number of very important changes in the employment relationships in the teaching profession.

Teachers are confused about their rights. They do not know where they begin or where they end. It is my opinion that the Ministry ought to have prepared a handbook, because it is a fundamental change, pointing to the changes which have been introduced and how they will affect the people who are working in the system. Of course, that was not to be.

As Senator Simmons has said, I have to tread very carefully, and I will not touch the matters before the court, but what appears to me is that the Ministry seems to be pursuing policies which are disruptive of the system, disruptive of the headteachers as managers in the system, disruptive for the children, and disruptive for the relationships between the teachers and the Ministry itself. The cumulative result of all of this, I am submitting, is that the morale in the teaching profession is low. In spite of that, however, I think that we ought to commend the teachers for being able to work and produce under these very difficult and trying circumstances.

I believe that we in this country, particularly in the Ministry of Education, need to see a return to sanity; secondly, a return to co-operation, consultation and compromise on the part of the Ministry, and we ought to look very carefully at the new Education Act without having to resort to the courts for declarations. If necessary, if one finds that in that situation there are problems which result from the discussions, consultation and compromise which would lead to amending the Act, then I am submitting that this ought to be done. What we have to be able to do is to restore morale and build confidence in the people who are charged with the responsibility of building character and preparing our young citizens for future leadership in all areas of activity in this country, and all parts of the world.

I want to turn to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. When the Barbados Labour Party came to power, we heard a lot of high-sounding phrases and high notions about the re-organisation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, re-organising the Foreign Service, and integrating the trade and tourism aspect into the traditional diplomatic work of the embassies. This has turned out to be a massive failure. Even in the traditional areas, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is floundering; relations with some of our neighbours are at a very low ebb.

Let us look at what is happening in CARICOM with our CARICOM partners. I want to say that the poor relationships which exist at present between Barbados and Trinidad did not start with Barbados' participation in the invasion of Grenada. The poor relations started before that, because we have a Prime Minister who, it would seem, has a penchant for making snide remarks about other regional Governments and their leaders. We can document that.

Nothing positive, in my view, is coming from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but certainly the Prime Minister is not justified in saying what he had said about other people. We need some positive developments coming from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The question of relationships is very important, but even now that we are trying to repair whatever damage has been done, you still find that the Prime Minister cannot avoid making snide remarks. This is a very serious problem that we have.

2.20 p.m.

The other problem which I think we have in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is, I find it difficult, on many occasions, to find out who is really in charge. Who makes the policy decision, the Minister of Foreign Affairs or the Prime Minister? I do not know.

The whole question of our coming together closer in a political union, that is so far-fetched now that it is unbelievable, because even in the area of economic co-operation, which was the one area where Governments in the region seem to have been getting together, that has now, for practical purposes, been blown asunder, and a lot of work now has to be done to repair that. Indeed, as I look around the Caribbean and note the reaction of the various major Governments in the area to this whole question of Caribbean integration, I have very serious doubts and reservations about the future of the integration movement.

Another matter which bothers me in this particular area has to do with the announcement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs that the Government has decided to establish a High Commission in Grenada. I believe that we ought to get the rationale from the Government for the establishment of High Commissions or embassies anywhere. I assume that the rationale for establishing a High Commission in the Caribbean context would have to do with the existence of a large number of our citizens in the country or with trade; we would be doing so much trade with that country that you would want to have somebody there at the level of High Commissioner who would be able to facilitate developments in that particular area. I do not see the strong and compelling reasons coming forward and I need to be informed of the reasons. Otherwise, I would have to conclude, as I have concluded, that establishing a High Commission in Grenada is a hopeless waste of taxpayers money. I would like to be convinced otherwise.

If the Minister of Foreign Affairs, for example, had said that the Government had intended to establish a High Commission in Jamaica, at least I could understand that. I think reasonable people would begin to understand that, because there are a lot of possibilities which exist there in terms of trade and other matters. We have a lot of Barbadians either studying there or living there, so there might be a reason which could be advanced. But

Grenada? I would like to find out why. There might be more in the mortar than the pestle, but let us know something about that.

I turn now to housing and mortgage financing. Housing in this country has suffered through the policies of the Barbados Labour Party Administration — fiscal and monetary policies, high interest rates, the bunching of the public sector projects, which had the effect of calling on the available funds in the banking sector, and the consumption taxes which were imposed on building materials. All of these have made it very difficult for housing to develop in Barbados in the way that those of us who have a keen and abiding interest in the development of housing would like to see, and I know it is going to be very difficult to repair the damage which has been done. If one were to look at the money which is set aside for housing, one would see that this falls hopelessly short of what is required within a reasonable period, even in the course of a year.

At page 97, under Capital Estimates, one finds that \$6.5 million has been allocated for the construction of units. Areas have been identified: St. Cecelia, which has been going for a long time; Maynards — start and stop; grass, weeds and all sorts of things have taken over down there; Lammings — started and abandoned. Two of the projects were started to give some visibility in housing in St. Joseph and St. Peter for elections, and were forgotten after the 1981 election, but, now, of course, that we have a by-election, or general election — some kind of activity in the air — one finds that there is some attempt to rectify the project in St. Peter. In addition to that, there is provision for road works at the Ivy and Rosemont.

I must confess that I looked through the Estimates with some anticipation, because I felt that enough promises had been made about a housing project at Checker Hall. I have spoken of this over and over again, and just about two or three weeks ago there was a statement from a Government source that there will be provision for a housing project at Checker Hall in the not too distant future. Indeed, the Prime Minister, when he spoke at the opening of Heywoods Holiday Village, referred specifically to this and indicated that there would be provision in the Estimates in the coming year for housing at Checker Hall. So I looked with some anticipation at that. But what do we find? Absolutely no mention of that!

2.30 p.m.

Again, I want to impress on the Government that this is a need, and one wants to see the kind of development which will contain not only houses constructed for rent and sale, but also the acquisition of land which would be sold and/or rented to those persons who have been displaced from their lands as a result of the construction of the Arawak Cement Plant, and also those

persons in the constituency who may need to get a spot on which to place their houses.

A very serious development has taken place in this country. People who want to own a house or to construct a chattel house find it very difficult to find land on which to place the house, and I think that, from a general policy and national position, the Government ought to recognise this and ought to look at this problem, because, as I said, I know that quite a number of people have been experiencing difficulties in that area.

It can be said that mortgage financing continues to be a sore point in Barbados. The Government has this year provided \$1.5 million in the Capital Estimates under the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and what purpose is this \$1.5 million devoted to? The note says "augmentation of resources of the Barbados Development Bank and contributions to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation". It is only \$1.5 million, and if it is to be divided between these two institutions, even if it is split in half, the most that would be available to the BMFC would be \$750 000. How much housing can some \$750 000 support?

The Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation, I am informed, has numerous requests for mortgages — but there is no money. All we are getting, it would seem, like in almost every instance, is a lot of lip service and no firm commitment or action in this particular area. I certainly would like to see much more funds directed into the area of housing, because this has not only social implications, but also very important economic implications for the betterment of this country. It is a fact that the National Housing Corporation does not have money to grant loans under the General Workers' Fund, and indeed has not made a loan for a number of years. We need to revive this. There is need for a massive injection of money into the housing sector, particularly in the area of housing.

I am aware that the Government has negotiated a USAID aid programme for housing. I am also aware that this has proven to be disastrous. I do not know who negotiated the terms, but it would seem to me that people who have tried to get money under that programme have experienced a tremendous amount of difficulties, and, as I understand it, the funds are there lying down and nobody has been able, or very few people have been able, to benefit from them. My friend Senator Hall advises me that Senator Arthur was the main participant in the negotiations on behalf of the Barbados Government, so maybe he knows a little more about what I am talking about.

I am told that the maximum amount of money which can be borrowed is \$35 000, and this, as I understand it, includes the price of the land. I am told that the

conditions for getting the money are rather harsh, and that the money is under the complete control of the commercial banks in which the money is lodged, so that people have to satisfy the demands of the commercial banking sector for this particular loan.

I wonder what really is the purpose of the loan. Is it to facilitate loans for housing in a particular sector, or is it just a thought and a lot of hot air? If money is there, let us find some way of having the kind of conditions which would enable people to benefit from it.

In any event, if one were to take a realistic position, indeed one must ask, what quality house could \$35 000 build in these days, taking into consideration the high costs which are involved in construction? I think we have to make sure that we move our country beyond the kind of wooden houses that we find in Barbados and move to the more solid structures where people can be more comfortable. I am not talking about luxurious housing, I am talking about comfortable but lasting houses, investment for a lifetime, as it were. I am therefore appealing to Government to please re-negotiate the USAID loan agreement and get better and less stringent terms. Do not let Senator Arthur negotiate it again, because he did not do a good job. We need easier terms both in relation to repayment and the length of the loan, easier qualifications, and we need to raise the ceiling which has been imposed.

I am submitting, Sir, that with a more thoughtful and concerned approach on the part of the Government, Barbados can do much better in housing. As an overall approach, some of the things which have to be looked at, as I said earlier on, is that more money must be made available for housing, easier mortgage terms must exist, and, I am further submitting, Government, in its commitment to generating activity in housing, ought to remove or considerably reduce the consumption tax which it has imposed on building materials.

2.40 p.m.

I will turn briefly to the National Conservation Commission — I think Senator Linton will wake up now. I am glad to see that at least there is some mention in the Estimates this year about the establishment of changing facilities at River Bay in St. Lucy. Again the evidence would indicate that this is a matter that I have been highlighting and raising for a long time. The public evidence is there in terms of a Resolution from the floor of the Lower House and also from this Chamber. I am glad to see that there is some indication that this is likely — I have to say likely — to take place.

I think that it is something which ought to be done, because River Bay is still a popular spot. I believe that one of the problems which we have always encountered

there is that there are no facilities — and it is an open area, to a large extent — so the establishment of facilities there would add to the character and quality of that particular area.

But I wonder what has happened to the promise which was made by the Barbados Labour Party after I introduced a Resolution in the House of Assembly in 1977 on the establishment of a national park at Archer's Bay and to which the Barbados Labour Party's administration agreed. Maybe Senator Linton could give me some indication about this. It would be one national from Ragged Point to Archer's Bay — that is always the answer I get — but I still want to find out what is happening specifically at Archer's Bay.

You would recall, Sir, that about two years ago, when I raised the matter of the establishment of a community centre and playing field in the Checker Hall area and suggested that, maybe, some of the area around Checker Hall, out by the cement plant, could be a useful area for development, Senator Trotman indicated that the Government had plans for Checker Hall House, and included in the plans was that Checker Hall House would be turned into a stop-over for tourists.

Aside.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Did you not say that? I remember these things. I want to know what has happened to this stop-over for tourists. I really did not believe you at the time, I do not believe you up to now, and the point is that I think we ought to get serious about these things.

I raise these questions because I know that promises have been made as a result of my urgings, and at least I am seeing a little fruit, but I am not sure how ripe the fruit is yet — the fruit might drop off before it reaches maturity. I think that we ought to get some indication on that.

Sir, as I understand it, I have twenty minutes more.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have about eight minutes.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Eight minutes? I just want to ask if you have taken the interruptions into consideration. Please Sir!

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you induce the interruptions as if this is a football match, I am not giving any injury time.

Laughter.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I did not complain of being injured, Sir.

Laughter.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, in my remaining minutes, I will have to deal with Information. The only aspect of information that I want to deal with is the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

I want to point to the utter confusion which exists at CBC. I want to know why is it that chairmen of the Board have had to run from CBC? Why have general Managers had to run from CBC? Why could respected members of staff not stay at CBC and attempt to develop the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation into the kind of media that one would expect that corporation to be? Is it because of interference from the Minister of Information? Is it because of the Minister of Information calling the CBC news room and questioning news items — why should a statement by the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Workers' Union get priority?

The Minister knows what I am talking about. As much as he is laughing, he knows what I am talking about, and the people at CBC know what I am talking about — political interference! The Minister of Information interferes directly into CBC, in terms of trying to direct the kind of news items which come out of that corporation.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President. I am sorry that I have to get up on something like this, but since I know for a fact that the honourable member has misled the Chamber in that what he said is a plain statement of untruth, I will have to object to it, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If these allegations are made, I have pointed out that the person making them is responsible. If you open yourself to something, you ought to have backing for it.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I have the backing. The only problem is that I think it would compromise certain people, so I will let it go. But the Minister knows what I am talking about. It appears to me that the Minister sees the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation as his personal possession. You either do as he says — or else!

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I am afraid that I must object, Sir, because this is going into the Record. To the extent that Senator Greaves has a point, let him bring the evidence; it can go into the Record and stand substantiated. But, otherwise, he is doing nothing more than uttering untruth after untruth, which is unworthy of any Senator in this Chamber.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: It seems as though we are both uttering untruths, according to you. You know what I am talking about.

2.50 p.m.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: As Senator Simmons said, I have a case. I know you would know that I have a case because you were the Chairman. You had to run, too!

Senator Simmons rose.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons, just a minute.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: I was just making a comment to Mr. Roberts. I ask that the comments be struck from the Record. I will deal with anything he says when my turn comes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute, Senator Simmons. I want to say this not only to you, but to other members. Members will compromise their opportunity for making a second reading speech if they jump up making remarks out of context. You are only allowed to speak once, so just be careful. I would not pay too much attention to asides made by members.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I believe that the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation has a good opportunity to enlighten and educate the Barbadian public, both through radio and television. But it continues to be ineffective in this area. Propaganda seems to be its main concern — propaganda on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party.

I do not want to talk about the unceremonious removal of Glenroy Straughn from *Gutterperk*, nor indeed of my illustrious colleague, Senator Hall, from commenting at cricket. But I wonder, what is the policy on that? If they are seen as active politicians and, therefore, have to be removed from the airwaves, let us know that, and at the same time let the Minister explain how Leroy Sissett could be on radio on that programme *One on One*. I have heard him. Explain that to this Chamber. Do not say that he was not on it. I want to know.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have one minute.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I thought you were interrupting me, Sir. I have run out now — Oh Lord! Sir, I really am appealing for more time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is against the rules.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: All right, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have a colleague nearby.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No, he has his thing to do. Could I ask the Leader of the Senate if I could be allowed some more time?

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is not his authority.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, let me just quickly look at community centers, since they come under.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have one minute.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: All right, give me a chance — Community centers. There is a need for major repairs at Rockfield in St. Lucy. It is falling apart.

Trade and Industry — Industrial Development Corporation. I am concerned about the kind of promotion which is taking place through the IDC, and indeed the kind of investors who are attracted here. It seems to me that the IDC is attracting investors which are: anti-union, who do not want workers to organize, employers who are high-handed and very difficult in their treatment of workers, and employers who are prepared to pay very low wages. I believe that we ought to move beyond that stage. We have to tell investors very clearly what the situation is in Barbados, because we have things to sell — we have a stable country, we have a work force which can work and produce — and, therefore, I do not think that we are doing a good job in that particular area.

I would like to see the IDC revise its whole approach and try to present a better image of Barbados, attracting a different and more reasonable kind of investor. Then, we would not have situations where people come into this country and invest and seem to adopt the attitude that they do not have to worry about workers becoming organized, about Unions, good treatment and good pay. That is the message which is conveyed to potential investors into Barbados, and that ought to be removed. It is a vital area which we ought to look at.

Finally, Sir, I would hope that we would not have a situation which I see developing in Central America and Latin America. I notice with some interest that Dominica has recently passed legislation establishing these industrial export zones, where industries which are attracted will come into those areas, and preventing the organization of workers into trade unions in these particular areas. I hope that I do not see that kind of development coming into this country. I am sounding a word of warning.

I am sure, Sir, that you will allow me to make two comments on the Ministry of Transport and Works.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no. I am afraid your time is up.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Arthur.

SENATOR O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. President, during the course of his presentation, Senator Greaves was very careful to remind this Chamber of his lack of expertise in economic issues. He did not disappoint us. Indeed, during his entire presentation I listened carefully to see if there might be any connection between Senator Greaves' discharge and known economic principles. Rather, I found that there was a curious resemblance between the tone of his presentation and those wise words of Lewis Carroll: "If you do not know where you are going, then any road will do." Mr. President, unlike Senator Greaves, however, I cannot ask your latitude by suggesting that I have no training nor expertise in economic matters, so I shall have to make a determined effort to be constructive in what I say in relation to these Estimates.

The Estimates that we consider today are not merely a set of numbers — they also embody an economic policy. And it seems to me that we have to discuss these Estimates and the policy that they embody within the recent course of the economic events in this country, and, equally, with reference to their likely impact on the functioning of the economy, both in regard to the immediate future as well as the beyond.

In relation to the recent turn of economic events, it is quite apparent to all sensible commentators that, of late, this country was faced with a number of very delicate and complexed options. In a capsule, we were faced with a situation in this country where major recessionary pressures emerged, particularly in our main export earnings sectors.
3.00 p.m.

A country can react to major recessionary pressures, particularly in its export sector, in two ways. It may seek, despite the evidence of recession, to maintain and enhance its standard of living at the expense of incurring substantial external payments instabilities in the process, or, alternatively, it could allow the recession to run its natural course, in which event it will pay the price in terms of rising unemployment. So the delicate situation was one in which a trade-off had to be effected between the maintenance of a sound external position on the one hand, and the adjustment to the standard of living that normally accompanies a real recession in the economy.

Many of the measures that have been taken by the Government to effect this trade-off have been unpopular, but sound. Among these measures was the restraint in Government expenditure in real terms to curtail the extent to which the size of the fiscal deficit depleted the country's reserves, pre-empted the private sector's access to credit and exposed the country to a disadvantageous long run debt situation to the degree to which it could have led if you had a large

deficit to a rapid build up in short term commercial debt.

Secondly, among the measures pursued by Government was a broad set of measures designed to manage total expenditure in the economic system, in the belief that there is a relationship between the growth of domestic expenditures and changes in our foreign exchange position. We are an open economy, which imports 60 per cent of the goods that we need both for investment and consumption, and whenever you pump up the economy by increasing domestic expenditure, you can expect the fallout to be felt immediately in terms of a depletion in your foreign exchange reserves.

It is quite obvious to us as a Government that when you are faced with a situation where there is a fault in your foreign exchange earning capability, the necessary and immediate thing that must be done is that you must manage the growth in domestic expenditure, whether that be by way of controls of credit or controls of growth in money incomes. You spend to the extent that you have access to increased money incomes or to the extent that you have access to increased credit.

The third kind of policy was a defensive interest rate policy to pre-empt the temptations from capital outflow from this country, and also to sustain capital inflows so vitally necessary to sustain investment in Barbados.

Finally, our stabilisation policies as a reaction to the 1981–83 recession feature certain changes in our sectoral priorities, including rehabilitation of the sugar industry, a change in emphasis in our manufacturing exports away from CARICOM and to non-CARICOM areas, and the development of non-sugar agriculture.

Economists will for a long time, believe me, Sir, debate the technicalities of these policies, but the weight of evidence at this point in time would seem to suggest that the trade-off that we have to effect between maintaining a sound external position and making that necessary adjustment in our standard of living has been finally and sensibly balanced. The evidence is, at this point in time, that we are battling out of recession with additional reserve strength, with our infrastructure and productive systems geared to take advantage of any resurgence in economic activity internationally.

We have paid a national price for this accomplishment. We have not been able to meet the individual's expectations as to what his income growth should be. We have had to employ forced savings by way of levies to meet current expenditures in critical areas such as health and transport. The private sector has been called

upon, necessarily so, to shoulder an enlarged responsibility by way of increased payable taxes and surcharges on profits. As Senator Greaves so correctly points out, we have also paid a national price by way of an increase in unemployment.

I should like to be in a position to tell the Chamber today — and I here use the words of the Chairman of our party — that weeping has endured for a night, but joy has come in the morning, that Government is now in a position to begin to pump up the economy again in the same way that it did in the 1970s. However, my reading of the economic situation is that at this stage we can only adopt a three-pronged approach to economic management in this country. First of all, we have to maintain our external payments position, because even though our reserves have grown, a large proportion of them are still in a liquid form. Secondly, we have to engage in selective rather than a broad-based stimulation of the Barbados economy. Thirdly, we have a national responsibility to engage in a rescue operation to enhance the viability of the corporate sector and to safeguard their capacity to carry on.

My contribution to this debate will therefore be guided by the extent to which the fiscal policy embodied in the Estimates is designed to give effect to these imperatives. Before I do so, just let me have a quick word on the three policy options that I say must guide us at this juncture.

First, the maintenance of payments stability. I am a reader of V.S. Naipaul, and he was once asked the question, what is the future of the Caribbean? He told us that the future of the Caribbean is Haiti. Even today, there are some countries which are bending towards Haiti because they have not been concerned with maintaining payments stability.

Why is external payments stability a major national priority? We are a small economy, which must necessarily, as I said, depend on imports to sustain over 60 per cent of our consumption and investment. The availability and the management of foreign exchange is the key constraint to our maintaining stable economic growth, and our promotion of social and economic development. If we weaken our external payments position, and if we ever reach the stage where we no longer have the capacity to pay our way in the world, then three things will happen. The economy will first falter, it will next collapse, and then it will begin to decay. The case of Guyana, the case of Jamaica and, unfortunately, the case of Trinidad, are vivid and very unfortunate evidences of this situation in the Caribbean at this point in time.

The day the consumer and the investor lose confidence in the Central Bank's capacity to provide him

with foreign exchange at a stable exchange rate on demand, on that day the people in this country will begin to devise their own means of meeting their consumption and investment requirements, whether it be by the way of the formation of black markets in foreign exchange, flight of capital, or the fall off in investment. There is no advantage whatsoever, from a national point of view, in our financing short term improvement in our standard of living if the price we pay for that is to make the economy ungovernable and unmanageable over the long term, to the extent that we pay for that temporary increase in our standard of living by way of a massive decrease in our foreign exchange reserves.

I have no hesitation, Sir, in suggesting to you that our main economic priority at this point in time is to maintain a sound external balance for the Barbados economy, and all policies, fiscal, monetary and otherwise, have to be assessed by reference to this particular benchmark.

3.10 p.m.

I would also suggest, by way of a second policy option, that we have now reached the stage where we can engage in selective rather than broad-based stimulation of the Barbados economy. Our reserves have grown, as I said, but they are still sufficiently illiquid for us to use reserve depletion as the basis on which we pump up the Barbados economy.

Secondly, the Government is frighteningly trying to effect new strategies in manufacturing and tourism. These strategies are still in their gestation period, and until such time as we have an enlarged foreign exchange earning capability as a result of increased growth in tourism and manufacturing, there can be no lasting hope for broad-based stimulation in Barbados.

Thirdly, one of the matters that must guide us in considering fiscal policy and the Estimates is the extent to which they allow for a rescue operation where the corporate economy is concerned. It is one thing to have national policies designed to enlarge markets, but if you do not have a viable corporate economy, then that national effort is wasted. It is true that the corporate economy has taken a beating over the last two years, and we now have as national policy makers to give that corporate economy, whether it be in manufacturing, tourism or sugar, a breathing space within which it can attain its real viable position over the long term.

The three main national priorities are, to maintain a sound external position, engage in selective rather than broad-based stimulation of the Barbados economy, and mount a rescue operation to enhance the viability of the private corporate sector. In order to relate policy to numbers, I will look at three things: the size of the fiscal

deficit, the financing of the deficit, and the sectoral spread of public expenditures, particularly the capital expenditure.

In relation to the size of the deficit, the quantum of expenditure reflected in this year's Estimates reflects an urgency on the part of Government to put the nation back to work. Total expenditures are estimated to increase from \$644 million in 1983-84 to \$746 million in 1984-85, an increment of \$102 million in Government expenditure. I understand and empathise with the urgency of Government's reaction to the need to put the nation back to work, but in reacting to the urgency of the situation, Government must be careful that it does not undermine the external position of the country.

I am of the view, as I look at these Estimates from the perspective of a trained economist, that the overall fiscal deficit contemplated in this year's Estimates is too ambitious. It is a deficit amounting to between 6 per cent and 7 per cent of GDP. We in this country find it difficult to sustain deficits without harming the balance of payments when they go beyond 3 per cent to 4 per cent. A deficit of 6 per cent or 7 per cent is a bit too ambitious.

Our experience has shown that Government spending cannot compensate for a shortfall in real activity, but indeed we can maintain a strong fiscal position provided that we have a strong economy. But we cannot create a strong economy on the basis of Government expenditure alone, and this deficit is too large, and I fear, and I would advise the Ministry of Finance officials who are here, that it could possibly take us back to the 1981 position. This is what Senator Greaves should have said, rather than regale us.

In relation to the financing, Mr. President, and Senator Greaves, I am of the view that a job which is not as tidy as we would wish has been undertaken in dealing with the financing of this deficit. We have a deficit of \$150 million based on capital expenditures of \$181.5 million. The assumption is that \$30 million Current Account surplus will be used to assist in the financing of the deficit. That assumption, of course, would have to be relaxed if the current expenditure situation has not taken account of a wage increase. When once the wage increase is factored into the equation, then we no longer can work on the assumption that we have a \$30 million Current Account surplus as the basis on which we support capital of this magnitude.

Secondly, the relationship between external financing to the capital programme and the size of the programme reflects a weakening. To give a comparative analysis, in 1982 we had a total fiscal deficit of \$95 million, \$47 million of which was financed by way of concessional loans. In this year's Capital investment programme, we have a fiscal deficit of \$150 million, but

we are only financing \$53 million of it from external concessional loans. That is to say that we financed 49.4 per cent of our deficit in 1983-84 by way of concessional loans, and this set of Estimates presumes that we will only finance 3.55 per cent of it by that means. The implication is that an unfinanced gap of \$97.5 million remains, to which one would necessarily have to add the increment to total expenditures that arise from whatever wage increase is allowed.

I am saying that a resource gap of in excess of \$100 million could give rise to serious balance of payments problems if not properly managed, because the question I ask myself, and which you should ask yourself, is how would we finance the gap between total financing required to cover the deficit and total financing identified? The answer is by a combination of three means: access to domestic banking credit, access to Central Bank accommodation, and access to external short term borrowing, because we have already covered and made provision for concessional borrowing from abroad.

Sir, access to banking system credit at this point in time, when one accepts a need to rescue the private sector, could be a bad shot played by the Government. We should not do anything at this point in time to crowd out the private sector from access to credit. Access to Central Bank financing is going to put pressure on our reserves, and financing of a deficit of this order or magnitude by reference to external short term borrowing is going to put pressure on our external debt position over the long term.

Therefore, much as Government recognises the need, without having to be told so by Senator Greaves, to put the nation back to work, it has, in my analysis, to carefully manage this situation to ensure that the deficit is not too large, nor the financing that it uses to cover the deficit inefficient from an economic point of view. By "economic point of view", I refer simply to the impact on our reserve position, the impact on the private sector access to credit, and the long term impact on the debt position of the country.

In relation to the sectoral spread of the investment, careful reading of it indicates that much emphasis in this year's Estimates is being placed, from a capital investment point of view, on roads, agriculture and certain capital investments by the Ministry of Finance and Planning.
3.20 p.m.

I am aware that a part of the investment in roads will necessarily be financed, to some extent, by the Transport Levy, although that in itself is not reflected in the Estimates. But if the Government runs into a situation in which it finds that the size of its capital programme is beginning to have a disastrous or disadvantageous effect on its foreign exchange or resource position, I

would advise it to walk carefully with the scale of its road programme in 1984/85.

I understand the need to completely revolutionize the road system of this country. Our existing road system was designed for a donkey and cart technology. We are living now in a high technology age, but we must also understand that we cannot do it in one year, and to the extent that a substantial proportion of the bulk of the capital expenditure falls within the Ministry of Transport and Works, I would ask the Government to walk carefully on that score.

I shall later in my presentation, and in dealing with Senator Greaves' points of issue, come back to the investment in agriculture. But there are one or two increments this year in total Government expenditure which I welcome, and which I really want to comment on.

In particular, the increment in the subvention to the Export Promotion Corporation, the increase from \$750 000 to \$1.5 million, is welcomed — with guarded feelings. I do not believe that we are as yet spending enough money in this country on export promotion, and the way in which these numbers are constructed would seem to reflect the fact that where export promotion is concerned, we are still engaged in institutional financing rather than programme financing. The difference that I am making is that what we are doing is funding an institution rather than funding a vigorous programme that that institution has devised in order to carry forward our manufacturing exports in non-traditional markets.

I really must stress this point, because it is no secret that, in the past few years, our manufacturing exports have grown under the strength of our ability to penetrate the CARICOM markets and to finance the increase of our trade in CARICOM. The reality at this point in time, however, is that the CARICOM area does not lend itself as a serious market of interest for Barbadian manufacturers. I am not saying this because I dislike CARICOM — I have nothing against CARICOM — but I am saying this because in talking about integration in this country, we tend to treat integration like we treat motherhood — as a god.

I make a distinction between motherhood and unwanted pregnancies, and the reality as of now is that the CARICOM market is in no position to sustain a substantial increase in exports from Barbados. Jamaica, Trinidad and Guyana are all vigorously engaged, as of now, in finding means of curbing their total imports, on the one hand and, moreso, to curb those kinds of imports that they can produce on their own — and the first set of imports that fall out in such an exercise are imports from competing countries.

We have, not because we dislike CARICOM but because of sheer economic necessity, to move beyond CARICOM. We have to do this. Indeed, I would not like to go to any person in this country — I want Senator Greaves to listen very carefully — and any part of the north of this country either, and tell them that I am making their future dependent upon the performance of the Trinidad economy, the Guyana economy or the Jamaican economy. It is nonsense. But when I call for financing of the EPC, and not only institutional financing but programme financing, let the EPC come up with a serious programme, with which we can move in a serious way into non-CARICOM markets. That addresses the issue Senator Greaves raised, but could not answer — given the existence of a serious and abundant problem, how do we address it?

Mr. President, I turn to some of the points of issue that were raised by Senator Greaves. He made one broad point to the effect that there is a crisis in the Services Commission, having to do with political meddling. I do not know whether this is true or not, but I want to relate a personal experience to Senator Greaves to let him understand what meddling can be all about.

In 1972, I applied to Services Commission while doing my Masters Degree in Jamaica, for a vacation job. I received a response from Services Commission to the effect that I should report to the Ministry of Agriculture on July 1, 1972, to act for three months as an Administrative Assistant. I had the letter in my hand from Services Commission. I turned up at the Ministry of Agriculture on July 1 to be employed. I was told that there was no job available for me in that institution. I do not want to relate it to the fact that during the 1971 campaign, there was a famous clash between myself and Mr. Asquith Phillips at All Saints Girls School which apparently did not please him. I do not want to make that connection, but I say no more on the question of the integrity of Services Commission than that I can have a letter in my hand from Services Commission to be employed at the Ministry of Agriculture as of July 1, 1972, and the Ministry of Agriculture say "You cannot work here."

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I was not chairman in July, 1972, Senator Greaves. I think that is offensive.

SENATOR O. S. ARTHUR: The question of debt, was raised by Senator Greaves. He said that we are in a precarious debt situation because, out of every dollar raised in revenue by the Government, we are having to pay out 18 per cent as a debt charge.

Mr. President, I would like to speak to Senator Greaves through you. Senator Greaves, if you were earning \$1 000 a month and of that \$1 000 a month, you had to pay out \$180 to cover your mortgage, to pay for your car, to pay for your higher purchase arrangements, and also to pay for any loans that you might have incurred to raise investment, would you regard yourself as being in a precarious financial position? Truly, Sir, can anybody who is paying out .18 ¢ out of each dollar for the service of debt be regarded as being in a precarious financial position, particularly taking regard to the fact that that debt had been used constructively to expand their productive base?

3.30 p.m.

Our debt in this country bears scrutiny. It is a low proportion when compared to our revenue, because Senator Greaves would agree that if he were in the fortunate position of ever having to use \$180 out of each \$1 000 he earns to pay for his mortgage, pay for his car, and so on, that he would sleep each night as if under valium.

We have incurred our debt in this country in ways that are positive. The Democratic Labour Party always tell us that the projects that we have implemented are their projects. At the same time, they should tell us that the debt now carried is the debt that they themselves would have had to carry if they had implemented the projects.

But one wonders when a project is a project. Is it truly a Democratic Labour Party's project when you have a recommendation in 1963 saying that the opportunity should not be missed to build a cement plant, you take thirteen years and we do not build a cement plant — in fact, your last idea was to build a cement plant which would require external help, in collaboration with Guyana, and then you come and tell us that the project is your project? Indeed, it reached the ridiculous stage where in the other Chamber, in relation to the Spring Garden Road, a former Minister of Trade and Industry informed the present Minister of Trade and Industry that the Spring Garden Road is their project because they had it on file.

I personally do not understand two things about that arrangement. Firstly, what does it mean to have a road on file?

Laughter.

SENATOR O. S. ARTHUR: Secondly, what was the road doing on file at the Ministry of Trade and Industry rather than at the Ministry of Transport and Works, where it ought really to belong, Senator Greaves? So when is a project a project?

Senator Greaves, the time has come when the people of this country will cease to believe you when you tell us, on the one hand, that we are implementing your projects and your ideas, and, on the other hand, you tell us that we are mismanaging the economy. You cannot have it both ways. If we are implementing your projects, at least say that the debt is being put to good use and do not tell us that we are mismanaging.

So, Sir, I am suggesting to you that in the same way that Senator Greaves could sleep with ease with a relationship between his debt service obligation and his revenue of .18, the Government feels that, for the time being it can be at ease.

I have already, however, warned the Government that every time any new addition to our external debt is brought before this Chamber, I would have to speak critically on it. Because the fact is that one would expect that, rather than being eighteen cents in the future, our debt revenue ratio will increase, and we have to be very careful in ensuring that any increase in our external debt is used for genuine purposes of expanding our foreign exchange earning on savings capabilities.

I can therefore support ventures such as borrowing to support the expansion of our oil industry. I can also even support external borrowing to finance a large scale programme in tourism or export promotion. I will not support the indiscriminate use of external debt for purposes which do not generate a return flow of foreign exchange in order to be able to service the debt that has been incurred. So while I admit that, as of now, there is no crippling debt problem, I am not trying to lull the Government into a false sense of security merely to tell it that it has to watch the extent to which it adds to this external debt.

Senator Greaves made sweeping allusion to the fact that there is an increased burden of Government taxes in this country. Sometimes in economics, you have to make a distinction between what is apparent and what is real. The real situation is that, as a percentage of total output in this country, the ratio of Government's revenues to GDP has in point of fact gone through a cycle. It was as high as 30 per cent up to 1978–79. Then Government made Income Tax adjustments without making compensation changes in indirect taxes, and in 1980–81, our revenues to GDP ratio fell to 23 per cent. Last year, it was 24.6%, and on the basis of the estimates of GDP that I have received for 1984, I have done a quick estimate as to what would be the ratio of revenues for GDP implied by revenues of \$596 million, and it comes out to 24.7 per cent. So compared to 1978–79, there is no more taxation per dollar of income in this country.

I talked about the difference between what is real and apparent. The fact is that people's real income has fallen, so even though there is no real increase in debt as such, as compared to earlier years, there is a greater burden of debt. To the extent that your real income falls, you feel the tax debt that you are carrying to an even greater extent. So he may have a small point, but he has to make a distinction in making that point between the real impact of the debt and the apparent impact.

The question of unemployment was one that was dealt with at considerable length by Senator Greaves. I think that we on this side have a responsibility to recognize that unemployment is the most serious economic problem that faces us at this point in time, except that we also have to qualify that recognition by saying that, while it is the most serious economic problem at this point in time — and this is not to sound callous — we cannot do just any and everything to solve it.

For example, I am very careful to make the point that I could never support Government's depletion of our foreign exchange reserves to solve the unemployment problem on a temporary basis, because you would, in the process, have made the country ungovernable and unmanageable over a period of time. Senator Greaves, however, while he was quite — I do not want to say lucid, because it may not apply — lengthy on the point, stopped short of offering us any solutions as to how we may adjust the problem.

In some quarters, the call for new ideas is a substitute for them. How do we get out of the present unemployment situation in which we find ourselves? On this side, we say that unemployment can be addressed by three approaches — the creation of new enterprises, the expansion of existing ones and reconciling the supply of skills with the demand for skills as they are likely to evolve. I know of no other means.

The question of reconciling the supply of skills with the demand for skills as they are likely to evolve is very much caught up in the whole question of training and retraining. Indeed, we are having a problem where that whole question is concerned, because there are certain structural changes that are taking place in the world and in this economy which put people with certain skills at a disadvantage. For example, in areas such as banking in the international economy, the role of the teller can become redundant if that sector is automated, and we always have to be very conscious of the impact of structural changes on the economy's capacity to employ, given that we ourselves are caught up in this whole business of rapid technological change.

Where Government can address the problem is by making a facility for the creation of new enterprises and the expansion of existing ones. And that is precisely

why I stress the point that, at this juncture, we have to be very careful of doing whatever may be necessary to launch a rescue operation on behalf of the private, corporate economy which is under some stress at this point in time. We have to do that by addressing their capacity to create new enterprises and to expand new ones at source. I have already alluded to two — I want to see this country make a substantial investment in export promotion and tourism promotion.

But we also have, I think too, to address the whole question of changing in costs, to the extent that that has an impact on the viability of the corporate sector. Utility costs in some areas are beginning to be a problem which we must recognize, and I am calling on Government to seriously review the impact of utility charges on the viability of the corporate sector and the capacity of the corporate sector to carry on.
3.40 p.m.

I am also of the view that we have, in dealing with our tax collection measures, to be very careful that we do not squeeze too hard to the point where we cripple the sector. There are entities in manufacturing and tourism which have just come through two difficult years; they need a breathing space. There will be cases where they will owe the Government taxes. Under the law, they should pay the taxes, but I do believe that the Government can find the means of reconciling the payment of those taxes with the cash flow position of the entities involved to pre-empt the situation where you get a one-shot increase in taxes but cripple the enterprises' capacity to continue to operate. I am asking that these two matters be dealt within the confines of the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Thirdly, the whole question of the generation of services is a matter that we have to bring to the front burner in this country. Our infrastructural and institutional strands recommend us to become one of the major service centers in the Caribbean. We have a good telecommunications system, a good electricity system that works, a good telephone system that works, reasonably good roads, an educational system, despite the strictures of Senator Greaves, that people still respect, but at the same time, we lack the range of resources upon which we can carry forward national development by producing only goods. We have to turn to services. At the same time, we are also beginning to train a labour force who can be adept in the operation of services. I am talking about international business companies, off-shore banking, captive insurance companies and — speaking now to Senator Greaves and I know Mrs. Bovell from Ashton Hall will agree with me — offshore medical schools — he knows who Mrs. Bovell is — and things of this character.

There is no distress in our selling a service to the rest of the world. There is no embarrassment in our being

put in a position where we say that we depend on services. In the same way that we can produce goods, we can produce services. Nobody questions the need in this country for tourist industry, and tourism is a service. So let us take the emotion and the confusion out of our service economy's future and put it on the front burner. In the same way that we have established an IDC to deal with industrial development, I am suggesting that we need to put services development within its proper institutional home. One of the reasons why we have gone our way with service is because, to recap Senator Hall, it has fallen between the slips; it is betwixt the Central Bank and the IDC, and neither the twain shall meet.

I will now deal with those matters which Senator Greaves asked me to address in my personal capacity — the ADC and the USAID Housing Guarantee Programme. The charge that is placed on the Record is that the USAID Housing Guarantee Programme has been a failure because Owen Arthur negotiated it, and Senator Greaves' recommendation in regard to how we can get out of the bind, is that the Government should never let Owen Arthur have anything to do with the negotiation of a housing programme in this country. That, of course, is Senator Greaves' facile approach to matters of substance.

Senator Greaves asked me for the information, I will enlighten him. The programme is deliberately designed to cater to the poorest of the poor. The first thing we had to do was to define a cut-off point beyond which people could not qualify under the programme. We did our analyses, and we do analyses Senator Greaves, and we discerned that you could define the poorest of the poor as falling within those households in this country where the household income is less than \$16 000 per year. If you know anything about house financing obviously you have to relate the amount of loans to the capacity of the person to pay. It would be a very nice thing for me to say in this Senate today that everybody, poor and rich alike, should have access to a solid wooden house but the reality is that there are people in this country who just simply would not have the capacity to repay for a \$50 000, \$60 000, or \$80 000 house on the basis of a family income, and that income is less than \$16 000 per year. So if you want to understand why there is that limitation, on the size of the loan, it is precisely because one has to define an income level beyond which a family could not qualify for a loan.

Let me give you the details of the project, because you are of the view, because of some mistaken reason, that all the money is going into the commercial banks and just laying there. It is a \$20 million project, \$10 million of which goes into the BMFC to finance new home construction. Four million dollars is split between the commercial banks and the credit unions to finance home improvements. Indeed my participation in the programme was not only to negotiate with Wall Street financiers in relation to interest rates and so on, but also to find a means of bringing the credit unions of this country into

the programmes. The commercial banks' part of the programme has not been moving, but if you go to NUPW, you would have a different story. Indeed, if your B.W.U. credit union wants any technical assistance to get involved, I am at liberty to let you know that I will be glad to help you come into the programme.

Four million dollars is to enable people in tenancies both to purchase the lands as well as to effect improvements in their homes. Under the aegis of the Freehold Tenancies Purchase Act, there is a provision to buy land that you formerly rented, but that does not necessarily in itself improve the lot of the person unless he has the wherewithal to buy the land as well as improve the house on the land. We are putting even more additional financial muscle into the tenancies programme, by under the auspices of this loan programme, earmarking \$4 million to enable low income families within tenancies to borrow specifically for home improvement and so on.

Why have the funds not moved, Sir? I really have to put the blame here on the Ministry of Housing. I truly have to do so.

The funds were borrowed on the United States market at an interest rate prevailing at the time of 11.6 per cent. But it is Government's desire to use the funds to capitalize a Housing Credit Fund. There are two options. Government could provide the funds as a grant to the Housing Credit Fund, in which case there is no cost on the acquisition of the funds by the housing credit facility. It would get funds at no interest cost to itself, nor would it have a responsibility to repay, because the repayment of the interest and principal would fall as a charge against the Consolidated Fund. So if the Housing Credit Fund received the money at no interest charge nor no amortization charge to itself, the rate of interest at which it onlends to commercial banks need not be an issue, or more precisely, there would be no need to equate the rate at which they onlend to commercial banks with the rate at which the funds have been borrowed.

3.50 p.m.

Even assuming that you were not going to go that route, when I was at the Ministry of Finance and Planning we built within the programme a flexibility for the fund to be self-financing, even where debt repayment was concerned, even if it did not get the funds from Government on a grant basis. Why? Because you would be getting access to 30 year money, but the home improvement loans would be for a period of seven years. In effect, what you would be getting would be a loan that you could turn over four times before you have to fully amortise it, and you would be receiving four sets of interest over the period of maturity of the loan. So on neither count is there any basis for the Ministry of Housing at this point in time to be tangled up with the commercial banks regarding the rate of interest at which

the money should be on-lent, irrespective of whether the Government provides the funds for the housing facility as a grant or as a loan. If the Government wants me to come back to tell them so, I will tell them so, Senator Greaves.

I will close on Agriculture. Senator Greaves has made the charge that the Government does not know where it is going in relation to agriculture. Let me give you one or two statistics.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have five minutes.

SENATOR O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you, Sir.

In 1981, the rate of growth of non-sugar agriculture was 7.6 per cent; 1982, 7.0 per cent; 1983, 15 per cent. He says that we have no policy on non-sugar agriculture. Our problem might be that in some respects we are being embarrassed by the success of non-sugar agriculture.

The problem in fisheries indicates that if there is a flaw, it is that one has over stimulated without paying due attention to the need to build marketing and proper capacity for marketing as to take account of marketing in the same way that one takes account of increasing primary production.

Government's small farmer policy takes a number of forms. The very close collaboration between the BMC and the BAS has done much — and I think you will agree too, Senator Greaves — to improve marketing intelligence for the small farmers. In the ADC's Integrated Rural Development Project we have now brought 1 000 acres of small farmer land into increased production by providing a complex of inputs, credit, irrigation, feeder roads, marketing assistance. At the Spring Hall Land Lease Scheme, we are maintaining a motor tractor cultivation scheme for small farmers, part of which is financed from this year's budget. If Senator Greaves does not want us to subsidise this programme, let him tell the people of Barbados that we must take it out of the budget.

The contentious issue at the moment is the supposed directions being taken at the Agricultural Development Corporation where three estates are concerned — Wildey, Fairy Valley and Coverley. Where Wildey is concerned, I must inform you that, as far back as 1978, the Wildey estate was seen as representing the outer skirts for commercial and even suburban development of the greater Bridgetown area. Part of Wildey estate was taken out of agricultural production to accommodate things such as the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic and the CDB.

What the ADC has been doing is maintaining a holding action on that estate, continuing to farm the remaining land until such time as an alternative use has been identified for it, given that that entire area has already been demarcated as being more suitable for

commercial suburban type development. The Ministry of Lands has now informed us that the time is coming where they will be wanting to move into that area for suburban development, and we have put in a contingency amount into the budget to cover the eventuality of our having to discontinue the holding action that we have been maintaining at Wildey since 1978.

In relation to Fairy Valley, the Government has a proposal from an Israeli expert to establish a model farm for non-sugar agricultural exports at Fairy Valley, which is ideal because of its direct access to the airport. We will not therefore be taking it out of agriculture if it leaves ADC, because the arrangement would be so organised that the workers who will be made redundant in relation to their employment at ADC would have the first option to be employed in the new venture. In any case, since their legal employment at ADC would have ended, if the proposal is implemented during the course of this year, we will have to pay them. In effect, we will be paying them severance pay on the understanding that they will be reabsorbed into a continuing agricultural thrust on the same estate.

We must be frank on this. A lot of the debate has been raised about putting Coverley into alternative use. There is the view that it is the best place to put the race course of Barbados, to move it from the Garrison and put it at Coverley. That might happen, and we have built into this budget a contingency in that event.

In relation to the Estimates, I think that the Government is a little over ambitious in relation to the size of its Capital budget, and I will only ask it to manage the flows in such a way that capital investments do not create balance of payments problems in this country. I am satisfied that the urgency of the situation where employment generation is concerned has been recognised, and that the increase in Government's expenditure contemplated in this year's budget is designed to address that basic problem in this country.

I am also suggesting to Government that it has to deal with the problem of unemployment in a wider sphere, by creating the capacity for the private sector to want to create more enterprises and to expand others, that we have to find the proper institutional setting within which to develop our service industries, and that we have to throw out larger investments even if we have to borrow into export promotion and tourism development.

In relation to the points made by Senator Greaves, I think I have said everything that needs to be said.

I thank you.

Cheers.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I think I ought to start my short intervention on the basis of Senator Arthur's comments and explanations of the difficulties in housing and the understanding of loan arrangements, and his suggestion that there ought to be an economist in every Ministry.

Broadly speaking, I want to deal first of all with Education and to raise a number of questions. I share Senator Greaves' discomfiture at the kind of publicity which is surrounding education. I do not think any true and honest citizen of Barbados can be happy when the education system is dragged before the public in the way in which it has been in the last few months. The coincidence of these affairs makes for a strong suggestion that some serious look has to be taken in the relations, almost the public relations, between the Ministry of Education and its component parts.

4.00 p.m.

One of the problems which seems to me to have contributed to this is that an Education Act, which replaces one eighteen years old, has provided too many new shocks at the same time. Changes have been drastic and rapid and, therefore, one has, in dealing with the implementation of these changes, to go carefully.

We are essentially a conservative society, and we do not take kindly to change which is dramatic. Therefore, in the implementation of that change, the people who are going to implement that change have to be very careful that they do not destroy the very thing that they want to construct.

So far as the National Advisory Council on Education is concerned, in Senator Greaves' remarks on its advice or non-advice to the Ministry of Education, he made some mention of a final report. May I just say that the National Advisory Council on Education is a standing council. That means that it reports all the time. There can be no such thing, in essence, as a final report. We are there to advise the Ministry and the Minister, and our advice is continuing. I think that is enough to explain anything. There can be no final report, certainly in my view.

In the Estimates, under Education, there is an item which provides for the maintenance of the Richard B. Moore Library. That library, so far as I know, is situated in a building off the compound of the University. It is a very valuable library. It is perhaps one of the finest libraries of negro literature in the world. It was the child of a very distinguished Barbadian who made virtually a present of this library to the country at the time of Independence. It is not being used and that, to my mind, is a shame. It is a burning shame that a valuable library, a collection which has been amassed throughout the lifetime of one of the most devoted

servants of Barbados on the Black race, is lying unused and neglected in a building outside of the University.

I see its appearance under Education and I begin to wonder whether it should be there. The Ministry of Information and Culture is responsible for something called BLAIN, the Barbados Library Archives Information Network, and it seems to me that that is where this should be.

The essence of the Richard B. Moore Library is that it is not for academic study, although that is not excluded, but that it should be available to a wide range of the reading public, all the amateur readers, all the young schoolboys, all the people who now in retirement to read at their leisure. It seems to me that to restrict it to the confines of an academic institution is not to make the best use of it.

Under Education, Head 11, there is a provision for \$1.3 million for scholarships. I want to say something about the trends that I have observed in scholarships in the last two or three years; is a Caribbean-wide trend and I should not be surprised if it is not a world trend. It is that all the scholarships are going to the scientists. All nine last year went to people who had offered physics, mathematics or variations thereof. None at all went to the humanities.

I would really like to see a system of scholarships to be earmarked, a Barbados scholarship or two, to those who offer languages or modern studies. In the present free-for-all, it is almost certain that the best candidates, the cleverest and the most motivated, will take the sciences, because that is where the money and the jobs are. It seems to me that the stimulation of a Barbados Scholarship in the humanities or in the languages would offer that kind of encouragement which would make a young boy or girl who likes those subjects go into those studies. I hope that increase in the scholarship money is going to take care of something like that.

Under Head 10, Support to the UWI, there is an element of \$16.375 million as against \$12.7 million for the year before. We know that the university and the arrangements for the campus countries are going to be changed. I should like to hear from the Government side, in due course, what are the proposals, in as much detail as they can give, for the restructuring of the UWI.

The restructuring of the UWI at Cave Hill and the question which Senator Greaves raised under Foreign Affairs, when he said that Grenada and the representative in Grenada is a waste of time, are closely united. First of all, I do not think that anybody who has been watching the events of the Caribbean since 1962, when the Federation folded up, and especially since the events in Grenada, can possibly say that the establishment of a

mission in Grenada at this time is a waste of time. I really cannot see how anyone can say that.

It is precisely because Barbados and Trinidad neglected the Eastern Caribbean at the end of Federation that resulted in the situation in Grenada. If you want to read the rationale of that, read Arthur Lewis' "Agency of Eight" to see that Grenada is the direct result of the neglect of the small islands in the Eastern Caribbean.

At the end of the Federation, and at the announcement of Eric Williams' famous equation, 1 from 10 leaves 0, a vacuum existed in the Eastern Caribbean which was crying out for leadership. Trinidad could reasonably have been expected to fill that vacuum, but they opted out. The prestige of the Prime Minister at the time, Eric Williams, was so high that it would have been no trouble at all for Trinidad to fill that vacuum of leadership. But he chose otherwise. It seems to me that Barbados ought to have taken that role. Barbados opted out. We were all too anxious to become independent on our own.

The result of all that is the fragmentation of those little islands. Bitter jealousies, quarrels over the composition of the West Indies Cricket team, quarrels over immigration between St. Lucia and Barbados — all sorts of things could have been ironed out at that stage. We allowed those things to get sour. We allowed all sorts of funny people to emerge in Dominica and in Grenada, and the end result is this mess on our hands.

It seems to me that not only should there be a Barbados mission in Grenada, but certainly one at the headquarters of the OECS States, in St. Lucia, and certainly one in Trinidad, which has already been announced but which has been held up for other reasons.

If you look at the emergence of the Prime Minister of Dominica into a very dominant personality in the Eastern Caribbean, you will see that the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States is forming itself into a very tight body. Those of us who look at the university realize that they have insisted on the appointment of a man, at the Vice Chancellor level, to deal with their affairs in the new dispensation of the university. We had better look very carefully at our relationship with those and adopt a strong, sympathetic and intelligent position, *vis-a-vis* the Eastern Caribbean. So, Senator Greaves will have to pardon me for disagreeing with him totally about the appointment of a High Commissioner in Grenada. It is a little too late, but it will still be useful.

4.10 p.m.

There are other areas of Foreign Affairs which one can guess at in the provision in the Estimates. There is provision which shows nearly \$1 million greater than the term before, and I wonder whether this includes the

strengthening of posts in Washington and at the United Nations. It seems to me that it is essential that these missions be strengthened.

There are many people who feel, like Senator Greaves, that the role of the diplomat is to deal at consular level with the problems of nationals in those countries. That may be one of them, but it is by no means the most important. The most important is to be at the heart of decision making; with people able to speak freely and on equal terms with representatives of all governments. That is the diplomacy, but the diplomats, unfortunately, cannot preach their own success. I am pretty sure that our representation in Brussels has had very beneficial results on our trade.

One other point, Mr. President, and I really do not want to prolong this, is that there is an implication in Senator Greaves' comment about wooden houses; he implies that a wooden house is not an instrument for a lifetime. Well, I do not know where he has been living, if in Barbados, because most of us here have origins in wooden houses which have lasted considerably more than a lifetime.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I should like to begin by concurring with Senator Arthur in that, on the face of it, the overall deficit indicated in the Estimates seems to be a bit on the large side, and, in a broad sense, there is an unfinanced deficit so far of \$97 million. It would seem as though Government could do well to take another look not only at the Capital Estimates, as Senator Arthur indicated, but also at the Current Expenditure.

I also notice that on page (ii), the growth over last year's Estimates in Other Charges is of the order of 21 per cent. I do believe that there is some scope within the Ministries to review historical expenditure of a non salary nature to see whether things which we spent money on in the past are worthy of similar expenditure in the future, and it may be that there could be some little pruning in that area also.

By way of a slight modification of Senator Arthur's submission, I should like to point out, however, that nowadays the Estimates do not give us enough information to make precise statements as to whether a deficit is too large or too small. I refer in particular to these special levies that we have, about which we do not have any indication as to how much they are expected to realise during the financial year under consideration. For instance, how much is Government anticipating to collect through the Transport Levy. How much do they consider would be applied out of that levy to the financing of, let

us say, the expenditure under the Ministry of Transport and Works Capital Expenditure?

Also, I notice that in the Estimates this year the Health Levy has been removed from other sources of financing, so to speak. This is on page XIV in the Memorandum. I notice that the Health Levy is no longer reflected as a source of revenue, and that is some \$12.7 million. I do not believe the Health Levy has been abolished, or is about to be abolished, so it would seem as though this is also a change in the presentation of the Estimates, and I do not know to what extent the money collected under that levy will be available for financing the overall deficit during the coming financial year.

There is also the question of the National Insurance Fund. How much money would be available from that particular source to assist with the financing of the deficit? If we expect substantial rate of growth in such sources, it may well be then that the deficit may be manageable. Be we anticipate that, even after making these adjustments, you will have a deficit which would be larger than can reasonably be financed from domestic sources, so Government should be aware right away that unless they can go over the various items and identify areas where they can adjust downwards, even if not in the actual Estimates, in the actual expenditure during the course of the year, they must start now to make arrangements for further external financing of the deficit.

Senator Arthur identified the internal sources, the commercial banking sector and the Central Bank, and the external sector. You can add to those a fourth internal source, National Insurance and things of that order in Government. I have been told that the Health Levy will now finance the National Health Service, and I presume the National Health Service is off budget in terms of these Estimates, I do not know. If the National Health Service is not reflected anywhere in these Estimates, then that would be the case, but as I was saying, you need to look at external sources of financing.

Senator Arthur said that Government should only seek to raise money externally for projects which can be identified as foreign exchange savers or earners in the future. I myself would be inclined to take a more general view of it. Rather than matching the particular financing to the project, one should look at the overall Estimates of Expenditure that Government is projecting, especially the Capital Estimates, and if you can see an appropriate bias overall towards activities which would enhance our foreign exchange earning or saving capacity, it should not matter too much whether some of those projects are financed locally and the ones that are financed overseas are not of that character. The overall situation is important, and, most importantly, even if we can achieve the ideal in terms of the appropriate use of external loans, if we come to the conclusion that this is the order of the

deficit which the Government must attempt to accommodate for whatever reasons, political or what have you, then you must recognise that there is a certain restraint in terms of our present foreign reserve position to try to avoid foreign borrowing.

So it would be our capacity to avoid foreign borrowing which should determine whether Government should proceed in the face of an overall budgetary proposal to engage in such borrowing rather than looking at it from a one-to-one correspondence between what you are borrowing the money for and what that project is going to generate. Above everything else, it is important that Government, as they proceed, not only in terms of financing the project ultimately, but at the level of intermediate financing in terms of ways and means advances from the Central Bank and what have you, must have a clear understanding of the implications of the various ways of financing their deficit.

4.20 p.m.

We heard Senator Arthur mention the problems of 1981. The main problem which we had in 1981 was a lack of understanding — it was not a fundamental, intractable, financial problem — of economic processes in terms of the intermediate problem of financing Government projects through the Central Bank. We know that whenever we do that the reserves are going to decline, and if we know this, we will have to accept it if we are going to proceed and operate in that way. Having done something which is going to make the reserves decline, do not be panicked into a position which would lead you to introduce policies which will eventually do the economy more harm than good. That happened in 1981, and will happen any time again that we find ourselves in the position to panic when our reserves are declining for reasons that we are not fully aware of.

I am suggesting, however, that in the coming fiscal year, Government must not only borrow abroad beyond what is indicated here on page 11 to finance the deficit indicated, but they are going to have to make rather greater use of the domestic private sector sources than in the last few years. There is hardly any scope, in my view, for relying on the Central Bank, having regard to the fact that the Central Bank is engaged in its own business of substantial capital expenditure on a new building. So there will be very little scope for the Central Bank to accommodate any significant amount of the deficit as seen. The sources are going to have to be predominantly National Insurance and so on, the private sector and external sources.

Senator Arthur made some reference to the type of fiscal policies embodied in these Estimates. I am not so sure that one can really look at these Estimates and perceive very much about fiscal policies. Most of the fiscal policies embedded in these Estimates relate to the

existing structure of tax legislation. One can perhaps look at some of the items under Capital Expenditure to see the general direction in which Government is trying to engage in capital formation, the acquisition of assets and public investment. But it would seem to me that these Estimates provide too scanty detailed information for us to be very sure as to the clear order of priorities that Government might have.

I myself would like to see some of these notes expanded a little so that you can know how much will be apportioned in different areas. For instance, in relation to the \$48 million in Capital under the Ministry of Finance and Planning, we have a general idea as to the range of projects that it would be spent on. But the magnitudes are not in any way indicated, so, because of that, one cannot draw any very clear conclusion as to any particular bias in the proposals.

I want to shift from that point on to a matter relating to the Ministry of Education, under Secondary Schools on page 65. There you will see a division into Statutory and Other Charges, where Statutory Expenditure, \$24.261 million; Other Expenditure, \$11.936 million. The details are supposed to be given in Appendix A, pertaining to the secondary schools, in the back. But Appendix A does not make it possible for us to distinguish between the statutory component and the other charges component; it is not broken down in that manner.

I should like to ask a question of the appropriate spokesman for the Ministry of Education in this Chamber, as to what is the indicated division in terms of those charges between the statutory and the ones that we are supposed to be voting on, the other charges as indicated in Appendix A. The statutory charges, I believe, would be those that are payable by virtue of legislation passed in Parliament some time before.

(Aside: Some salaries.)

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Some salaries. But then there are the salaries of the people who are not appointed. This is the part of the question that I am getting at.

The reason I am asking the question is that it is related to the type of treatment which is meted out to the various schools. I would like to have known what is the division under established posts vis-a-vis unestablished posts in the various secondary schools across the island in order to find out if some schools are more favoured than others in that particular regard. If that is so, I think the time has come for such practices to be discontinued.

I do believe there was a time when at some secondary schools in Barbados nearly all the teachers were appointed while others had a fairly substantial sprinkling

of unappointed staff and unappointable staff by virtue of the limited establishment in those schools, which was below the requirement for teachers. Since they are now all brought on one footing, I want to know whether these inequalities still persist in the teaching profession in Barbados.

Looking at Appendix A, it also seems as though there is a considerable discrepancy between the establishment as indicated under the various schools here for 1983-84 or 1984-85, whichever one you want to take, and what one would find in terms of the actual teaching staff at the schools, let us say as indicated by the little pamphlet put out by the Ministry of Education. I should like some explanation as to the reason for this difference between the numbers of the establishment indicated in Appendix A for the various schools under Teaching Staff and the numbers indicated by the Ministry of Education in the little booklet.

At one stage, I thought it might have been related to Establishments or something, but at another time I was wondering whether it was related to typographical errors. I should like to know what the explanation is.

In terms of typographical errors in this section, there seems to be at least one typographical error relating to the St. George School, I think.
4.30 p.m.

I just want to point out that this appendix is very badly organized. The schools are not set out in alphabetical order. For instance, Harrison College is before Ellerslie, and West St. Joseph is before Princess Margaret. At one stage I thought that I could pick up a certain kind of order, but when I saw West St. Joseph before Princess Margaret, I did not know what was going on. I would hope that next year they will have them in strict alphabetical order so that I will be able to find information with greater facility rather than turning all through until I come to the school.

Under Non-Teaching Staff, on page 20 it says six. But the money is far too much for six. So there is a typographical error there. Six non-teaching staff would hardly work for \$540 000. So I do not know if it is 16 or 26, but I have an interest in knowing the correct number. But looking again at the non-teaching staff attached to the various schools, unless there are other typographical errors, it would seem as though there is some.....

Asides.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I do not know what the number would be but I do not believe that it is 36. Harrison College has 28 and Ellerslie has 19, and so

on. The highest other number I see is 28 non-teaching staff.

I would like to find out about the basis on which the non-teaching staff are appointed and whether one can identify consistent principles which would suggest that justice has been done across the board. I have my doubts about whether or not all schools are justly provided with non-teaching staff or, indeed, for that matter, teaching staff.

The essential plea that I am making in looking at this appendix is that I cannot get the type of information that I would like to get in relation to the provisions for secondary schools. I am asking some questions about it, and, in the future, I would like to see this appendix better presented, so that we can get details as to appointed staff, temporary staff and other relevant facts. I also hope that it will present the schools in alphabetical order, or some order that can be followed, rather than what is here at the moment.

On the question of the Ministry of Education more generally, I would like to compliment the Ministry on releasing certain information regarding the performance of schools in the CXC and GCE O' level examinations. But I want to suggest that that information needs to be supplemented by other information if it is not to be misleading. It is not sufficient for us to be told about the percentage success rate at the various schools; being told that Presentation College had the highest rate of all, and maybe Harrison College the second highest. We would want to know things about students who leave school without getting a chance to take any GCE examinations. We would want to know what this means in terms of the per capita pass rate and entry rate among these schools for students who are in the examination forms.

To illustrate what I am talking about, if you look at Harrison College and Queens College and you look at the past rate, you will see that Harrison College has a higher pass rate than Queens College. But if you look at the entry levels, you will see that Queens College entered considerably more students than Harrison College, but the two schools are about the same size in total numbers, and the intake in first forms, I think, would be similar. The question is, what happens along the line to enable Queens College to have so many more entries than Harrison College, especially when you remember that some of the students at Harrison College probably take more subjects than those at any other schools? We want to know what is happening along the line inside of Harrison College. We want some information about students who are being superannuated without taking examinations. We want to know something about the relationship between the

number of entries and the number of students in the examination classes before we can make a full comparison.

Some other information which would help those of us who are interested in the proper interpretation of those results would be information about the average marks attained by those students in the Common Entrance at the time when they entered the school. In other words, if we want to evaluate the quality of teaching in Barbados we can be seriously misleading if we say School A has the best success rate, either in per capita, absolute terms, or whatever terms, without an appreciation of how those students compared with other students at the point at which they entered the system. It may be that some of the schools that do not have quite a success rate may be taking students who, if they had gone to the school with a high success rate, would have been wash-outs. This is information that, in general, we would want to know in order to have a clear understanding of what our schools are achieving.

I want to comment on certain economic issues to which Senator Barrow referred in his opening remarks. His opening remarks, as he said, were intended to be particularly modest, but he made one comment which, I am sure, reflects a view in certain official circles, but which is not, in my view, particularly correct. He suggested that it seems as though the same policies which contain inflation contribute to unemployment, and he instanced our low rate of inflation this year and our higher level of employment. That is not generally true in the Barbadian context. That is something which is believed to be true in terms of economics text books. But it is not true in Barbadian context, and people worldwide, are discovering that it is not true, because they are discovering a phenomenon called stagflation, where high unemployment and high inflation seem to be going along together and seem to be generated not necessarily in every instance by identical factors, but there must be some common causation for this thing to persist in that way.

In the Barbadian context, most of the policies which create unemployment cause inflation. And what is worse, they are policies which officials believe will stop inflation, like high interest rates. High interest rates, in the orthodox literature, are seen as a policy to restrict arrearage demand, which when it is too excessive, causes prices to rise. In such a case, one of the suggestions is to increase interest rates, increase taxes, and so on to dampen demand and, therefore, dampen the pressure on prices to reduce the rate of inflation.

In a place like Barbados, that is not true. It is not true because first of all, the consequence of excessive demand in Barbados is not inflation, it is balance of payment problems. We import more at the same price, or

maybe a little cheaper. The second thing is, the way in which our price formation process goes, and I am certain that Senator Seale would know about this, about how it organizes his markups and so on, things like taxes and high interest rates induce higher markups and not the opposite.

4.40 p.m.

In Barbados, when you have your high interest rate regime, you will have a situation which will be suggested to you by the International Monetary Fund and by people who are schooled in traditional closed economy economics, which will be introduced to dampen demand and restrain inflation. It will not do that; it will increase prices by virtue of the way in which our price mechanism works, and it is going to lead to certain businesses being ruled out in terms of not being viable any more. It will lead to business closure, contraction of business and unemployment.

Part of the unemployment we have today can be traced right back to our high interest rate regime which, quite evidently, would have been influenced not only by thinking among Government advisers and others, but also by the International Monetary Fund. In more recent times, I think they have come to recognise that this business about containing inflation and high interest rates does not work, so they have another line about stopping capital outflows and so on. But, essentially, in Barbados most of the measures which cause inflation cause unemployment, and the measures which generate employment do not cause inflation — they may give you a balance of payment problem, but not significant inflation. Unless this point is fully appreciated by Government, it is entirely possible that we can find ourselves being afflicted with faulty economic policy again.

The particular reason why our inflation rate is as low as it has been in the past year is because of two factors: a general slow down in the rate of inflation internationally, and two, the fact that our dollar is tied to the U.S. dollar, which has appreciated *vis-a-vis* most of the other major international currencies in the world. This would have meant, therefore, that our imports from the non-dollar area, in some cases, might even have declined in nominal terms, but most definitely would not have experienced any dramatic increases during the last year, and the slow rate of inflation in the dollar area would also suggest that our import prices would not have moved dramatically. In other words, it is the slower rate of increase in import prices in our dollar terms which has translated into the slow rate of price increases in Barbados predominantly. Another fact is that the interest rate came down in the last year or so, so that also will have some mitigating effect on price rises.

It may be that Government can take the credit for having the interest rate where it is. To that extent, you

can say Government had a hand in it. If you can consciously say that Government each and every day has the discretion, so to speak, to do something about the exchange rate and to leave it where it is *vis-a-vis* the dollar, then Government can get credit for that. Indeed, I would give it full credit, especially since in recent times we have been hearing people trying to suggest that we should change the value of our dollar downwards.

We have heard that argument coming from people in the tourist sector, and they make it with a lot of force, and, I would presume, with a lot of sincerity. That line of argument about the benefits that could come to tourism, and consequently to Barbados, if we should reduce our exchange rate, is an entirely misguided argument. You know the nature of the argument. It says that because of the appreciation of the U.S. dollar, tourists out of Europe now have to pay rather more for the services which they buy when they come to Barbados as visitors, and if we devalue, they might pay less. That argument is particularly wrong.

It is true that the European tourist is disadvantaged, but he is disadvantaged not so much because we refuse to devalue our currency — he is disadvantaged because his currency has declined *vis-a-vis* the U.S. dollar. That would be so whether or not we change our parity. If we change the value of our currency downward, what will happen immediately is that all the foreign inputs, all of the things that are imported and used in the hotel industry and the other tourist oriented industries, would go up in value overnight, and, accordingly, the charges for these things would have to go up.

The next thing is that, to the extent that our wage levels are not at a point where the workers can sustain any substantial and continuing reduction in the real wage, you will get forceful wage bargaining, the wages will go back up, and so the existing real situation will persist as it is today. That, by interpretation, means that the hotels will have to carry up the prices. If it is at all possible for the hotels to maintain low prices in the face of devaluation, they can lower the prices right now without any devaluation.

The particular argument about what we can achieve by devaluing our currency in terms of attracting visitors from Europe is not really valid. Of course, remember it is not only a question of attracting visitors from Europe, as important to this economy or, indeed, as important to tourism that is. What is important if we reduce our prices under any circumstance, be it as a result of a devaluation or just any price reduction in our dollar, is whether or not the overall demand for our product will expand more than proportionate to the reduction, so we can earn more dollars.

It will mean, therefore, that we will have not only to get more visitors from Europe, but we will have to get more from America, more from all around, and between them they will have to spend more money than they are spending now. My belief is that they will spend less, so that is another argument against that policy which has been urged.

I want to suggest that there is an area where Government, through its various agencies dealing with tourism, in trying to induce the hotel sector to act appropriately, can perhaps try to influence hoteliers and others in the industry in a manner which could address the problem faced by the European visitor. It is entirely possible for, say, a hotel to structure its prices in accordance with the length of stay of visitors. We know that, traditionally, European visitors stay longer than American visitors. If you want to charge the European less than the American, you do not have to say to a person that you will charge him less because he is a European. You charge people who stay longer less, and these people would happen to be European.

If you had a price structure which was related to the length of stay, the longer you stay the better rate you get, you might still be able to attract the European. There is nothing wrong with that. Essentially, if you are guaranteed of having your rooms filled continuously for two weeks or a month, as opposed to having two days out of every week, two visitors coming every week to that room, you can see that it really is costing you less to have that one person continuously occupying the room than having the room vacant in between and having to change linen more frequently if the fellow is just coming in for a night, and that kind of thing.

There is an objective basis for charging people less because they are staying longer. It so happens that it fits in nicely with the problem which is confronting the country right now, that is the European visitor who will stay longer, and he is the one you have been talking about easing. You do not go in for an across-the-board policy of charging everyone less.

4.50 p.m.

Sometime ago, I made a plea for some more detail in the Memorandum to the Estimates. It would sometimes help us if we had a clear insight into the procedures used by Government in estimating revenue and, in this regard, I would like to direct attention to the Land Tax projection which is in (iv). In (iv), I notice under Taxes on Property, Land Tax, that the revised estimate for 1983/84 is \$20 million, a revision upward from the actual Estimates of \$19 million, and now they have here in 1984/85, \$26 million.

I think that, if I understand the way in which these Estimates are presented, they are presented against

the background of existing tax structure, meaning that you are not taking into account the higher Land Tax rate that we had last time around. That would be something for the Budget, when you have a revision of what is indicated, but this figure, presumably, indicates the original tax structure. If that is so, the \$26 million seems to be a bit high, and that could hardly be expressive of the increment in property value. It seems to have some element of revision of tax rates, so either it is almost a clue that we are getting into the Budget or this is an error and the figure should be somewhat smaller than is indicated there.

That is just one outstanding example, but there are other areas in which the basis of the projections do not seem to be entirely self-evident to me in terms of projected rate of growth. So once again I want to make a plea for an expanded Memorandum to guide us on matters like these.

On page 2 of the Memorandum, you have Sources of Funds, Projected Receipts to March 31, 1984, and the fourth item there would be Debentures. The point about that item is that it is different from the others in that the others show you institutional sources, like the IADB, OPEC, USAID, the World Bank. But debentures could be held by anybody, and it would be instructive for us to know if debentures are held by the National Insurance Scheme, by the Central Bank, by commercial banks, or whether they are overseas, so that in trying to interpret this document in terms of the Sources of Funds, we would be able better to know what are the precise institutional sources in relation to that.

Mr. President, this brings me to the end of the points which I want to raise in relation to these Estimates bar one. The last point which I want to make is in relation to Appendix C, which gives you details of Supplementary Estimates, where \$16.561 million is under Current Account and \$30.84 million under Capital Account in terms of Supplementary Estimates during the last financial year. That is page 24(C).

The point is that these figures are fairly substantial, and we know that, contrary to earlier practice, Government no longer introduces Resolutions relating to supplementary expenditure into this Chamber for consideration. We know that many indications have gone forth that the President and other members of this Chamber, I included, would like to see the original practice reverted to where we consider such Resolutions.

It makes nonsense of our really trying to look in detail at the Estimates when we know that, during the course of the year, you will get another \$50 million or \$60 million in adjustment to these Estimates which we would not get a chance to comment on. If we are not going to get that continuing chance to comment on the

Government's intentions as far as expenditure is concerned, it would seem to me the time should come when we should not really worry to comment on the Estimates either.

I would once again like to urge that members on the Government side should take it to their party to do whatever is necessary. I do not think that any change in the Constitution is necessary; it was there before without any change in the Constitution. The only thing that has happened has been the opinion of an Attorney General, which can be reversed by the opinion of another Attorney General so that we can bring those things back in here and get a chance to consider them properly. But whatever is the procedure, I think it is not right that the Senate should not have a chance to comment on the supplementary provisions, especially when it is the tradition of Barbados that such provisions are fairly substantial in relation to the overall Estimates in terms of incremental changes therein.

I thank you very much.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Last year I called the Estimates "hold-strain Estimates". I said at that time that I did not see anything that would improve productivity, and maybe even take the country forward. I notice today that the honourable Leader also referred to them as "hold-strain Estimates."

This year, I am going to classify the Estimates as optimistic, because I find that the Government is very optimistic when they are going to receive more money in Corporation Tax, for instance, after two very hard years of recession. I wonder where the money is going to come from. The only way I believe that can happen is if you increase the rate, and certainly at 48 per cent it must be one of the highest in the world. I do not see how we can get more money out of Corporation Tax.

When I took a look at Classification of Revenue — I was reading this last night — I will confess that it nearly upset me. When we really think about it, all of the \$596 million that come in come from taxes all the time. They would not even change the wording — taxes on incomes and profits, taxes on property, taxes on goods and services, taxes on international trade — and then when they are about to change, they call it "Other Taxes." Even under Non-Tax Revenue, they are collecting money on registration of vehicles and what have you. Nevertheless, the country has to exist, and I believe the only way it can exist is on taxes.

5.00 p.m.

I should like to look at capital expenditure, because I think that is the expenditure that will create jobs and will put growth into the economy. I have noticed that

this year, while I am all for how the money is going to be spent, unfortunately it is not going to make much growth in the economy in the year coming. A lot of money is going to be spent on highway improvement and building of new highways, and although they will open up many areas and create much economic activity, the fact is that they are going to take a year or two to build, and therefore you cannot really see it within the next twelve months. I think we need to see something in Barbados right away, and this brings me to tourism.

I notice that \$1 157 000 more is going to be spent on tourism. I believe that after the increase in salaries to the various officers and what have you, that would probably only leave \$400 000 to \$500 000 for advertising. If this country does not carry out a meaningful advertising campaign in the United States and Canada, we are not going to boost up our arrivals in order to stop the hotels from going bankrupt. We need to spend a minimum of \$25 million, and I would have liked to have seen in these Estimates that we are going to take \$25 million and really go on a campaign. We do not need any more breakfast seminars nor people running around the place. We need TV advertising; we need a campaign out there, and we need it quickly. The hotels in Barbados are in a sorry state. We have got to do something.

Next I go on to agriculture. I remember, Sir, the words of Senator Ward, that there are many experts in Barbados on agriculture. I am not saying that I am going to be an expert, but I am going to tread on agriculture a little bit. The late great revered Senator we had here, Senator Deane, used to say: "After sugar, what?" I believe that if the plantations continue planting sugar cane we are going to have another Transport Board on us — every year there are going to be more and more grants, because cane sugar is in trouble. Beet sugar has taken over, the price is much lower and we can only wait here and make money once ever six, seven or eight years when, by an act of God, the beet sugar crop is ruined.

Sir, we are going to have to look around. It is a very massive undertaking to diversify away from sugar in Barbados, but the estates themselves, unfortunately, are going to close down unless the grants become greater and greater each year. So I see that, under the Agricultural Development Corporation, they are going to give the commercial section of the ADC some \$2.75 million. Not all, Senator Arthur, the Chairman tells me — they are getting smart and closing down three propped-up estates, because there is no money in those and they would run the Government out of funds.

This is a serious thing. It is not anything to laugh about, because it is a serious thing to think that an owner

has a plantation, he works and stays with it, and then, all of a sudden, everything comes to a stage where he is terribly frustrated, he cannot make ends meet at all at any time.

That is why we must have a thrust in tourism. That is why we must go all out to get tourists to Barbados. We have to talk about 500 000 tourists coming here, but we have to get them. We have got to make certain that they arrive in this country, and we have got to get everybody motivated. There is no use continuing to be motivated by sugar, because it is going. I believe that the former Prime Minister may yet find his wish, that he did not want to see another cane blade, come true.

There are a lot of areas that you can speak on during the Estimates. One of the most topical subjects in the last couple of weeks has been the Town Planning Department and the scheduling of properties. I am one of those people who live in a house that carries a plaque, placed there by the Barbados National Trust many, many years ago. I was particularly surprised that my property did not appear on the list.

I do not know what is wrong, but the little information that I seem to have gathered on it is that Mr. Broodhagen came out here, under the aegis of the Canadian Commission, to do a survey and present it to Government for eventual scheduling. I believe that somewhere along the line this survey ended up in the Town and Country Planning Department — and all of a sudden these properties became the properties. No discussion appears to have taken place.

I have noticed many properties missing. I do believe that the Prime Minister did mention in the House that a further list is to come, but I think that this is one of the problems of this Government, that somehow it goes ahead and does some things hastily without really consulting. This has upset a lot of people, because if you go around and see a lot of the properties on the list, you would see that they were only really and truly wood ants nests and not worthy of any preservation.

The point I want to make about preservation of properties is that we cannot just talk about 25 per cent off shingles. Although that is welcomed, you only shingle about once every fifteen years, so a little saving in the shingles is not very much.

Ten per cent of the rateable value for deduction and repairs is good once your property is in good order, but if your property is not in good order, and you have to bring it into good order, that is no incentive either. A lot of the properties I have noticed are owned by very poor people, who, therefore, are in small income brackets, so 10 per cent of a rateable value given off their Income Tax does not really mean anything.

What I want to suggest, and I am sorry that Senator Barrow is not here, because he does not like me to talk about land taxes, is that the Government owes it to these people to waive the land taxes on these properties, because if you want to preserve them, I think they should get something. I believe that, in England, you do not pay any land taxes on properties that are scheduled, and I think it is only fair that we should have no land taxes on properties that are scheduled.

The next area I would like to turn to is one that would bring the attention of Senator Williams — Immigration. I noticed that Senator Greaves talked a little bit about work permits. I am not going to talk about work permits, I am going to talk about the illegal immigrants in Barbados. We have got too many of them.

I read that Castro let go some of his criminal Cubans in Miami. I can assure you that Burnham has let go a load of his criminals in Barbados. It is a sorry thing to see the number of Guyanese in this country, and they are nothing more than one-armed bandits, if you like — they are robbers. I think that the Government and the Immigration Department are going to have to look around and really take a look at these illegal immigrants in Barbados and try and get things going, because home fires must burn first. A lot of them are taking up jobs that rightfully belong to Barbadians.

5.10 p.m.

When I talk about Immigration, I think about the police. I notice that the Commissioner of Police made mention of the fact that there is a lot of white collar stealing in Barbados. My experience is that while there is stealing all around, white, blue and otherwise, in all honesty the white collar one is much bigger. This is a cancer in our society. You described England, I think, as a nation of shopkeepers. I would not like to say here that Barbados is a nation of thieves, but we have many of them now all around. It is an area that is very worrying, because it is getting very organized. We are going to have to support the police.

When we talk about supporting the police, I do not know if you have ever been a witness in a case, Sir, but everybody gets called for 9 a.m. Whether your case is going to be 3.00 o'clock, 2.00 o'clock or 1.00 o'clock, you have to be there at 9.00 o'clock. The conditions operating in the courts are not really too good. I noticed that one of the other members mentioned the fact that it looked like an auction house with a lot of old cars. I can assure you that the other day when I was attending a case, when I parked I saw an old toilet bowl. It was there for many weeks. I bring it to the attention of the Minister of Health, because he can have a little look; it is in the car park of the Central Police Station.

Aside: What?

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: It is there. I believe it was there up to about a month ago. The place is undoubtedly filthy. One does not want to be a witness there. You have to be with all sorts of people. You have shelved the building of the Supreme Court, on economic grounds I suppose, but we need something down there. I recall Senator Simmons defending me in a case; we were sweating, nothing was working, and we even had to stop the case and beg for an adjournment. We have to do something with the police stations.

When you go to District A Police Station, for instance, there is a lovely new building in the back, but there is some sort of old building in the front. The other day I went up there to pay a driving licence and they were building some little board shed. I asked the chap, "What is this?" He said that they were offices or some such thing.

There is no planning, no idea, nothing — everything is just pushed in. They have moved the Licensing Department. When the Licensing Department moved from the Central Police Station, all they did was to move up the furniture, the same old desks, the same old systems. There was nothing looking smart. When you look out at the back of the building there, where I think the Mounted Police used to do shows, you will see that they have left the remnants of the stand and what have you and weeds are growing all over the place. We have to do something about it.

We need the help of the police. We do not only want to give them Weymouth sports grounds or sports fields, we need to give them some good conditions. It is sad to look at our police stations. We need improvement.

Another area I want to talk about is unemployment. Fifteen per cent of the labour force in 1984 is a lot different from 15 per cent of the labour force in 1977. This is something which we have to study. When there was a small labour force in 1977, I believe some 80 000 or 90 000 people, 15 per cent only represented between 12 000 and 14 000. Now, however, there is a labour force of about 110 000 people, and you are talking about 18 000 or 20 000 people out of work. That is a lot of people. So we have to do something. You have to call on everybody and find ways of creating jobs in Barbados.

I heard Senator Greaves say that a job is very hard to get. I was pleased to hear that a union leader like him would be talking about this, because, regrettably, some of the policies of his organization have led to unemployment. But I am pleased that they are coming around to know that a job is very hard to get.

This brings me to land taxes. What has really happened here is that the people who have done development in this country, and created the jobs at a time when they needed creation, have been hurt hard. So when I, like Senator McClean looked and saw that that figure has gone

up by 30 per cent, from \$20 million to \$26 million, I became worried. Are we now going to suck another \$6 million in land tax, Sir?

Furthermore, this year I believe there is supposed to be a review of the property values. Anybody owning a property would know that the value is not the same as it was last year — it has gone down. I can only hope that the Government would now look at this, and when it sends out its improvements this year reduce the values of the properties. It is a democratic Government, it is a fair Government, therefore, it must do what is right.

Heywoods cost \$60 million. Could you really value it at \$60 million? Would you be able to sell it now for \$60 million? Sandy Beach cost \$11 million and I do not think that anybody would pay \$5 million for it now, because we are depressed. Senator Ward has a hotel which I believe cost many millions of dollars too. I doubt that at this time he could earn half of what it costs, because property values are depressed. I think that you have to relate this to the reviews.

I cannot close without saying something about the Barbados Development Bank. I do not know if we are going to get more money, I cannot really spell it out, but I see \$1.5 million in the Note, which says that it is for the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation and the Barbados Development Bank. I am hoping that we have gone from \$500 000 to \$1 million and you are giving them \$500 000. I do not mind giving the Barbados Mortgage Finance Corporation some money, but I hope it is not the other way around — I hope that we are not staying with \$500 000.

To give you a little idea of the unemployment situation, we had a job for an Analyst, and we received something like forty-four applications. I did not know that there were forty-four people in Barbados with degrees who wanted jobs. You had to have a BSc. in Economics in order to get this job, and we received forty-four applications. We had a long time shifting through them to see who should even be asked to come for an interview, because we really could not ask forty-four people to come in.

In closing, I want to say again that these Estimates are optimistic. I would love to see Corporation Tax produce \$400 million instead of \$215 million, because it would mean that we are making money — we do not pay it unless you make money. But with the economic situation at the moment, it is difficult even to make a profit; just to exist is very difficult.

I can only hope that there is a little rethinking. I am going to plea again that a supplementary comes quickly for more money for tourism, because it is the only area that can recreate the jobs immediately. The

roads are excellent. I am with them with the Airport Road; it is needed; but it cannot do anything for Barbados until it is completed, and it is going to take a year or two to be completed. We need the jobs before then.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Williams.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, after making some general comments about the Estimates, as a document, I shall take the opportunity to deal with the Ministry of Immigration. It seems as though the Ministry of Immigration remains at the centre of concern of a number of people. Even Senator Seale, to my amazement, is concerned about the number of Guyanese here. Therefore, with reference to the comments made about a Government policy on Immigration, I shall take the opportunity to deal with that as I see it.

5.20 p.m.

Senator Arthur said that the Estimates represent an attempt by Government to put Barbados back to work. I am always particularly concerned when I see the number of people being made unemployed, and I have always believed that Government has a responsibility to fill the breach whenever that happens. Government has been accused from time to time of embarking on too many capital projects. But I firmly believe that it is only through those capital projects that we can employ enough people to cushion the impact of the number who, from time to time, go on the unemployment line.

Within the last few weeks a number of people have been made redundant, and I am glad to see that, as a policy, the Estimates have built into them a large amount of money for capital projects. I think that this will go a long way in easing the unemployment problem in Barbados, which has been put at 15 per cent. For any small country 15 per cent is indeed high, and everything has to be done to reduce that figure. It cannot be done by Government alone; the economy has to be made buoyant once again, and the private sector must be able to fulfill its role in that regard.

Within the Estimates, we see that in the area of Export Promotion, which is particularly important to us, the money allocated has been increased by 100 percent. That indicates the importance Government places on the country's export promotion drive.

In the area of road improvement, we see that some \$24 million has been allocated for the financial year.

As far as agriculture is concerned, there is an allocation of some \$4.1 million to the Scotland District. I made reference on the last occasion to the fact that every effort should be made to make the agricultural sector as vibrant as possible. Again, Government has placed great emphasis in that area.

In the area of fishing, we see some \$2.1 million allocated to a fishing harbour. I firmly believe that there must be a phase-in and phase-out programme of projects in fishing and agriculture. Within the last few months, we have seen virtual completion of the Oistins' Fishing Terminal. I believe that we need to move from one project to another and, therefore, I am glad to see that we have made provision for a fishing harbour within the city and another one in the Northern area.

I was pleased, to say the least with the contributions of both Senator Arthur and Senator McClean. Senator Arthur made the point that the deficit looks a bit on the ambitious side, and Senator McClean in his contribution, suggested that that deficit ought to be financed both by external financing and domestic levies. I think his point is very much taken, but the suggestion inherent in that is that there is a need for foreign borrowing. I am always particularly conscious of the impact that that would have in terms of our ability to service our debt; therefore, while I take the point which Senator McClean is making, he would appreciate that that in itself has certain implications. We also need to make sure that we do not crowd out our private investment within the country by putting too much strain on the local banking sector.

Senator McClean also made reference to the allocation of money to schools in Barbados, and he did make a point that Government has put all schools under the same common policy. I am one who believes that there should be no difference in terms of the allocation of money to either the newer secondary schools when compared with the older secondary schools, so I am very much in concurrence with the point raised by Senator McClean. I think the only other point he made as far as education was concerned was the need for a clarification of the teaching persons as contained in the Estimates *vis-a-vis* those figures showed by the schools.

The economic analysis of the Estimates itself, I think that was done effectively by Senator Arthur. Senator Greaves, of course, gave us the same cold soup from 1983, just warmed up. I have already complimented Senator McClean for a very clear and precise analysis along with Senator Arthur. I will deal with one or two of the points raised by Senator Greaves as far as immigration is concerned, and at the same time also make reference to some of the accusations leveled by Senator Seale.

Senator Greaves is asking for a clearly defined policy on immigration from a work permit point of view. It is my responsibility, to grant work permits to come into this country from time to time, and, indeed, you would find that it is mainly in areas where there is a deficiency. The Industrial Development Corporation is out there trying to encourage investors to come to our shores, so we have to make sure that we are not inflexible in our approach, but complement the efforts of the IDC.

Barbadians are always particularly concerned that everytime a work permit is issued it comes over to them as one other job not being available for Barbadians. That is the concern of my Government, it is also my concern, and I have the responsibility for it. But at the same time, I have to make sure that I do nothing which would discourage people from coming to Barbados because they perceive us as having a too restrictive policy as far as issuing work permits is concerned.

5.30 p.m.

If someone wants to come to Barbados and set up an industry to create jobs for Barbadians, to create export earnings for this country, I tend to think it would be particularly indifferent for me or for any Minister to tell that person we are not going to issue him with a work permit. Of course we have to make sure that there are certain built-in safeguards to ensure that even if you issue a work permit in time period one, then, when you get into the next time period, there ought to be some qualified Barbadian who would fill that position.

When anyone asks for a work permit, we stipulate that they identify a person who is going to work along with the individual who is granted the work permit, and the individual who is assigned would be given every exposure so that he would be able to take over at the end of a year, two years or three years, depending on the duration of the work permit. Therefore, we make sure that it is consistent with our industrial thrust, and I will not tell anyone that I will prevent anybody from bringing industries to this country by not issuing him or her with a work permit.

Barbadians will always continue to be identified and to be trained, and therefore it is the policy of my Ministry to work in close collaboration with the Ministry of Labour. When we recognise that there is a shortage in a particular area, we feed the information to the Ministry of Labour, because, of course, we will then have to create training programmes for people in the short term. Obviously that information goes to the Ministry of Education as well, because they all work hand in hand. We even went to great length to come up with a negative list showing those categories of workers for which we would not be issuing work permits, and they are all very clearly spelt out.

Senator Greaves read from a document which showed that someone might have been classified as a labourer or carpenter, or a gardener or messenger. What he does not know is that under the heading of work permits are included people who are allowed to reside and work in Barbados. This Government, for a period of years, has given illegal immigrants to this country, who have been here for a long period, the opportunity to come forward and get their status regularised. Some people have done that. If someone comes to the Immigration Department and asks for a work permit, having been here for a long period of time, in order to regularise their status with a view to becoming immigrants, they are issued with permits to reside and work. They are all classified under the heading of work permits.

If someone was here in 1970 and is now being issued with a permit to reside and work, and he was a gardener then and is still one now, he cannot be classified as anything else but a gardener. It comes up in statistical information saying that a gardener was issued with a work permit, but what it would not tell you is that that person was here for the last 12 years.

I have said before that what we need to do is to break down the information we have. For instance, that same heading of permits should really reveal that X number of people were given permits to reside and work, and that other permits were for people who had work permits for a specified period in the country. After that, if there is a justifiable reason, they would be issued with another one or they would be asked to leave.

It is therefore particularly unfair to read out a list saying that carpenters, gardeners and messengers were given work permits. They are people who were here for very long periods, whose status is now being regularised. One must always understand that while you have regulations that must be followed, they have to be applied to people, and one must apply them with a certain degree of fairness and humaneness, whoever is responsible for the Ministry.

When I reach the stage when I could pick up someone who was here for twelve or fourteen years and just tell them callously that they have to leave, I tend to think that would be the time for me to vacate that particular Ministry. I will carry out my duties with fairness and humaneness while paying true deference and respect to the law.

Senator Seale referred to CARICOM people from Guyana as one-armed bandits and robbers, and he suggested that they were taking up jobs that Barbadians could indeed hold. We are concerned with all categories of illegal immigrants in Barbados, whether they are Guyanese or Indians. We are concerned about everybody.

As far as the Guyanese are concerned, let me say this. We have statistics showing the individuals who come into Barbados, and this comes to me on a weekly basis. Those Guyanese that come in on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday in each week are cross-referenced with their departure, so it is not a matter that they come in, are issued with permits to stay here for two or three weeks as visitors, and we do not keep a check on them.

Just as Senator Seale is particularly concerned, John Public out there is concerned, and I, as an extension, would have to be concerned, and I am concerned. Therefore, when the criticism is levelled, I would have to be in a position to be able to refute it.

We keep a monitor on each and every one of them. If Guyanese want to come to Barbados to enjoy our hospitality like anybody else, we are not going to tell them that they cannot come, but at least we are going to make sure that they do not overstay their time. If you look at the statistics for the last couple of months, even for the last year, you will find that there is a list of a number of people who were asked to leave Barbados. You will find that they are of all nationalities, and you will probably find some of them are Guyanese. When the Ministry finds the particular individuals, they are asked to leave.

5.40 p.m.

What Senator Seale and other people can do is assist us in any way they can. If they know people who are illegal immigrants, then they have a national responsibility to draw it to our attention. But I do not think it is fair just to see a particular race or a particular individual and say that the person is here illegally or not.

We have the situation monitored and under control. I, at least, intend to make sure that I follow very, very closely what goes on as far as illegal immigrants in Barbados are concerned. But you must appreciate that we are a tourist-oriented country and, therefore, inherent in that is that you cannot have those tight restrictive checks and balances that you would normally have if we were not.

People want to come to Barbados. If they come to the airport and they have a valid passport, enough money to cover them for a period of time, and, of course a valid return ticket, we will not tell them that they cannot visit. But, at the same time, we will make sure that they are monitored. I really cannot subscribe to Senator Seale's views that they are one-armed bandits.

While I am on Senator Seale, I will just make reference to his point that, in essence, we should scale down our sugar plantations. He recalled that the question was once asked in this Honourable Chamber, "After sugar, what?" I think he would remember that I, too, was one of the people who at the time was saying that Government had a responsibility to make sure that those sugar planta-

tions are kept going. Those sugar plantations still employ over 7 000 people, and I am yet to see any one particular industry, or any one particular initiative by Government or by anybody, that can absorb 7 000 people in the short term, while, at the same time, bringing in the foreign exchange that we get from the sugar.

I would be happy to see our economy diversified to the extent that other industries and other areas are able to absorb some of those people, so that if you had to phase out sugar over the long term, it would not mean a number of people going on the unemployment list. But to the extent that we cannot find any one industry to absorb those persons, Government has a responsibility to keep those sugar plantations going. It has to make sure that it does everything to assist the sugar industry, and no one can deny that in the last two or three years everything was done to assist the industry. As a matter of fact, we were told that the support scheme and the efforts made by Government should never have been entertained in the first place — this, of course came from the Opposition.

But we believe that sugar is a commodity that goes through a cycle. There were times when receipts from sugar were down and there were other times when we had such returns on sugar where even the Democratic Labour Party took some of it. I refer to the windfall money, some of which was put into the Labour College. I supported that then and I would support it now; I will be consistent. I believe that Senator Hall would believe that, having been a trade unionist for so many years, and having identified with the Barbados Workers' Union, I would still come and take a different position today. To surprise him, I will not do that.

We got receipts then, because of the cyclical variation of the sugar industry, that we did not expect, and I am hoping that at least we will see some of those days again. But you will only see that if you have an industry. If you shut it down, then, that opportunity will no longer be there, so while Senator Seale is of the opinion that it is a dying industry — this, of course is my interpretation — and that we should do nothing to assist it, I really cannot support him.

The last point made by Senator Seale was the fact that unemployment was 15 per cent. I have already said that I agree with him that 15 per cent is particularly high. I believe that, inherent in the Estimates, you will find that a number of people who are now presently unemployed will find themselves back on the employed list.

I, however, would want to agree with one thing that Senator Seale said, and that is regarding the need for increasing financing for tourism advertising. I have had the privilege and opportunity to travel to North America, Europe and a number of other countries, such as Jamaica and Bermuda, which are doing a lot in the area of tourism

promotion. I really believe that we need to change our strategy as far as tourism promotion is concerned.

I will take this opportunity on this occasion to compliment the Tourist Board of Barbados. On the last occasion that I spoke on tourism, I said some fairly harsh things about the Tourist Board, because I felt at the time that it was not serving its purpose. However, over the last year I have seen marked signs of improvement, and I would want to be one of the first persons to compliment the Tourist Board for its successful operation over the last year. If I find it necessary to criticize, I will do that; but, when there is a need to compliment, I will do that too.

However, one must point out that financing must be specified, and a well-developed programme must be formulated, rather than give money to the institution. This is why I said that I think the Tourist Board needs to change its strategy. Instead of a lot of the members of the Board and other people going to North America, and Europe and spending many, many hours at functions and parties, I believe that that same money can be spent on television advertising, which has a wider audience. I have not done an analysis on it, but you may probably find that the cost may be about the same — it may even work out cheaper. That is not saying that we dispense with the Tourist Board, but in terms of our thrust and our efforts, we might do well to look at television advertising.

5.50 p.m.

I will therefore ask the Tourist Board to come up with such a programme, and I would indicate that I would even support the borrowing of foreign exchange for an investment programme. Over the years tourism has been able to outstrip sugar in terms of foreign exchange, and I think the point is made time and time again that if we look at the receipts that we get from tourism *vis-a-vis* what we pay out in terms of tourism promotion, the ratio shows a marked imbalance, so if it means borrowing money on the open market to finance tourism promotion, I tend to think that it would be a step in the right direction. The signs are there that the industry is improving, and I think a filip at this stage would be for us to inject more money in the area of tourism promotion.

Senator Greaves said that Government is doing nothing for housing. This is something that bothers me a great deal. When you look at the number of housing developments that have been created over the last seven and a half years, that argument is never borne out.

I am particularly concerned about the attitude of our society to paying their rents. A lot of people do not recognise the serious impact that is created when people do not pay rents. If you will go to the National Housing Corporation, you will find that you have thousands of

applications for people wanting houses. You will tell prospective tenants that you expect them to pay up their rents, you expect them to pay on time and they will say "Yes, Sir", but when they get the houses, they believe they are theirs — given freely by Government.

Every person who refuses to pay his or her rent denies another Barbadian the right to have a house. I, too, am particularly distressed when I see Government being forced to take up people's belongings hoping that they will pay the arrears or make some concerted effort to do so, but you will find that there are people in Barbados, and I say this without any fear of contradiction, who have not paid for three years, and this was until they realised that Government meant business.

There was one person who called me and said: "I am particularly concerned and I want to know if you can help me." I said: "What are you talking about?" He said: "I believe they may want to come and take up my things." I asked "How much rent do you owe?" He said: "Sir, about five." I asked: "Five hundred?" And he said, "No, Sir, \$5,000." A simple calculation will tell you when last that person paid any rent at all.

There are people who would find it extremely difficult to pay, but the National Housing Corporation is not insensitive. If you go and explain your situation, and tell them that you normally are supposed to pay \$30 or \$40 but you can only pay \$20, and they see that every week or every month you pay that \$20, they know you are making an effort. But when you look and see that some people have not paid for three or four years and they owe \$3 000, \$4 000 or \$5 000, what other conclusion can the NHC come to but to try to take some course of action to retrieve the money?

This comes over as if Government is insensitive, but I tend to think that Barbadians would be very disappointed in any Government which sits down and allows anybody to pile up that amount of money and refuse to pay. Government has a responsibility to the entire country — not to any one person. A person gets out of society what he puts into it, and we all need to have a national responsibility.

I think there is a lot of indifference as far as paying money to the National Housing Corporation is concerned. I think people need to really take a close look at what is going on, because that same money can help finance further housing projects and create further jobs in Barbados. I would only hope that we will see a different trend and a different approach on the part of Barbadians.

I firmly believe that basically Barbadians are honest, and are people who would want not to flout the laws but, rather would comply with them. But at the same time you will always find those few exceptions, and people should not take it that even if you have to come down heavily on 20 or 30 people that that is representative either of the attitude of the Government, or that it represents a callous attitude on the part of people

who live in housing areas, because there are a lot of people in the housing areas who actually pay their rents on time. For a long time, I have wanted to comment on that. I know it is a particularly sensitive area, but there are times when things have to be said in the interest of the national good.

In the area of the funding of housing development, this cannot be truly reflected in the budget. The Finance Corporation should also seek to raise housing development bonds with the assistance of the Barbados Development Bank. I know that Senator Seale has done quite a bit at the BDB. I am particularly impressed with his record so far, and I hope that by saying that he does not now become complacent. I do not think he would, but nevertheless I would tend to think that it might serve him well to look at the area of assisting the BMFC in funding a housing development programme.

Senator Greaves touched on the issue pertaining to debt. He said that the debt servicing was distressing, and he made reference to a figure of 18 per cent. Of course, in his own inimical style, Senator Arthur dealt with it — he was particularly effective — and I have been saying for a long time that once debt servicing is kept in manageable proportions, then we have no need for concern.

At all times we must make sure that our capacity to gain foreign exchange and service that debt from our foreign exchange receipts is kept under strict control, but that 18 per cent certainly does not in itself present any problems. I think Senator Arthur made the point that if you are asked to pay \$180 out of \$1 000 then it places no great stress on you. If I was getting \$1 000 a month now and all I had to pay out of that to service my mortgage and my incidental debts was \$180, I would have no problem at all.
6.00 p.m.

If we look at the loans that Government has incurred in the recent past, you will see that the money was well spent. Those loans went to build an airport, a cement plant, and Heywoods. We are all impressed with our improved road system, and Government continues to address its mind to road improvement to make sure that the roads which we have in Barbados are consonant with our requirements for the 1980s, and not the kind of roads that you had in the 1930s and 1940s. Our loans went into schools, clinics, our port, a fishing harbour and agricultural diversification. The long and short of that is that our money was put to good use, and the point is that each one of those projects has the capacity to earn foreign exchange for us in the future.

What it took to develop Heywoods and to build the cement plant in 1983-84 would have taken a lot more if we had decided not to have built when we did, but to

wait until 1990 or 2000. In that respect, and against a background of a world economy that was in recession, the mere fact that Government was able to do all of these things and yet keep its balance of payments in check is complimentary of any Third World country in 1984.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Applause.

(Aside: Do you want me to wind up?)

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not know if members want me to call on the Minister to wind up the debate.

Senator Hall do you wish to speak? Senator Hall.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, the fact that nobody is keen to speak is either that they are tired, or they are very satisfied with the standard of debate, led by Senator Greaves. Or, perhaps it is the result of the master stroke of two years ago, when the Opposition was gagged, when they were not allowed to speak on some fifty or sixty Heads, when it was argued in this Chamber that the reason why we have to speak for one hour and, in another case, two hours is simply that Senators could not get the time to do the people's business, and that since the Opposition had taken up so much time, they wanted the independent Senators and the Government Senators to have a say.

This afternoon is a classic example of the result of that argument. In fact, it proves that the allegation is not true. When two days are earmarked for debate, all it means is that when Senators get the opportunity to speak on important issues like today, then we find that no one wants to say anything. I think that that is diabolical. If you want the Opposition to speak this evening so that you can have a field day tomorrow, I hope that I would not come in here tomorrow and see everybody become brilliant and talkative overnight. But we will wait and see.

I have no problem. I have so much honey that the bees envy me, so I could speak this evening for four hours. I hope it is not too late in the afternoon, and that perhaps you would give me that latitude which you did not give Senator Greaves. I understand, I suppose you would probably think he is impetuous at times, but I am going to level with you. I think that the Leader of the House would have no fear about me, and he would not be jumping up every minute trying to deny any allegations. They are very sensitive today, and with reason — a lot of blows were shared — and was not necessary after Senator Greaves spoke. But there were some very good contributions.

The Minister in introducing the Bill said that he was just laying the foundation for debate and would answer the issues emerging from the debate. He said very little else. He said there was a \$30 million surplus and that he was cognizant of the fact that it will disappear when it comes to paying the civil servants their increased wages this year.

Senator Seale thought that the Estimates were optimistic. He also felt that the Government was hasty. I concur. He seemed to have upset young Senator Williams. I nearly said "Minister"; I seemed to have drawn the impression from most of his comments that he was the Minister.

Senator Williams felt that when Senator Trotman left Immigration that all the troubles were over. He seems to have been surprised that people were still critical of that department. I suppose that an old stager like Senator Trotman would sit back and listen to the youngster and see how he handles things. The point is that he felt it would be a trouble-free day and that nobody would criticize him, and I know that when Senator Seale talked about the illegal immigrants from Guyana, I did not hear "bandits", but I know I heard, "robbers".

In this Chamber, as far as the Opposition is concerned, they are only worrying over there about what Senator Greaves said. It is analogous to a great bowler at one end, and, it seems just as great a bowler at the other end. He is not as hostile, but his length and direction are always right, so you are lured into a false sense of security and attack him, and then you find that that is the fellow who gets all the wickets.

I must repeat in this Chamber the points that I have made, and will continue to make, although not forever, as the goodly gentleman in the Lower House said, as a perennial Senator. When the National Youth Service was being discussed and I warned of a Guyanese — I did not call him a robber — what I said was that he never really adhered to the eighth commandment. I do not know if it is the same thing. But Senator Williams has to understand that we on this side, the Opposition, and indeed the independent Senators, at times must say things that upset him, especially if he controls a Ministry.

6.10 p.m.

Senator Williams said that some people in housing areas owe as much as \$5 000 to the NHC. I know that I am the only person in here who ever lived in a housing area, and I must feel very proud about that. It is true that people owe \$5 000, but what is also true is that the same type of letters that go to the man owing \$5 000, will go to a person owing \$50, who has been living in the house for twenty-five years without owing anything. When dealing with people, one should look at the length of time they stayed in the house and try to find out

what are their constraints that would suddenly lead them to owe a few dollars; not treat them in the same way as people who obviously started out with the idea that all is free.

Senator Arthur was erudite. I must say that his eloquence surprised me. It surprised me, in the sense that most aspiring politicians are very "flighty" up here. He did not say a word about St. Peter. When one considers that in a very short time he may well be in the political way of things down there, one will have to give him credence for the fact that he did not even try to get political gain by saying some of the things that could easily make people understand that he is campaigning for the up-coming by-election. I think it was a text book lecture.

Sir, let me tell you something. Senator McClean used to come in here with his economic jargon, and I could never understand what he was saying. That I must confess, but neither could the Government Ministers, because they never answered him. In 1981, after the Government had said "You never had it so good", he came here in October or November, 1981, and spoke gloomingly of the Government's economic woes and no one answered him. It is funny, it is a curious paradox that I suddenly understand Senator McClean now that Senator Arthur is in here. I do not know why, but I certainly do.

Senator Arthur said that the deficit of 6 per cent was ambitious. He did not give you all kisses. He said in no uncertain terms that he thought it was ambitious, although Senator McClean would sort of slightly confuse the issue by saying that he could not say that it was small or large until he had the information, obviously alluding to the fact that Senator Arthur had information that he was not privy to. I have always believed that the best economists in Barbados were our fore-parents. I know it is good to see your scholarly approaches, as Senator Griffith would say, but I think one has to understand that they had to agree to survive. That is the important thing, but we see the learned Economists today sort of disagreeing — perhaps to survive, too. I suppose they will have to disagree so that we will be able to take sides, at least.

I am not going to go into the realms of the unknown, and I refer to economics. As I have said, we have had two lectures from the greats in Barbados, and I think we must be thankful for them.

I would like to take a look at tourism, an area that Senator Seale said will need an injection of \$25 million to put it right. He wants them to stop those garden parties on the Eastern Seaboard, and he wants them to come to grips with the situation, since tourism is

important. But we have to look at two fundamental matters concerning tourism before we can get deeply into the issues.

The first point is that we should really think in terms of having a full-time Minister of Tourism. Now you will say that you have heard this before. That has been enunciated from the platforms of the Democratic Labour Party for a very long time, but, recently, the Barbados Hotel Association and indeed the Barbados Manufacturing Association, have reiterated these views. I think it is true to say that the Barbados Manufacturing Association did call for a Minister of Industry, but since the same Minister has held both posts, it turns out to be the same thing.

I really do not wish to belabour the point, simply because I think it is so easy for all of us to understand. We should not think that it is a personal matter or that anyone has to lose face over this matter. The plain facts are that tourism, the manufacturing industry, and the external trade are all facing serious problems. We feel that they are so important to our economic well-being that each area must get special attention, and at the highest level.

The second point is that we should resist the temptation of fooling ourselves that all is well, that we have turned the corner, and that the worse is over. We tend to think that there is a silver lining and that little is wrong with tourism. Why do we think this way? I think we have to ask ourselves this question.

This attitude was promoted, first of all, by the Minister. It was promoted before the winter season, when all the predictions were that they would have a great winter season. It was promoted secondly by the Parliamentary Secretary and, inevitably, the Director of Tourism, the Chairman of the Tourist Board and, worst of all, it was given credence by optimistic forecasts by the Central Bank, endorsed by no less a person than the Central Bank's Governor. We have to worry about these things, because in September 1983, the Official Economic Report printed a rosy picture of the tourist sector. It said that it was the only sector that was doing well, and the bank, so far as I can ascertain has not denied the accusations that these reports were compiled with incomplete data.

All this has persuaded people, and people in high places, at least two Senators in this Senate, to think that all is well with tourism. I have no doubt it has persuaded the Prime Minister to think so, because suddenly, the Prime Minister has backed away from his famous letter to the Director of Tourism. There is a calypso in Trinidad that says, "Don't back back on me". I feel that the Prime Minister should not be backing back on the people of this country, because he knows that at least the Opposition concurred in the view that he took, the devastation and so forth that he implied. What is more, many

knowledgeable people in the hotel industry felt the same way, and that is what worries people.

6.20 p.m.

So we have to ask ourselves why, after all these predictions, not all gloom as some members said the Opposition is always talking about, have we had the worst year in the history of this country in tourism? The Barbados Hotel Association implies that many hotels will go bankrupt. The management of Heywoods said, on March 14, that the season was over. For some hotels, it never really started. That is the gloomy situation that we have here, and the Barbados Hotel Association said that the hotels were full for no more than a couple of weeks in February.

What I have to ask is, can the hotels exist on that? Can the taxi drivers exist on that? Can the workers in the industry get along on a part-time basis, that is if they are working at all? You wonder why it is that the beach vendors harass the tourists! Quite frankly, I feel that the answer is simple. There are not enough tourists to sell to, so the few that are there are being harassed. People try very hard to sell them the few things that they have.

I would like, therefore, to appeal to the Government, in the interest of all concerned, to give consideration to the inclusion of, first, the Barbados Workers' Union; secondly, the Chamber of Commerce; and thirdly, the Barbados Hotel Association when they are thinking in terms of having members on their boards. I think that we have to do this in the interest of all Barbadians, because we cannot afford to omit that expertise which, I am sure, will be forthcoming if these people are allowed to go on the board.

That decision was made some eight months ago, and it was said that other people would be brought on to the board, which would seem to cushion the blow. I must confess that I have not seen it materialise so far, but perhaps this is indicative of the fact that the Prime Minister is thinking of going back to the system that served this country so well for about 25 years. That is what I would like the Minister or the Prime Minister to do.

I personally will join with the Minister in looking forward to the report of the accountants who were commissioned to investigate the cost of tourism in this country, because we would like to know how competitive we are. I am sure that Senator Seale earlier today alluded to the fact that we need to know this. We also want to know whether we are really one of these high priced destinations. We have to know how expensive we are, because Barbados is not the only place in the world where the sun shines brightly. There are other vacation destinations in the south of Spain, the Bahamas, Bermuda and other places throughout the world. If we

go ahead with the erroneous view that we can get away with anything, and no matter what we do people will come here because the sun shines, I think that will be a very sad mistake to make.

I feel that when that report is forthcoming, we could let the public know their findings. Let us know what they are saying about us, and if there is remedial action to be taken, let us take it as soon as possible.

I am no economist. I suppose Senator McClean and Senator Arthur can tell you, but I will hazard a guess that with all the taxes Senator Seale alluded to, if that is the situation, we may well find that Barbados is not merely a high priced destination for tourists, but we may well find that Barbados is expensive for Barbadians too. I suppose he was talking about Stamp Duty, Consumption Tax, Import Duties, various levies, increased licences, utility charges, and 8 per cent on everything. It frightens me, Sir.

We have to look at this situation very seriously. If the Minister really knows that two flying fish and trimmings cost \$18, I feel he should confront the culprits and ask them for an explanation. If that is true, what may well be true too is what the taxi drivers and other people say, that the hotel charges are running the tourists. If perchance it is not true, then I would say that it is a very unfair charge to make on the hotel industry. But if it is true, I feel that the Minister should seek information on these matters and get those offenders to put things right.

I also feel that it must be clearly understood that when we criticise in this Chamber, or anywhere for that matter, for instance, if the Ministry of Tourism is being criticised, it is with a positive end in mind. The simple fact is that we all need tourism. We must have tourism, it is for the betterment of all Barbadians, and I feel that we have to do our best to make sure that tourism is pulled up again, because it is as low as it could get.

It is true that when you have the Minister having to go and ask for American aid with the imposition of an offshore medical school, on the pretext that it is going to be one of the saviours of tourism, then it is a serious thing. We have to stop the hotels from reducing themselves to cannibalism, from walking the streets, the beaches, and the highways soliciting one another's guests. That is exactly what is happening in this country. Anyone close to tourism will know exactly what I am saying today is true.

6.30 p.m.

We have to get away from this situation. If we have to put \$25 million — that is a lot of money, even from Senator Seale that is a lot of money; even from

you, Sir, that is a lot of money — in an advertising campaign, then let us do it. It is inevitable.

We have to advertise instead of just going on these trips, in my view, meaninglessly. It is a first come, first serve basis — you put down your name and you go to Boston next week. That is the way it is. I feel that a meaningful programme, an advertising programme, must be ensued whereby you will find that not only little countries like St. Lucia, but also Barbados is seen. When you go to New York and you look at the television, you hear about St. Lucia and all those places and nothing about Barbados. It is ludicrous, it is suicidal and I do believe that we have to look in another direction when you are talking about tourism.

Sir, I know that I am in trouble with the time.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No. You have at least half an hour.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Only half an hour? I will have to skip this, then. Seeing it is late in the evening — I do not give you any trouble. You know that — I think that you could give me a little latitude. I really feel so, because, Sir, you do not get any trouble from this sector, no trouble whatsoever.

I would not need half an hour to deal with the Carlisle when you are talking about tourism in this country, but it is a very serious thing. Although we say that we need tourism, and we need the tourists, it is my view that we need Barbadians, too; even more, we need our own people.

I am distressed and I feel somewhat diminished when I read about the Carlisle in the newspapers. I know, having travelled the world over, having been in places like London, where the odds are that because of my pigmentation, or lack of it — because of any thing — I may well find myself up the wrong street, but when it comes to this country, where my navel string is buried, I have to think very seriously of what happens in this country.

I do not believe that anyone, because of his colour, class or creed, should not be admitted into a club just on those stark facts, because when that happens, it is a heinous block on our morale and our social landscape. I am very serious about this, because I know of the indignities my forefathers suffered under the aegis of institutions like that place about 100 metres up the road from the Carlisle, the Yacht Club. That was in the colonial days, and those days must never be seen to be re-emerging in the form of a club called Carlisle.

Last year a little known calypsonian sang a song called "Ban the Carlisle". Had it been Gabby, Serenader,

or any of the greats, Gryner or the one that sang "Barbados is a Paradise", it would have been a hit and people would have listened. But he was, in calypso terms a nonentity, so who could give him the right? How could he have such audacity to suggest that a place in Barbados should be banned? Nobody listened, but now you see that an Assistant Manager at a prestigious hotel is turned out and the whole world listens.

I do not listen to what people have to say, I go and find out for myself, and I was at that meeting at the Barbados Hotel Association. I was there when the President, Mr. Alfred Taylor, was in a most vociferous mood. He was livid. He could not understand this thing happening in Barbados, although he admitted having heard about it before. He perhaps did not pay enough attention when the Manager at Welcome Inn, Mr. Griffith, was kicked. Nobody said anything, but now it was a member of the Association!

Do you know, Sir, that they voted on a Resolution which was passed nearly unanimously? There were two objectors, the family of Mr. Walcott, of course, and six abstentions, but the rest of the audience voted against the Carlisle, that they were not going to advertise it. They were not interested in it; I dare say they were interested Barbadians. They were not a bunch of coloured people either; the majority, about 95 per cent of them were white, but they were concerned, as I am, and as you should be, about this serious situation.

I believe that we have to do something about it, because no self-respecting Barbadian, as I said, of any class, colour or creed, should tolerate this putrid type. I make no apologies for saying that. I am going to move away from the Carlisle, because, from the tone of my speech, I am quite sure that everybody understands how I feel about it.

We are telling our cricketers not to go to South Africa — the Minister of the Government would not allow them to play at the stadium, and the previous Minister made the situation abundantly clear what is the situation. I am diametrically opposed to them going to South Africa, everybody knows that, but then, what is the point of Desmond Haynes coming here and making 100 in a Test Match, and we are all very glad, and then he goes to Carlisle and he is kicked out, or he is kicked out as he was kicked out of the hotel in St. James. I cannot take all of that.

I do not know what the laws are — I think Senator Simmons can tell me — but certainly, there must be laws in this country that do not permit us to do that at this time. If that is not the case, come in here and get some legislation and make sure that people in Barbados should not be treated like that.

It is not that I do not know the place, I also know the gentleman. He had the little club up the road called the Garage — six old cars and a little marlfill! I am not speaking out of ignorance.

You see all the letters written by families and people who were mistreated at the Carlisle. We must not, as Barbadians, be seen to be encouraging that sort of thing. I do feel that as long as we put that one right, Mr. Walcott, I am sure, would know that the people of this fair island would not tolerate this sort of thing.

Sir, it does not look like I will get much further up the road. Since we were on sport, I want to talk on sport for a few minutes, because the Chairman of the Sports Council is here, and I know he can reply tomorrow morning.

It would be rather remiss of me if I did not state most categorically that the National Sports Council is a well-run organization. I do feel that it has a good chairman now, and it had one before him, perhaps not as good, but good all the same. But when one looks at the Estimates and see a \$1.6 million vote, with another \$800 000 for capital expenditure, and realize that salaries will be about \$1 million out of that, I would say that the Government is cutting the sportsmen in this country short, and I will tell you why.

I am privy to the Five Year Plan. I think Senator Jemmott knows it too. The Five Year Plan is a good document, but that plan will go nowhere with \$1.6 million. You cannot expect us to get any better in the field of sport if you do not have any more coaches. You cannot expect us to get any better if you do not have equipment, and I think that everybody knows that a place like the National Stadium still has no equipment. We have no money to buy the equipment, and if you have not got any equipment, you will find that the coaches will not be able to coach effectively, and people will say that they are not doing their job. That is the thing that really bothers me.

6.40 p.m.

I feel that we need some trained teachers in this country to help coaches along with their job. If we have them we would be a lot better, because some kids cannot even catch a ball if you throw it up; they would not even hit it with a racket if you threw it up; they would miss it completely. Some of them cannot walk properly far less run. This is not to say they are invalids; it is that their posture is bad. You will find that coaches must study sports medicine, they must get very involved, and unless you are going to have money, you are not going to get that done.

I am very concerned that the incentive that was promised to the West Indies Board of Control players, as

a deterrent from going to South Africa, has not been paid, when all the Governments in the Caribbean sat down and agreed that they would give them some money. I am very upset, I am diminished, I do not know what to say. Words fail me for the first time in my life. Still, countries like Jamaica and Guyana, not of any particularly great economic stability, have yet been able to put up the money that they promised to the West Indies Board of Control.

Let me read the cable that I received as Manager of the West Indies team in India:

"Congratulations to the West Indies Cricket team for making what seemed an impossible task possible. Exciting always to the end. Please convey my profound gratitude to your team for making the participation of the West Indies in International Cricket a factor which brings out the best in competitiveness and enhances the game of cricket. Deserves full support. Today I handed over the amount of \$US45 000 to the West Indies Cricket Board of Control which is the amount required by the Government of Jamaica as the first year instalment to a fund for the improvement of payment to cricketers to remove the uncertainty in this area and to make this aspect of their careers more certain. The Rt. Hon. Edward Seaga, Prime Minister of Jamaica, Office of the Prime Minister, Kingston."

That could be a document of the House.

I believe from the bottom of my heart that we can find some way of honouring the agreement and paying the West Indies Board of Control the money, because the West Indian cricketers to this day feel that the West Indies Board of Control conned them. I know, Sir, because I was the manager. The Government of Barbados did not pay. Perhaps it is in the other vote. Let the Minister get up and tell me. I am sure that if they hand over this money to the National Sports Council, it would be okay. They have the expertise in the National Sports Council, and they could make the recommendations necessary to have this thing come to fruition.

I feel that the West Indian cricketers would feel a lot better. One considers the case of Larry Gomes. He flew to Johannesburg, he had negotiations with them. Sir, it is a hard thing to refuse \$1 million. He came back and the Prime Minister of Trinidad grabbed him on the plane and offered him a job. Do you know that the people of Trinidad built him a house and gave him everything, furniture every two years. He is no Richards, but he got that — although people are not going to do that to everyone.

Now he was just dropped from the West Indies team. Let us say that he had refused the money from the South African Rams and came back here and got

dropped. He would have said that he was an idiot to leave all that money out there and then come back to be dropped. But he was dropped with justification, loss of form, which could happen to anybody.

I believe the non-payment by Barbados was an oversight. If I did not feel so, when the Prime Minister came to India, when I wrote a letter to Mr. Ramphal, the Secretary General in Delhi, and asked the Commonwealth Prime Ministers to come and see the cricket in Bombay, I would have asked him about it. The Prime Minister of Barbados came — we were very decent to him, and he was decent on that occasion, too — and had I known, I would have asked him about it and perhaps it would have been over. But I felt there was no problem.

How could that money be a problem in Barbados? We had six Barbadians in the last Test Match. I am not saying that is the criterion, but I am saying it is a commitment. If Mr. Cato did not want to give it, and he said so, hard luck to him. Let him wallow in his cricketing ignorance. If he could not afford it, that is another matter, but if he is saying he is just not giving, it is all right with me.

The West Indies Board of Control said that to have a tour down here costs \$4.2 million, and I think the President said that we will never, without sponsorship, see another tour down here. God forbid. I hope that is not true.

I think my colleague alluded to this. He was talking — and I spoke to the Leader of the House about it — about commentaries and things like that. I merely mentioned it to him and he told me it was a policy. You can probably elucidate a little further. Perhaps you could illuminate the dark corners of his mind and let him know. He is not here, but you can tell him what you told me.

If it is a policy, that is fair enough. I was on the Governing Body of Combermere School last year and, just like that, I went straight through the eddoes. If it is a policy, it is fair enough with me. I was on the Board of the National Sports Council under four successive Ministers, Ministers Craig, Johnson, Don Blackman, and DeLisle Bradshaw, and I got dropped. If the election is soon and you drop me, fair enough, I understand that, that is no problem with me.

What I cannot understand how you can drop other people who have given yeoman service, and some of the best people. The Board cannot deny that. The chairman is there. Let him get up and deny that. Some of the people dropped are some of the best people he has had, and will ever have. Let the father of them all over there, Mr. Jemmott, tell you that what I am saying is the truth, and nothing but the truth. If the Prime Minister wants a lady to come on the board, there are many boards on which

she can go. There is the Child Care Board, and there are all sorts of boards. I do not know the lady; perhaps she is good, but you do not just drop a lady for a lady just so. I cannot understand that. I can understand Hall being dropped, but nonetheless, I know that there will be none sitting over there, or in your higher councils, that can ever challenge my expertise or my contribution to any of the boards that I sat on. I think the Chairman of the Board will obviously reply to that.

Sir, I tell you that this hour is inadequate.

Today is a great day. I have lived to see the day when I have spoken for 35 minutes and Senator Trotman has never said a word to me, so something is happening. After Health, he will have a lot to say again. Health was not discussed in five days' debate in the Lower House during the Estimates. It was not called. I wonder why? People are concerned about the health services. We used to be so proud of them. Under the Democratic Labour Party, the whole world was proud of the health services. I see smiles, but it is true. Now, we are steeped in confrontation and uncertainty, lack of confidence and low morale.

I heard on television the other night that \$16 million was collected from the Transport Levy since October, 1981, and if you say one per cent for the employer and 25 per cent for the employee, Health Levy is one per cent for the employee and the employer, then it stands to reason that in that same period you would have collected \$22 million. It is a lot of money, and people want to know what is happening with the health services. They want to know what is really going on. When they look at the hospital, they get very upset. I am sure you must be upset, Mr. President. I saw your photograph up to yesterday when the hospital was in its planning stages. You saw how well it progressed. You must have given yeoman service to the development of that hospital, and therefore if you see things going wrong, you must be very upset.

6.50 p.m.

If you look at the Casualty, that is another experiment — eight years in Government and then another experiment just so. It reminds me that when I was a little fellow, in an Old Moore's Almanac there was a little boy who was watching the boy that was watching the boy who was watching the car — we are getting experiment, upon experiment, upon experiment all the time. I do not believe that this sort of thing is good, with no results.

If, for once, you could show me something meaningful coming out of the experiments, it would be all right with me. I think that what we have to do is to manage the services. Senator Trotman, you need to manage the place, not cope. Coping is falling into a well

and getting out eight hours after; managing is seeing the well and evading it. You have to manage the place well; when you do that, you will probably find that everything is all right.

We have to find out if the freezer at the hospital is working. I do not like to talk about these things, because people get frightened. I want to find out about the Koreans and the Pakistanis that were supposed to come. I want to know if you went to Malta to recruit doctors.

No wonder the doctors are calling for an arbitrator. I do not think that with all the confrontations going on here, you need an arbitrator — you need Jesus. You need the Saviour, because you are talking about health.

Senator Seale alluded to hasty decisions with no consultation. If you do not consult but impose your will on the people, then it will fall to nothing. I think we need the doctors, and when I heard a comment from the Prime Minister that doctors or no doctors we are going ahead with the Health Service, I had to wonder who you are going to go ahead with. I do not think we should pick a noise with the doctors. If we set them against the population, then we will be in real trouble.

Sir, the Aedes Aegypti. The vote for the Aedes Aegypti had been reduced, I think that at some time prior to 1982 — this is my information — there were something like eight cases of dengue fever. Now, there is a smaller vote when there is a 100 per cent increase in dengue fever. I just wonder what are the plans of the Minister in that direction. Perhaps we can hear a few things from him on that situation.

I turn now to the Psychiatric Hospital. Only the other day we were thinking in terms of building more jail — I was not in here, it was not even debated at all. When you have economic stress, when you find that people cannot pay their mortgages, when you find that people are made redundant and do not get severance pay, you may think that you have to build more jail, because if you are doing nothing, the devil finds work for idle hands, and you would end up in jail. But you had better build more psychiatric hospitals, because when you have more big mortgages to pay and things like that, you go stark, raving mad. They call it a nervous breakdown, but I think it is mad. In Barbados there is no nervous breakdown. If you are going funny, you are mad, you and your generation for another hundred years.

I am worried about the policy of successive Ministers regarding the Psychiatric Hospital. Mr. L. B. Brathwaite said that he would drive a tractor and push it down himself. The Hon. Don. Blackman went at night, the epitome of frustration, and went there and took pictures of naked people at night. This is a tourist country; it did not look good at all.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sleeping on the floor!)

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sleeping on the floor! There were no beds. What is the problem? What is the policy?

I know Senator Trotman tends to have a different view. I have studied you, but not in the Ministry of Health. I do not think we could study you there. Somehow it comes through to me that you seem to think that.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Address the Chair.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I must apologise. I would never disrespect you. You know that, Sir. I am going to skip him and what his policy seems to be.

There seems to be a problem with nurses going on visitations. That is fine but it has problems from the point of view of the protection of people. We also have to think in terms of the people being short-staffed. There is no back-up staff. What about the — I want a pretty word for it, but all it means is that toilet paper and things like that are lacking — toilet facilities? Those are the kinds of problems, and the Minister must address himself to this situation; and he must know what the situation is.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have seven minutes more.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I know I did not get any interruptions, Sir, but I still feel that.....

Laughter.

(*Aside: Appeal for light.*)

SENATOR W. W. HALL: That is not true at all. I never lost any light.

I have to think in terms of the public spiritedness of people. Yesterday was the day when everybody was supposed to have gone up to the Garrison and cleaned it up. I did not see the Minister. I went and I took my family. Perhaps, you should have gone around and have a look. Maybe you did. If you did, I apologise. I feel that you should have been in evidence. I should have seen the Minister having a bird's eye view; he should see what the Ministry is doing. If you do that, you would see that people would know that our leaders would be worthy of emulation.

How many of us in here went to the Garrison yesterday? Probably you were serving God or something like that. But the point is that I feel that you could

have gone. I did not even see Senator Seale. Concorde Hero was basking in the glory of Hopefield Farm and Senator Seale was not there. I was a little disappointed about that.

Laughter.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Anyway, Sir, I know I have only six minutes left and a lot of ground to cover.

I think I had better take a little look at Trade. In Saturday's *Advocate* I saw that the Government had refused to lower the Consumption Tax on soft drinks in containers, on the grounds that disposable plastic containers were an environmental hazard. I notice also with great interest that today the Manager of the Sanitation Service Authority said that the bottles that he found, and that I found yesterday on the Garrison, were a serious problem. Of course, there is an ecological problem involved here. I just wonder, Sir, what is the situation.

You can pass this on to the Minister of Trade. I am saying most categorically, and this cannot be denied, that the factory in Jamaica is dumping beer on this market, contrary to the spirit of the CARICOM Agreement. I remember that Senator Arthur said that we cannot go there, that they are not going to have imports. And, if you are selling below your cost, you are dumping. I can give you chapter and verse on it, but I believe that we would probably have to go and see the Minister, and if I give you all the figures and he reads them in the newspapers, I think that he would be prejudiced. I think he would be quite entitled to be so.

I saw a letter in the newspaper, this is what happens — and the writer said that if you can have a foreign drink sold at lower prices than the local drink, then there must be two things; either you are taking the consumers of this country for a ride, or you are getting unfair competition.

I have something in my brief case — I do a lot of shopping too. I could not make this a document of the Senate, but I could make it an object.

Laughter.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I can tell you that this Red Stripe beer cost \$1.26 in November and it now costs 99 cents. That is dumping. I know that the honourable Minister will definitely.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I only have two minutes.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Does the Senator perhaps have an interest to defend?

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Oh yes. Of course, I have an interest. I have an interest in beer, but not in drinking it or from the point of view of my having any brief for BANKS. I have an interest for the people who are working out there, who feel that they will be made redundant if this thing continues.

7.00 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You can probably remove that object.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: You do not want to have a look at it, Sir? I want to make it an object of the Senate, but you object. I do not understand it. About eighteen months ago we came in here, and there was a vote in the Capital Expenditure for the National Youth Service. Since then, I have not heard a lot about it. The late Governor-General's Throne Speech stated that plans were seemingly going well, and the idea was that there should be 240 voluntary hours a year from youngsters. Nothing has happened, not a rock has been turned, and it seems to have been shelved. I submit that it was shelved because of the criticism of the military presence in that Youth Service. I told Senator Williams at that time — he was not a big shot in the party then, he was only the President of the Young Socialists — that he was fraternizing with a man whom it was not good to be with, a man from Guyana.

But not a rock has been turned, and I would like to know from the Minister exactly what is the situation. I know there is a vote in the Capital Expenditure for the Youth Service, but let us know, perhaps chapter if not verse, what is happening. Let us get an overview of what your plans are, because I know that, whatever else the Brigadier may say, you do not get people to give voluntarily service so. If they belong to a group, like yesterday at the Garrison, you might find that they will come along, but big people are not voluntarily going to give of their free time. They must be motivated, and unless you do that, I think you are going up the wrong tree.

I would like to talk about that Transport Board, Sir. I see Senator Seale changed its name from the Transport Board to "Grants". He said that it is just grants that you just do not want tourism to be just like Transport Board, just getting grants. I would like to talk about the Transport Board.

I would have liked to talk about housing, I would have liked to talk on many other things, but when you curtailed us and gagged us — not you personally, Sir — when the Opposition was cut from two hours to one hour when there are burning issues out there to be discussed, I think that one cannot of necessity go into them with the thoroughness that one would like, although Senator

Simmons said that I moved from place to place, this is true. But we have seen the old trick of forcing the Opposition to talk later in the afternoon so that you can come renewed in vigour tomorrow morning.

But it will be very interesting for the first time to hear the Minister's answer to Senator McClean, although I do not know if it is an economic point to say that Harrison College will come after Ellerslie. I do not know if the Ministers still do not understand what Senator McClean says. Now that they have Senator Arthur in their ranks. I do not think they will worry with Senator McClean. They can now afford to answer him and give him some lashes. Do not just give all the lashes to Senator Greaves.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Hall, your time is up.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I would just like to thank you. I cannot just stop in the middle of a sentence, Sir. People will think that I am illiterate. Sir, I would just like to thank you for your latitude, and your well meant feelings can only be exceeded by my gratitude, and my capacity to absorb them.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just before I suspend the sitting, the Minister would like to make an announcement.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, earlier I referred to a Resolution which was dealt with in the Other Place, and which, at the time when we started, had not come here, and it is this Resolution I wish at this point to ask leave to give notice of.

It is a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of \$3.6 million from the Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Ltd., for financing the purchase of 10% of the shares in the Barbados External Telecommunications Ltd.

Sir, it is my intention tomorrow at some point to invite the Honourable Senate to give approval of this Resolution.

SUSPENSION

Mr. PRESIDENT: At this stage I propose to suspend the sitting until 11.00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The sitting is suspended until 11.00 a.m. tomorrow morning.
7.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

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

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. President, apart from some general remarks which I will make on the Estimates, I intend merely in this contribution to reply to Senators Greaves and Hall in respect of matters raised by them which merit reply, and in particular with respect to those matters affecting the National Sports Council.

Mr. President, were it not for the fact that the whole international community has been in a state of recession for the last three years, it would appear that the policy of Government has been one of stop-go, and I am careful to say "were it not for the fact that there was international economic recession". So even though it appears to be stop-go, this has been caused by the conditions of the world's international and monetary economic community and, in the circumstances, I think that all Barbadians owe it to the Government to commend the Government for the manner in which it has been able, notwithstanding the vagaries of the international situation, to manage the economy and the affairs of Barbados well.

Were it not for the fact that the Government somehow contrives to irritate us by minutiae from time to time, the performance of the last three years, given the state of international affairs, would have been exemplary. But the short-comings of Government have had to do more with their image, public relations, and style of management rather than the essentials of their management. I can only hope that within the next two years the irritants will be once and for all behind us, and that we will have a Government and a party free from the trivia which are blown into sensational matters and undermine the self-confidence of the membership of the party and, to some extent, the country as a whole.

That the Government has been able to achieve a Current Account surplus of \$31 million is highly commendable, and I think that deserves the compliments of all Barbadians. It will be dissipated in the payment of salaries — almost all of it. It is one of the problems of Government that civil servants have to be paid and have to be paid proper salaries so that they can keep pace with inflationary trends and, by way of incentive, give a proper day's work for a proper salary. But were it not for proper management, there would have not been a Current Account surplus. So I think that next year, having got the wage claims of the Public Service out of the way, if present trends continue and there is an enhancement in tourist earnings, then the country can look forward to prosperity similar to that which we witnessed in 1979–80, in particular 1980.

I think I have a reputation for speaking my mind, but on this occasion, those who would expect criticism may be disappointed. I can only congratulate the Minister of Finance for the manner in which he has handled the

country's economic affairs. We are a model to many developing countries, a model to many countries within the region, and, of course, because of the way in which we have been able to handle our affairs, we have been the object of some jealousy. But even though some of the region may be jealous of our performance, they are still able to use Barbados from time to time as an exemplar of proper administration. The National Insurance Scheme has been a model for some of the less developed countries. In virtually every facet of Government there is something we have to offer, which is of use and which is made use of by another neighboring territory.

Barbadians, of course, notwithstanding the economic performance of the country, notwithstanding the enhancement of Government finances, which are themselves different from the economy at large, still complain. But I suppose the Barbadian will complain because he is never satisfied with less than excellence and he is always striving for something better. Luckily, the advantage that we have in Barbados, as compared with many other developing countries, is that we have had successive Governments which have shown themselves willing to listen to the moods or the rumblings of the great mass of people and to respond to their demands or requests.

That I think, Sir, is the form of Government which we operate, the Westminster form, and it is something that speaks well for the democratic processes which we have in Barbados. We have politicians and have always had politicians who are willing to listen to the community, and who respond positively, when the economic circumstances allow it, to the requests and demands of the electorate. To operate in ignorance or in disregard of the voice of the people to be autocratic, is to court disaster, is to lead to anarchy eventually.

There are few countries without any natural resources to speak of that can boast of an Estimated Expenditure of \$565 million, and the notes in the Estimates tell a story about the growth and development of Barbados, and its transformation from virtually a village to a nation. If you look at Capital Expenditure for the 10-year period of 1973–74 to 1982–83, Capital Expenditure has grown from \$30.9 million in 1973–74 to \$112.6 million last year. That trend of gradual expansion is found in every sector; every Department of Government has expanded and has been updated over the years.

11.10 a.m.

I do not think that, looking at Barbados objectively, there is much room for complaint, but of course the function of the Opposition in an Estimates debate is to criticise, oppose, and, if necessary, destroy, and embarrass. So the speeches yesterday from the Opposition, in particular the speech of Senator Greaves, was one

in his usual style of negativism, wild, bland accusations, without any reference to factual support. Not a substratum of fact subsumed anything he said yesterday. Even though I am becoming a little tired of Senator Greaves and his style, I still think that, for the Record and for the public of Barbados, even though he was wild, he has to be answered.

I have not read today's papers yet, so I do not know if this aspect of it reached the Press, but one of the things he said yesterday was that he understood that the National Sports Council had refused to pay a lady her gratuity. There is only one such possible case, that is in relation to the late Vernon Phillips, a former employee of the Sports Council, and the facts are these.

Mr. Phillips died on the 9th October, 1982. His wife is Alice. On the 14th October, 1982, five days after Mr. Phillips died, we wrote the Establishments Division of Government and requested Establishments to advise us on the quantum of gratuity that was payable. On 11th November, 1982, Establishments replied to us and submitted a formula for the computation of the gratuity. Mrs. Phillips was advised that she should produce documentary evidence in the form of letters of administration to the estate of her deceased husband before she could receive the gratuity.

Mrs. Phillips actually came to my Chambers. I advised her to consult her own lawyer, who would take out letters of administration for her. She went to Mr. Calvin Alleyne, attorney-at-law.

On the 4th May, 1983, Mrs. Phillips' attorney asked the Sports Council for the amount of gratuity that was payable, and by letter of 13th June the information as to the quantum of the gratuity was submitted to Mr. Calvin Alleyne, as attorney-at-law for Mrs. Phillips. On 13th January, 1984, her attorney then advised the Sports Council that letters of administration were granted to Mrs. Phillips, issued on the said day - 13th January, 1984 - in the document numbered No. 400 of 1983. One week later, on 20th January, 1984, the National Sports Council paid \$4,644.88 as gratuity to Mrs. Phillips.

On March 26, 1984 Senator Greaves comes in here and says that we have not paid the lady. It is that kind of deliberate, callous misrepresentation, born of mischief, that is the hallmark of Senator Greaves and his party. It is that kind of wild nonsense that would make headlines, of course, in the Press.

Those are the facts in relation to the accusation, wild though it was.

He then went on to deal with Immigration. Senator Williams has already replied to that. There is one matter that I want to mention in relation to immigration; it is a

very parochial matter that affects the Turf Club. I speak both as Chairman of the Sports Council and as a Steward of the Barbados Turf Club.

For many years I have had some relationship with the Jockeys Association and the Immigration Department on the question of work permits. As I understood the policy in the days when Mr. Sam Headley was the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry, CARICOM jockeys were never required to have work permits on the basis that our jockeys used to go and ride in Trinidad virtually every Saturday in the days when we used to have four meetings rather than days now, and the Trinidad authorities never required them to have work permits. When theirs came here they were never required to have work permits.

Trinidadian jockeys still come here, ride and do not require work permits, but an exception seems to have been made in the case of an Antiguan jockey, Eustace Joseph, who has been required to pay \$60 in respect of a work permit, even though Joseph has been living in Barbados for at least six years now, since 1977-78. In addition to that, there is a very good jockey from Jamaica, Everton Miller, who has been riding here, and a work permit has been requested in respect of him.

I think what has happened is that, as between Trinidad and Barbados, there seemed to have been an understanding which has not been extended to incorporate Antigua and Jamaica, because there was never the traffic of jockeys between Barbados and Jamaica, and Barbados and Antigua, even though with respect to Antigua it is only one way.

I think the Immigration Department should settle a policy in respect of all CARICOM jockeys. When Chally Jones went to ride in Jamaica a few years ago, he had to have a work permit, but that was because of the infrequent situation of a Barbadian going to ride in Jamaica.

Apart from that, I cannot really complain too much about the way in which the Immigration Department functions, and I have had a lot to do with it in the past year or two. The Immigration Department today is considerably better and more efficient, even though there is a greater burden of work placed on it than under the Democratic Labour Party. At least today, and it needs to be said, the persons manning the Immigration Department of Barbados are, from all the information that I have and from all I have seen, honest and integritous people. We do not have a situation where, like when the Immigration Department was under the Police, a Superintendent of Police could stamp a resident stamp in the passport of anybody who was willing to pay him a bribe for doing it.

11.20 a.m.

Government will not let people know what used to go on. I know about that. I saw one of the people up to this morning. I can talk about it. Those allegations cannot now be levelled against Mr. Kenrick Hudson and his team of officers.

Why has the Immigration Department had such difficulty in finding records of persons who were allegedly made resident by a facetious stamp put in their passport? Because they never kept the records in the Police Department. A lot of them have gone missing. Innocent people, who were told if they gave so and so, \$100 or \$200, he would put a stamp in their passports, went, paid money and got stamps in their passports only to find out that the investigations went down, that the stamps were worthless and were the result of corruption.

I have not heard the two members of the Opposition in here accuse the Government of corruption, but I believe some talk did permeate the debate in the Other Place about corruption. They should be the last to talk.

Senator Greaves talked yesterday about the proliferation of gambling. He said that there have been all types of gambling since the Barbados Labour Party assumed office in 1976. What he has not told this Senate is that there was a thing introduced by the Democratic Labour Party in the 1960s, which made two full pages of the newspaper in England called "*The People*", and which was glorified in the name of the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. They brought that form of gambling to Barbados. It was the most corrupt and vicious gambling ever associated with this island of Barbados, and which gave Barbados a bad name in the international community.

I read in London about who were connected with it. There were interviews from all kinds of people in Government, including the late Capt. Fergusson. That newspaper would be available in the records of "*The People*" in London, and speaking as a Barbadian who was living in London at the time, I was ashamed to read what was written about Barbados under the Democratic Labour Party and a form of gambling which could only be best classified as a rip-off. I have not heard them talk about that.

He talked about the one-armed bandits. The Democratic Labour Party brought them to Barbados. The bandits were here in 1974. Parks was here in 1974. Anthony Wright was here in 1974. They were then operating illegally.

The DLP started not only to introduce forms of gambling to Barbados that were unaccustomed to the populace, but they introduced forms of gambling in Barbados that were corrupt. They started the destruction of the moral fabric of the society, if that is what they are claiming.

Let us remember that racketeer Clarke used to go to operators weekly and collect money for distribution, and then was asked to swear an affidavit that there were only 52 machines in Barbados in 1976. I know about that. The affidavit is on file, so I will not have this Government pilloried unfairly.

I have made my position on casino gambling clear. Sometime ago, when it was sought, in my view, to sneak it in, I opposed that. If you are going to have casino gambling, do it properly – let it be properly ventilated and let the public have their say on it. But I do not know of any plans for casino gambling; I have not seen any new legislation or anything like that coming, so I cannot speak beyond that. And it is an untruth to suggest that the Barbados Labour Party destroyed the moral fabric of the society, or, at least, is on the way to destroying the moral fabric of our society, as Senator Greaves inferred yesterday, by introducing forms of gambling. He knows better or ought to know better.

He mentioned yesterday that nothing much has happened in agriculture – and he left it there. He just said that there were marketing problems. To say that nothing much has happened in agriculture is to ignore the published fact that in terms of supply of vegetables, in 1983 Barbados was almost self-sufficient, if not self-sufficient. That is a far cry from what obtained five, six or ten years ago, and that, at least, showed that there has been positive movement in agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture, and, in particular, the people who spend the money and grow these things, are to be congratulated.

If we could get the other sectors of agriculture moving in a similar direction, for example in dairy farming, the future would be hopeful. We still depend heavily on the importation of frozen meat from overseas. I do not believe that we are too far behind from becoming self-sufficient in pork production. There will be times of the year when we need to import, like at Christmas for the making of hams and so on, but, generally, I think the level of pork production is increasing. Certainly chicken is also – Mr. Rayside would not like to hear me say prospering – doing well. The main problems are in the area of pricing, and this is a matter that has to be worked out from time to time between the producers and the Ministry, taking all interests into account, the interest of the producers as well as the interest of the public.

Senator Greaves dealt with foreign affairs and said it is a massive failure. He said that economic regional cooperation has been blown asunder and that he has very serious doubts and reservations about the future of regional integration. There has never been a full-scale debate on foreign affairs in here. Senator Wickham has been calling for one, and I hope that at some opportune time we will all address ourselves to the need for it.

I have one or two personal views on foreign affairs which I have expressed previously. My thesis is very simple, and it is that, as a developing country, Barbados cannot afford to parade on the diplomatic stage in the same way as, let us say, an Australian diplomat can parade. Our interests are different and our time in the game is shorter. We have only been in it since 1966; those fellows have been in it for years before.
11.30 a.m.

I genuinely do not believe that it behoves any ambassador of Barbados in New York, Washington, Canada or England to seek to play diplomacy like an American diplomat or an Australian diplomat. We have several hundreds of thousands of Barbadians in New York, in Canada and in England who, even though they are in a host community that may be hostile to them, are eking out an existence, but still believe that Barbados is home. They have a number of particularly social problems, be it problems of race, problems with the police, problems of housing, problems of education, and our noises should be made on their behalf to let them know that Barbados still considers them as people whose interests need to be protected. The garden party type of diplomacy does not assist them. The big lunches and the dinners and all that cannot help them. The man in Manchester, in Reading, in Brixton wants to see his High Commissioner, wants to discuss his problems with him, and, if possible, he would be grateful for some assistance.

Sir, I put forward that view about four to five years ago within the party, and I was surprised at some of the responses I got, that they are over there; we do not have any more responsibility for them; it is different when we had students on scholarship and so on. That is a total misconception of the role, and it is an abdication, in my view, of the proper responsibility that ought to be paid to our nationals overseas.

I believe that at the recent meeting last month of the Heads of Mission there may well have been a shift in emphasis where we are now willing to see that those human and social needs of our nationals overseas are being attended to. If that is so, and if my information is correct, then I think the Government is proceeding in the right direction. Thus, when the choice is to be made of the Barbados representative to any of these places, it is crucial that we examine the personality of the ambassador designate to see that he has the qualities that will best allow him to empathise with his brothers overseas and do something meaningful for them.

Secondly, emphasis should be on tourist development. This debate so far has gone very heavily on tourism. We recognise the value of tourism, and to that extent, as I indicated in an earlier speech in here, somewhere should be found for the accommodation of the Missions and the Tourist Boards so that they can work together for the better promotion of the Barbados tourist product overseas.

I do not think that there is a lot by way of trade that can be done, and that should be, in my submission, the third emphasis, except perhaps in America where we now have to make every effort to take advantage of the CBI provisions. So for America, certainly in the next few years, there must be a concentration of a build up of trade.

I do not know if there is a lot to be gained by over emphasis on trade relations between Barbados and Britain. In fact, Britain's performance during the Grenada crisis leaves me to think that Britain does not care that much any more, but I was not surprised. You see, having lived in England in the decade of the Sixties, in the time when the British Labour Party adopted a very clear stance in relation to Commonwealth immigration, I think it was about 1964, something that caused me to cease voting in British Parliamentary elections. It was the behaviour of the Labour Party which I supported, and it was clear then that Britain was washing its hands of Commonwealth immigration matters, which were seen as being irritants and potentially disruptive of good societal relationships. Then, of course, in 1967 you had Powellism, and that whole decade of the Sixties saw a more positive stance being taken by racists in England against Blacks. Those of us who were there in those days knew quite clearly that our homes were not aimed for Britain, but rather back in the Caribbean or Africa, or wherever we came from.

Britain's role in relation to its former colonies has been the same, in my submission, under both Governments, the Tories and the Labour Party, chiefly because they are afraid to deal honestly and truthfully with the question of race. You saw it clearly in 1965 in the matter of Rhodesia when Smith declared UDI. All kinds of excuses were made by Britain against the introduction of force in Rhodesia, and I would say that Britain found in 1965 a good ally for its position on Rhodesia in the person of the then Prime Minister of Barbados, the Honourable Errol Barrow, who agreed with Britain not to use force in Rhodesia, and even made an excuse for them that the topography of Rhodesia did not lend itself to military intervention. Mr. Barrow as Prime Minister of Barbados said that.

I hope that our Foreign Affairs Ministry will now become, as I said earlier, more interested in our nationals overseas. I believe that the image of the Missions will improve because there is no doubt that, particularly in Britain, the Barbadian nationals have little or no respect, the vast majority of them, for the High Commission. They ignore it as much as they can because they do not feel that it identifies with them, and I hope that things will change. This has been so for very many years; it is nothing to do with any individual High Commissioner.

An effort has to be made to reach out to these immigrant communities, particularly in England, and let

them know that Barbados and Barbadian people and the Government and the Opposition still care about them. We cannot ignore them. They make a financial contribution to this country. Many of them send back home remittances every month to relatives. Many of them come back home and invest in property. I hope that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is now taking all of that into consideration.
11.40 a.m.

I also want to deal with one other point that Senator Greaves made about foreign affairs; what he calls the blowing asunder of regional, economic co-operation. Surely, the stances adopted by many CARICOM countries, particularly in the last three years, have been conditioned by the state of international economics. What has happened in the last three years, and not only in the region but elsewhere, is that most countries have become very self conscious and have adopted what they call in the jargon, a protectionist policy. So Jamaica is looking after itself first and securing its manufacturers, and after they are satisfied that they have got their own manufacturers' positions stable, they would consider giving you licences. The same thing applies in Trinidad.

You cannot want a better example than the problems with tomatoes in Trinidad. I know that last year at the Gold Cup a Trinidadian told me that a pound of tomatoes in Trinidad was costing \$18. Mr. Kinch from Wakefield Plantation could send them into Trinidad at \$4 a pound and cheaper, but they would not let him get licences to send the things into Trinidad. Do you know why? Because there was an area in Trinidad which was growing tomatoes, whose representative was Mr. Kamaladin Mohammed, who was also the Minister of Agriculture, who had to protect his own supporters and electors: Everybody became very self-centred.

The little skirmish with Mr. Pitt and our Prime Minister was one of the straws. But that had nothing to do with the deterioration in relationships between Barbados and Trinidad, if there is a deterioration. All that has happened is that Trinidad has had to tighten up.

There was a time, four, five years ago, when there was a lot of Trinidadian investment in Barbados. There are Trinidadians now who would wish to invest in Barbados, but they cannot get their money out. Colonial Life wants to do all kinds of investment in Barbados. They want to buy out Plantations Ltd, or part of it, Home Centre, Citibank. They want to do a development up there by the bottom of Bishop Court Hill by the traffic lights, Chelston — I think that is what it is called. But do you think the Trinidad Central Bank is going to allow millions of dollars to come out now? No, Sir!

But that has nothing to do with whether the Prime Minister said anything about Mr. Pitt or otherwise. It is

a purely economic or, if you like, a monetary matter, in which Trinidad's self-interest is paramount. If they can return to a situation of buoyancy, presumably some dollars would be allowed out. That is the real problem, and it is so in Jamaica.

I do not think there is any suggestion that the Prime Minister of Barbados and the Prime Minister of Jamaica do not get on well. Still, our manufacturers are having difficulties which would seem to be threatening the cohesion of CARICOM, but they are difficulties which are rooted in the economic problems that confront Jamaica; they are nothing to do with the Prime Ministers' relationships with each other. So I think that we have to be careful, even though we recognise that CARICOM is under stress, to identify the source of the stresses, and the source of the stress is in the instability of the individual economies.

Senator Hall mentioned a couple of things yesterday. Let me first begin by saying that we on the National Sports Council are all sorry to learn that Senator Hall and two other persons have not been re-appointed as members of the Sports Council. I believe Senator Hall must have put in about seven years on the Sports Council and I am sure Senator Jemmott will agree with me that those of us at the Sports Council very much value the contributions of Senator Hall, which, I want to say publicly, were all made very impartially. There was never the semblance of partisan political behaviour when Senator Hall sat as a member of the National Sports Council.

The right to appoint to a statutory board is vested in the Minister. And even though representations were made and opinions were sought, ultimately the discretion was entirely that of the Minister. I do not think that we could seek in any way to fetter the exercise of that ministerial discretion.

I just want it clearly understood that all of us — and we have minuted this to our most recent meeting — want to pay tribute publicly to the three members who were changed. However, the changes give another three persons an opportunity to make a contribution to the public life of this country. I think that seven years is a good time for anybody to be on one particular board.

Senator Hall also raised yesterday the question of the West Indies Cricket Board and commitments made by the Governments. I did note, without reading it that has got full spread on the back page of the *Nation* today. Overnight and this morning, I have been able to speak, for the sake of clarification, with the Minister responsible for Sport and the Prime Minister himself.

The facts are that the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, through Mr. Allan Rae, its president, did

write sometime ago, last year, the Prime Minister, not the Minister responsible for Sport. The Minister responsible for Sport heard about it through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It would seem that most CARICOM Ministers of Foreign Affairs, if not all, were consulted on the matter, and the decision was taken to refer it to the Heads of Government. The Heads of Government then recommended that the matter be dealt with by the Ministers responsible for Sport in the various territories.

To that extent, an initiative was started by the Minister responsible for Sport in Barbados, who wrote the CARICOM Secretariat and asked the CARICOM Secretariat to convene a meeting of CARICOM Sports Ministers and invite representatives of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control to the meeting so that the details and ramifications of the whole matter could be placed before the Ministers and a decision could be taken.

11.50 a.m.

The CARICOM Secretariat has not yet convened the meeting, but some Governments have apparently gone ahead and paid. The Ministry responsible for Sport in Barbados has never been apprised of the scheme in any detail by direct communication through West Indies Cricket Board of Control or any of its representatives. Notwithstanding all of that, I am authorised to state that the Government of Barbados expressed its willingness to contribute to the scheme and that the Government of Barbados will honour that commitment, that further, there has been some quite substantial correspondence passing between the Prime Minister and Mr. Allan Rae, the President of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, and I think that the cricketers can confidently expect shortly that Barbados' contribution will find its way into the treasury of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control.

I cannot now in possession of the facts totally absolve the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, because it would seem that the channels of communication were not properly followed. They preferred to talk to the Prime Ministers when Ministers of Sports were responsible. Perhaps they should have set out to the Ministers of Sports the whole scheme and ask the Ministers to take it to their respective Cabinets and get their decision. I think the wires of communication may have been crossed. Happily, as far as Barbados is concerned, Barbados will honour its obligations and commitments very shortly.

I hope that is done, because I know from talking to certain West Indies players that there is concern that what was promised has not materialized. Indeed, I heard talk not from any players, but from persons in the administration of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control. I would like to advise the players to defer any litigation that they may have in their minds for

a few weeks, because they have to recognize that you are dealing with a number of individual governments. I think that in Jamaica the private sector was also involved and requests were made of the private sector to contribute, but I certainly do not believe that any Government in the Caribbean which expressed an earlier commitment to contribute would now back away from that commitment.

The processes of Government are not only different, but are more difficult to comprehend than perhaps the average person can understand. You cannot just take up Government's money and write a check. A Prime Minister cannot do that. There are administrative and bureaucratic processes that have to be gone through. You are dealing with a lot of states — ten or eleven Caribbean states; some are committed and others are not; some may have the money now and others may be waiting for it. But if they are patient, I am sure that the matter will be shortly resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned and particularly the players.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are getting close to the end of your time.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir.

I will wind up on the police. Senator Seale spoke yesterday in support of what Commissioner Durant has called the increase in white collar crime. There is probably some evidence for that. I do not have it, I have not seen the most recent criminal statistics, but I take it from the Commissioner that if he says there is an increase, there probably is the increase. What I know there is an increase in is the presentation of cheques which have no value. Business people are suffering terribly from what are called "bouncing cheques."

I have advised one or two companies on the matter to do like what was done in Jamaica. The last time I was in Jamaica for any length of time was about 1975 — I have been back a few times, but not for two weeks. I saw in a lot of business places the actual bounced cheques put up in a glass cage in the place. So if David Simmons wrote a bounced cheque to Clarence Jemmott, and he is running a fish and pork business and you go in there, you will see my cheque stamped "NO GOOD". They have them beautifully decorated. You will not be tempted to write it again. I gave Mr. John B. Simpson that advice. Get them and photocopy them, and stick them up. You are not libeling anybody, because you can prove the truth of it. They do not have any money in the bank, and do not have much reputation to protect anyway if you give a bounced cheque. Stick them up and make examples of them.

Alternatively, take the cheques to the police, and when the police bring a charge of obtaining by false pretenses or obtaining credit by fraud, the money will

come up fast. But if you send it to me and tell me to sue the person in court, you will never get it. I will sue and then there will be the question of what he has to levy on, and all of that. He will pay back \$20 a month or some rubbish. No, embarrass them! Make them public examples! Stick it all about Barbados! Let people know who are the bouncers or turn it over to the police.

I have always supported improved conditions of work for the police, and it is unfortunate that Governments do not seem to appreciate that there is an element of development in the Police Force, and for that matter, in law. You find now that we have the new High Court shelved to another year when hopefully there will be more money. There are not a lot of votes in building a court, there might be some votes in a road or something like that. But the police, the law and the courts have developmental elements — and I think we should try to recognize this. If you do not have a proper Police Force, properly equipped; and if your system of justice is not respected, you will probably have a society that thrives on lawlessness and which will not be attractive to tourists. You will find a slump in tourist arrivals, and your revenues will decrease — all because you have not had the foresight to see the linkages among policing, the court system, good order and behaviour in a society.

I am really counselling the Government to think again. The Democratic Labour Party made this mistake in the past, and I hope that we do not persist in doing the same. Even though more has been done for the police under this Government than any previous Government, there is still a lot more to do.

At the same time as I say that, I want to warn the Police. I know they do not like me to speak about them in here; they feel it is an attack. When I speak about the Police, some of them get very thin-skinned and stop speaking. But I have to tell them that they have to look inside and make sure that the crooks and vagabonds in the Police Force are weeded out. The Police Force is only a microcosm of a society. Of 900 or 1 000 men, you are going to find some dishonesty in them. You have some of them who cannot tell the truth if you bring Christ down here. They come into court and tell the biggest lies on people. Somebody gets sent to prison and has a chip on his shoulder for the balance of his life because a policeman has been untruthful.

12.00 noon.

Where a policeman is untruthful, he should be dealt with even to the point of dismissal, because if you can go on oath and tell lies and are proven to be telling lies, like I had last week in a speeding case which the *Nation* reported, one Sergeant clearly telling lies, there is no place for you in the Force. He may lie in a speeding case, you do not know what else he may lie in, and you have to clean it up. Even though we are supporting the police,

and we want better conditions for them at some of the police stations, we must not let the police believe that all is sweetness and light within the Police Force. It is not.

Sir, please beg the Prime Minister or somebody to do something about District D in St. Thomas. It is in a terrible state.

Mr. Durant has a big job on his hands and I, in my professional capacity, want to pledge my support for the police. I have always got on well with them, I have even been an honorary adviser to the Association for many years, but I will not condone bad behaviour, dishonesty and corruption or low standards within the Police Force. He has got to show the willingness to meet the public halfway by dealing with his own internal problems while we give him our support.

I have exhausted my time, and I am obliged to you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, first of all I want to reply to some of the comments which were made during the debate yesterday and this morning before I forget anybody, and I will deal with Senator Simmons first.

During his presentation, Senator Simmons made the very good point that Barbados should pay attention to the nationals who live overseas. We have very large Barbadian communities in North America and in London, and he has urged the Foreign Service Ministry to pay some attention to those persons. He seemed to have slipped a little bit, because if he were paying closer attention, he would have noticed that from London the Foreign Affairs Ministry has brought home one of their economists for the Public Service, and that person has been replaced with a Consul General, thereby indicating a shift away from an economic role, which we could not play in Europe, to the consular duties, which are so pressing in London, Birmingham and Reading.

I believe that Mr. Brewster has been up there for over a year now and is doing a job which Barbadians are very proud of. I do not think it is fair to continue to say that we are not paying attention to nationals in these countries. There has been a major change in the staff structure to reflect the change in thought which Senator Simmons has called for.

In addition to that, despite all the foolishness from the other party, the department which I used to preside over, Immigration, has been paying a lot of attention to nationals in Britain, and we have been trying deliberately to get the people who live in Britain to have the status of their children regularised in Barbados, and they have been discouraged from doing this because of party politics. The Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, Minister Griffith

and myself have made several trips to Britain, and we have been urging them to get their citizenship properly organised.

A lot of people believe that if you were born in Barbados, or your father is a Barbadian, all one has to do is to say one was born in Barbados and that is the end of the matter. We have been impressing upon them to have their births and deaths properly registered in Barbados. We have amended the laws to provide for the registration of births of Barbadians in Britain so that those entries can be made in our register in Barbados. So we are in fact paying attention to our nationals overseas.

When we say we are not going to give them passports unless they are properly registered, the other party says that we are making it difficult for them. What we are saying is that we are not going to cheapen our passport laws by issuing passports to people where we cannot verify their citizenship. We have asked them to co-operate with us, and a lot of them are coming forward and having their citizenship regularised. This is published on a monthly basis in the *Official Gazette*. This is further evidence to Senator Simmons that in fact we have been paying some attention to the consular duties in London.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the ones who were born in America are as willing to come forward. I do not know what the particular reason is, because whereas they cannot claim dual nationality, the point is that they have dual nationality. If a person is born in America, he is a citizen of America, and if his father is Barbadian, that person is a Barbadian, and that is the end of the matter. Neither the Barbadian law nor the American law can change a man's fatherhood.

Senator Simmons also spoke on the question of the cricketers, but the one point he omitted was that even though the Government has made public its willingness to honour any payments to the West Indies Cricket Board of Control, the payments cannot be made because the West Indies Cricket Board of Control is yet to say how much has to be paid and to whom it is to be paid. So we are still in a bit of a no man's land with that, and the ball is not at all in the court of the Barbados Government, but indeed in that of the West Indies Cricket Board of Control. So Senator Hall, who was coming through at medium pace yesterday, really has not got his facts altogether.

I want to deal with Senator Hall a little bit. Senator Hall started with a side swipe at the National Housing Corporation for putting pressure on tenants who would not pay their rents, and he made out a case to suggest that before pressure is brought to bear on the tenants, the cases should be investigated. Any person who is associated with politics as closely as Senator Hall has been would know that before any pressure is brought to bear

by the National Housing Corporation on any tenant in any of the estates, each case is properly investigated; and in the cases where there might be some welfare element involved, the cases are referred first of all to the Welfare Department for the advice of that Department. Only the people who can pay and will not pay are the ones who we see being defended by the Press.

Each case is properly investigated, so there is no case of anybody who is unemployed, who has been laid off for ten weeks, who is having difficulties with national assistance being hounded down by the National Housing Corporation. That step only comes after they have been properly investigated, after it has been decided by the Welfare Department that they can pay and will not pay. Only at that stage does the heavy hand come down. Then one gets all this sympathy from the Press — as if people who live in houses are not to think that the payment of rents is a charge on their wages.

Senator Hall drifted from Housing quickly to Tourism, and he joined with the other elements of the Opposition in calling for a separate Minister of Tourism. That was his first point. That is of some significance too, because there is a serious attempt to put some pressure on the present Minister of Tourism. On the one side, they say they want a Minister of Trade, and the other side say they want a Minister of Tourism. I want to deal with that, because the impression being given when we say that a particular sector is not performing because it wants a Minister would seem to suggest that either the Minister is incompetent or he does not have enough time to spend on the particular subject under his portfolio. 12.10 p.m.

While the Manufacturers' Association and the Democratic Labour Party are calling for a Minister of Trade, the Central Bank suggests that, notwithstanding the pressures presently being felt because of CARICOM restrictions, our export trade is better than ever. According to the Central Bank Reports, in 1976 Barbados exported \$137.6 million. In 1977, it exported \$151 million. In 1978, it exported \$186.4 million; in 1979, \$232.6 million; in 1980, \$337.2 million. In 1981 exports fell to \$297 million; in 1982 they rose to \$372.6 million and, according to the Bank, up to October, 1983, exports had reached a record height of \$426.9 million. So the same Minister whom they now want to replace managed to move our export earnings from a lowly \$137.6 million in 1976 to \$426.9 million, at the end of ten months last year. That is a real performance by the Ministry.

In terms of CARICOM, we seem to panic quite quickly when a cold wind blows in San Fernando or Point Fortin — we think that we will all catch pneumonia up here. We do not have the figures prior to 1978 in this booklet, but, according to the Central Bank, our CARICOM export trade is represented as follows:— In 1978, we

exported \$64.3 million to CARICOM. In 1979, we exported \$76.2 million to CARICOM. We went in 1980 to \$116.6 million; up to \$121 million in 1981, up to \$141 million in 1982, and for the period January to October, 1983, it is \$113.2 million.

So, rather than trying to pull down the Minister of Trade, we in Barbados should be saying that we have an efficient Ministry of Trade. Even in the face of difficulties with Trinidad, Guyana and Jamaica, — not so much Guyana, because they cannot pay anyhow — we have been able to improve our export position.

They want a new Minister of Tourism, so we have to check the correct record. What does the record say? That in 1975, we had 221 000 tourists in Barbados, that it went to 224 000 in 1976, to 269 000 in 1977, to 316 000 in 1978, to a record of 370 900 in 1979, to 369 000 in 1980, 352 000, some decline in 1981, and in 1983 we are at 303 000, which is a far cry from the 221 000 before Mr. St. John took over the joint Ministries. To answer his equation I ask this, does he want a separate Minister of Tourism, as they did under the Dems, and have 221 000 tourists, or a joint Ministry, run efficiently, and have 303 000?

This foolishness about a separate Minister of Tourism and a separate Minister of Trade and we cannot get this done and we cannot get that, has nothing to do with reality. It has to do with a straightforward attack on the Minister of Trade — one without any justification.

Senator Hall then seemed to suggest that the fall-off of tourists between 1979 — 1984 has something to do with the kind of structure which exists at the Board of Tourism. There was a time when the airlines were represented on the Board of Tourism, when the Workers' Union was represented, and I believe the Hotel Association was represented. But what does the Board of Tourism actually do? The Board of Tourism manages the system. It is not an advisory body, and the Minister must have people on his Board who will manage the Board along the same policy directions as the Minister is going, and he can only do that if he takes the people whom he thinks will manage the Board in that way.

Room is being made for consultations with the Hotel Association, the Workers' Union and other interested parties. The Minister proposes to establish an advisory council, and the role the representatives are supposed to play will be that of advisors. It is not the business of the Workers' Union to manage tourism in Barbados. It is not the business of the statutory associations to manage tourism in Barbados. That is the business of the Tourist Board. If they manage the Workers' Union and give their inputs to the Advisory Council, if they manage their hotels properly and give their advice to the Board of Tourism, then the Barbados tourist product would im-

prove, but they are not to believe that they have a right to get into the day-to-day management of the Board of Tourism.

Senator Simmons talked about Senator Greaves being irresponsible. Without checking, Senator Hall comes in and announces how we should have direct consumer advertising in North America, that we should stop going on these trips to the Eastern Seaboard, thereby trying to give the impression that the only promotion work being done by the Board of Tourism would be the bandwagons which go mainly to Canada and America.

The Board of Tourism is, in fact conducting consumer advertising in North America. But consumer advertising is an expensive business — One is not advertising on CBC. The rates are high, and there is a limit to which one can advertise with small budgets. It would probably take the entire budget if one wanted to have a big splash on ABC or NBC in America. They are doing TV and newspaper advertising, but, as I said, the amount of advertising that can be done like that is severely limited by the financial constraints which, all of us know, exist.

We heard it last year, we heard it the year before, and we must not go on year after year saying that the Board of Tourism will not advertise. We might make the point that Senator Seale likes to make, that maybe we want \$25 million. I am not too sure how the Board of Tourism would raise \$25 million. Senator Seale may have some idea, and somebody said that instead of Let's Go to the Races, we should have Let's go to the Hotels. 12.20 p.m.

There is one other point that Senator Hall made and it is one that concerns all of us; we are obviously worried about it and the effect it has on tourism. This concerns a place somewhere, I am told, in Bay Street — I have no interest and therefore I am not too sure exactly where it is — called the Carlisle. Everybody is clamouring for the Government to do something about the Carlisle. It is my understanding that the Carlisle operates in violation of the Liquor Licencing laws of Barbados. Five cases have been brought so far against the proprietor of the club, he has been convicted on two of these cases, and he has appealed against the convictions. The appeals are to be heard by the Divisional Court, and while people are panicking, the Divisional Court will meet on the two appeals, and my understanding is that it is expected that the court will sit on Friday, 30, on the Carlisle business.

What I am very concerned about is the very easy way in which people say the Government should do something about the Carlisle, the Government should close down the Carlisle. The courts in Barbados exist for the Government, the courts in Barbados exist for the

tourists who come here and are turned away from Carlisle, the courts exist for the taximen who get turned away, and the court also exists for the proprietor of the Carlisle, and I do not like the trend I have been getting that the Government should do something about Carlisle, because when the Government is encouraged to do something about the Carlisle today, tomorrow the Government will be asked to do something about somebody else, and we have to make sure that we preserve law and order in this country. The judiciary exists and it must be preserved in its integrity, and we should await the outcome of the court cases. That is all I can say about the Carlisle. I would be very nervous to live in a Barbados in which politicians can decide who operates and does not operate. I do not want to be part of that as a Minister or as a citizen. The courts must decide on these matters, not Ministers.

In a general swipe around the place, Senator Hall asked a few questions about my Ministry. I made a note as he made the point about a freezer at the QEH. These are the small things that Senator Hall gets involved in. Senator Hall does not get involved in things like the National Health Service or the level of health care. He gets involved in whether or not a freezer is working, and whether or not toilet paper has been delivered at the Mental Hospital on time. I am not getting into that kind of business. The suppliers will take care of that on a day-to-day basis.

As far as the freezer is concerned, we know the freezer is not working, and if instead of talking about the freezer not working and he had checked his Estimates, Senator Hall would know that we accounted for a new freezer in the Estimates too. It is because the freezer is not working, and because we know it is not working, that we are voting additional funds to have the situation remedied in next year's Estimates. So it is not a great manifestation, that is nothing new, Senator Hall.

He also made some reference to the Aedes Egypti programme, which started as a scheme in Barbados over 20 years ago, and he said that the vote is small. There is a Parliamentary Question on something to do with Aedes Egypti and, therefore, I am not going to get into that until I am prepared to answer Senator Linton, but suffice to say that we are considering the merger of the Aedes Egypti programme with the regular public health inspectorate. We believe that a merger will allow them better supervision of the workers in the field, and whereas there is no real danger from the Aedes Egypti mosquito in Barbados, we have to make sure that we monitor the situation all the time to ensure that it does not ever become a problem, because we cannot afford to have any yellow fever in Barbados.

Senator Hall continued, in what I described earlier as his military medium pace, and said he heard about dengue fever, and he stood up in this Chamber yesterday and said that there is a serious increase in dengue fever in Barbados.

(SENATOR W. W. HALL: That is not true.)

SENATOR THE HON O'B. TROTMAN: Do you want the Record?

I asked for the figures and this is what happened, according to the figures I got this morning. In 1982, there were 103 cases; in 1983, there were 63 cases; and in 1984, no cases — but Senator Hall comes in here and said for the records of Hansard that we have an increase in dengue fever!

I am not going to say he is irresponsible. I am not going to get involved in any cross talk between Senator Hall and Senator Barrow — they are old partners — but that is the sort of irresponsible Senator we have representing the Opposition. We are very lucky that one of the Reporters did not pick up that and flash it across the news that there is an outbreak of dengue fever in Barbados. We have to think of what could have happened to our tourism figures if that kind of misinformation had got on to the news last night or this morning. And Senator Hall will say he is a great Barbadian, that he has always supported things Barbadian, but that kind of comment will destroy tourism in Barbados. I am sure that he is going to find an appropriate time to apologise to the Chamber for his misconduct.

Senator Seale did make one small accusation. He suggested that when the houses were being checked to be put on the schedule to be preserved, the owners were not properly consulted. My advice on that, is that there was some level of consultation with all owners, but that some persons just did not respond. So it is not totally fair to say that the inspections were made, properties were listed and that was the end of the matter. Senator Seale just fell out a little bit with that.

12.30 p.m.

Senator Greaves, the other DLP Senator, said that nothing was done for training in the last three years; he suggested that all training was being abandoned in the Public Service; that if we did not train people there would be a great collapse in the Public Service, and that it would take ten years to redo the damage of the past two years.

I like to check figures, because it does not matter how you seem to perform, the score book is always the best place to check whether a fellow is getting on or not. In 1980–81, the period mentioned by Senator Greaves, 398 persons received assistance from the Barbados Government to go on training of some sort or another, some on study leave on a long term basis, some on other technical training, and even some to exams for the University. In addition to that, 15 got British Technical Assistance awards; 13, US Government; 12 OAS, 28, PAHO; 17, to CFTC and other minor groups, and 492 people who did local training. In 1981–82, 591 public officers benefitted from the training fund, and in 1982–83, 680 public officers benefitted through the Training Department. But Senator Greaves would say that nothing has been done for training, and that we are going to have terrible collapse in the Public Service.

I want to make a few points about my own department before I take my leave of you. There has been a lot written about the National Health Service and whether it would get off the ground, according to one editorial recently. One of the problems which we had with the progress on the National Health Service was the drafting of legislation due to some bottleneck problems in Marine House. I am happy to report that we have got that sorted out, and I can report that the first draft of the National Health Service Bill is now in circulation for further consultation with the Barbados Workers' Union, the National Union of Public Workers, BAMP, The Chamber of Commerce, the Employers' Confederation, the Nurses' Association, the Small Business Association.....

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The Prison Officers' Association.)

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Not the Prison Officers' Association. We have not sent it to them. I am not too sure what their status is, but that can be checked on if you want that information as well.

We are prepared to consult with all the persons who represent people in Barbados at all levels. When the various comments are returned to the Ministry — we have asked them to treat it as a matter of urgency — we will try, wherever possible, to incorporate advice which is acceptable in the new draft, and come to Parliament very soon with a Bill for the introduction of the National Health Service.

I am not going to comment on the question of negotiations with the doctors. I am not as pessimistic as some of the writers of editorials. I believe that the doctors and the Ministry will eventually work our problems out. We have differences, but when people are talking about money, there are always problems, and if we are talking of millions of dollars, we are talking about a lot of money. But we are going to ensure that the National Health Service is brought to the citizens of Barbados in such a way that the health care of Barbadians will be improved, and at such a cost that the taxpayers of Barbados can afford the Health Service.

The one thing which we have not spoken a lot about in the Ministry of Health so far is the question of the Sewerage Scheme for the south coast. Much of the study, is now completed, and it is expected that we should be able to start the programme of works on the south coast sewerage system very soon.

We are going to have a lagoon somewhere in the Graeme Hall area for the treatment of sewage. We have sent officers to Jamaica and to Canada to see how the lagoons work. We are quite happy that there is no odour to bother the people in the nearby built-up districts, that the lagoons will not be a threat to the birds

in the swamp or the fish in the swamp, and we are at present negotiating with financing for the south coast sewerage. We have to do this not only because the south coast is part of our tourist plant, but we also have to protect the inshore fishing, because the sewage which goes out into the south coast has been killing off marine life.

In passing let me say that evidence is that since the QEH sewage has been put into the sewerage system, there is some sign of growth in the reef off Carlisle Bay again, so I suppose that, in time, marine life will return to Carlisle Bay. It is for that kind of reason that we are going to forge ahead with the south coast sewerage system, because if we do not, the sea eggs will be affected eventually, fishing and the reefs will die.

In the Estimates this year, we also have a lot of money voted for the QEH under Capital Expenditure. We have plans drawn for the expansion of the QEH. We are going to spend \$7 million at the QEH building extensions for the Paediatric Unit and the Burns Unit.

In addition to that, we are at present negotiating for financial assistance to refurbish the equipment at QEH. This is going to cost us some \$4 million, and we are hoping to get a loan from IADB at extremely low rates of interest for the refurbishing of the QEH. A lot of the equipment in the QEH came over from the old General Hospital and has passed its useful life span.

We are hoping, in this coming year, to do a lot of refurbishing work on the QEH. We are doing this because we believe we have to maintain the hospital at a level where it can continue to function efficiently. Not only is it a teaching hospital, but I believe that it is probably the most efficient and best run hospital in the Eastern Caribbean, and I hope to keep it that way.

In terms of the QEH and its efficiency, we have introduced the micro filming of patients' records, and we are introducing the computerising of the accounts at the hospital. This will assist us in retrieving the information a lot faster, and will assist in the more efficient running of the hospital.

12.40 p.m.

The Casualty is always a talking point. One would have read that at present we are now carrying out a study. We are doing something about the Casualty. We already have a consultant in place, and we hope that, by Monday, we will have his Barbadian counterpart in place. We want to do away with the Casualty as it presently exists. We want to convert the Casualty Department into a real Emergency Department of the hospital. The Casualty, when reorganized, will not be a place where when people have hangovers or stump their toes, they have to bottle-up the hospital with minor problems. Those

problems have to be taken care of in another place. The Casualty, as we know it, will become a real Emergency Department, where people who have real problems can see a doctor in a few minutes time.

Hand in hand with that means paying some attention to the Ambulance Service which at present is not something of which we can be very proud. We have been trying to train the staff, we have been trying to upgrade the facilities, but that will be a long exercise. When the service started, it started as a simple ferrying of people up and down in vans, and, therefore, the kind of employees with the lack of training who were first assigned to the department will not easily enter the new concept of an Ambulance and Emergency Department, with people up to the level of paramedics who will operate the service. We are going to have a real problem on our hands in trying to retrain all the people who are presently in the Ambulance Service. Some, only a few weeks ago, finished the last of one programme, and we are encouraged by the reports that some of them have been quite receptive to the training and that there is hope for some of them.

This brings me to the last subject. I am going to deal with the District Hospitals. They are listed in the Estimates as District Hospitals, so, I must not call them alms houses. We have a situation in Barbados which some of my predecessors have been very vocal about. We have these institutions, which at present operate as no more than poor houses, where people, who are too old or too weak to maintain themselves, are put there by their younger relatives to die. Recently, I asked one of the matrons if they get visitors. She said: "Yes, everybody in the District Hospitals get visitors. They get their first visit when they are brought in by their younger relatives and they get their second visit when they die....."

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Not only for National Insurance checks. They come when they die in case the old lady or man has left a piece of land and they might be in business; so they will go back and check. They are not interested in visiting anybody in the District Hospitals.

Nevertheless, we believe that human beings should not be made to live the way those old people live in the alms houses — a disgusting state of affairs. It takes a lot of courage and determination to visit the District Hospitals. You have to put in a couple of brandies first to settle your stomach, and a couple of brandies when you come back out — otherwise, you are in real trouble. We are going to do something about that. We are raising money to refurbish these hospitals. We want to make them places where old people can live with some degree of decency, we want to clean them up, and the present

figures indicate that we will need about \$15 million to do all the hospitals and make them habitable.

We are negotiating at present with an international agency. We believe that we can get the money at about three per cent. Maybe you would not believe that, but we are trying to get the money at 3 per cent because it is a lot of money. If we get the \$15 million at 3 per cent, we should be able late this year to start to do some work at the District Hospitals and provide better accommodation and care for the old people of Barbados.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Jones.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Thank you, Mr. President. There are certain things in the educational sphere we are asked not to comment on and I do not intend to comment on them, but I do intend to speak about the Eleven Plus examination and the introduction of the General Paper, because that distresses me greatly.

I want to know what our educational system is trying to do with our 11-year-old children. As far as I recall, the manifesto of this present Government stated that they were hoping to abolish the Eleven Plus examination. But on the contrary, I now find that, far from abolishing it, they are increasing and inflicting a heavier and more severe burden on our children. I wonder, if the general physical and mental characteristics of our 11-plus children were seriously taken into consideration when the ministry opted to add this additional paper.

There are many time-honoured notions about children at the adolescent stage which have been called into question by psychologists and physiologists. But of one thing that all are very definite about, is that children at that age, 11-plus, should not be pressured. The onset of puberty visits that age group with certain problems, which, sometimes, children at that age cannot properly cope with. I think that these are things that we should take into consideration.

Having myself corrected papers for the Eleven Plus for many years, I am convinced that the present paper of Arithmetic and English is adequate for that age group. As a matter of fact, I believe that there are some teachers who cannot do the English very well themselves. I think the present system is ample. I have seen those papers and corrected them, and I can tell you that if children have never been exposed to the English paper, I do not mind how brilliant they are, they are not going to do well in that paper if they are only seeing it for the first time. Now, you are going to add to that.

I wonder if you know the scope of this General Paper and if you have ever seen the General Paper syllabus that they are hoping to put on these 11-plus children. Let me tell you something about the scope. The scope covers History, Geography, Science, Health, Government, etc. Imagine telling a child of eleven that he should know and understand how the "Society has developed a variety of social, political, and economic institutions to cater to societal needs and to facilitate the community." That is part of the Social Studies component. I have seen the paper. Then they have questions on forms of Government. How is that knowledge relevant to a child of 11? Somebody will have to tell me.

As a matter of fact, one of the questions I saw was "What was the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility?" What a child of 11-plus has to know about the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility? A lot of grown-ups do not even know anything about that, and I do not see how this is relevant to a child of 11. It does not make any sense to me at all. A case may be made out for knowledge on health and knowledge of water and even electricity — yes, sugar production too — but the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility? That really got me.

Most of the General Paper is what a certain columnist in one of our newspapers calls "intellectual junk food". That is what it is. What will it do that has not been done in the past? How will it help in the proper placing of children in the various schools? I do not follow. 12.50 p.m.

Even in the system we now have — and I can talk with authority on this — even the essays they gave our children to do at the Eleven Plus only have a value when there is a tie, and that wastes a lot of our time. I know because I have corrected those essays for years. We are correcting essays for 250 or 300 children and the only time those results are ever looked at — and I challenge anybody to contradict me on this — is if there is a tie between two students. Other than that you do not look at it at all. In other words, if a child does well in Arithmetic and English and gets, let us say, 280 plus 280 marks, and he got a C or a D in an essay, that does not matter. If a child got 279 and an A, he is still coming below the child with 280 and a D. It is only if two children get the same mark, say 225, and a fellow got A in the essay and the other one got 225 and a C, then the one who got 225A will get in. Other than that the essays are not looked at at all, and I am sure that I am right on that.

As I said, the present system was enough, but I feel it is an unfair imposition on the child. Imagine a little child of 11 having to sit two days in succession! Can you imagine what that is doing to the little child? The little child comes home from the first day of the examination,

excited, not knowing really what he has done. He cannot sleep that night, because he knows the next morning he has another examination paper. Then what does it do to the parents? It gives some of them neurosis. If you ask me, it might end with some of the children being sent to the psychiatric wards, and you are also pre-supposing from the teachers some futile miracles.

This General Paper has no soundness in it as far as education is concerned. That is my irrevocable decision about this, and all this General Paper, in my view, forces children to do is to know less and less about more and more until they know nothing about everything. That is all I can see it doing. I am diametrically opposed to this paper on several grounds, and I make no apology for saying this.

The children already have 2¼ hours of deep concentration when they are taking the Eleven Plus examination. Are you going to bring them back the next day and make them concentrate again? It is too much strain on the children.

Another thing about this General Paper, if you have seen the specimen which was sent out, is that in a lot of it the children do not have to write a word at all — all they have to do is to draw circles. As somebody says, you draw those circles and it is not an estimate, it is a guesstimate, because some of them will draw the circles and some of the circles will be right. Are you telling me that just because a boy or girl does better in the General Paper than another person it means that this boy has more ability than the other one? Absolute nonsense! Because I do not know anything about the CARICOM Multilateral Facility and another boy gets that right, he has more sense than I have? I find it educationally unsound.

What is more, the Teachers' Unions are opposed to it. What beats me is, why is it that the authorities in the Ministry do not consult with the in-service teachers and with the unions before they come out with these things? It seems to me that we do not think in terms of meeting those who are in the business and who know about it. Let us face it, unless you have been a teacher yourself you cannot stay from the outside and say what is good to be done inside the school. You should be consulting with the people whose job it is to be there, day in — day out. Nobody in an office can tell a school how it should be run. I am saying that if they go on like this they are going to damage the whole educational system we have in this country, and I am opposed to that.

I have a few words to say about tourism. We know that we all depend on tourism and we are going to be depending on it more and more, but if we want to attract tourists to this country, my personal opinion is that it is imperative that the first people with whom our tourists

come into contact should be people who are properly trained and specially selected to meet the people the first time. As the old saying goes, first impressions go a long way, and when you come as a tourist from a long trip, you are tired already on the plane, you get off the plane and you see somebody's face looking sour, that puts you off. You want to see a little smile, something to cheer you up.

I feel that the people who have to be the first to come in contact with tourists should be people who have affability and courtesy. If you find that a particular person is not that kind of person — they might be very competent, but they are not the first people for tourists to meet — put them inside the office where the tourists do not have to meet them. The people to meet the tourists when they come should be people they can feel at home with — as soon as they see them they should feel happy.

My wife and I were in the Bahamas last year, and when we got off the plane, the way we were greeted made us feel we were wanted. There was warmth, courtesy, and you could see a smile on the person's face while he was saying how pleased he was to have us there and he hoped we would enjoy our stay. That is the kind of thing that we need. In my view, it is the way they are received more than anything else that stops a lot of tourists from coming here.

I can tell you. We came back from a boat trip two years ago, and when we were received there at that Deep Water Harbour, honestly, if I were not a Barbadian, I would have turned back and gone back on the ship. We spoke and the person did not answer. I made a report against that customs officer. I believe she is still working down there, though. I made a report to the Chief Customs Officer about that person, Miss Angelina Lovell, a name I will never forget for as long as I live. You would have thought that we were bandits or something, the way that person treated us. That sort of thing puts people off more than all the other things we talk about. If I were not a Barbadian, I would have got on that same ship and gone back out again. This is the kind of thing we have to be watching. We want people who can make other people feel that they are really wanted, that we are glad to have them.

The next thing is the hotel prices and the rates, which I think are too prohibitive. In the hotels, the service you get is not first rate either. When you go to some hotels in Canada and in the United States, the graciousness with which you are served, although the meals may cost quite a bit of money, make you feel happy about paying. But what happens here is that you get the feeling that you are doing them a favour or you are annoying them by going there to receive something, and this is what I think is damaging tourism in Barbados.

So it is not so much a question only of hotel prices, although that is part of it, but I feel what is causing people to avoid coming to Barbados is that our people nowadays have no manners, and I make no apology for saying that. They are most discourteous, and they behave as though they do not know what civility means. Civility is not servility. It means being kind to others, being thoughtful about others. You know that we depend on tourism and you should make tourists want to come here by your courtesy, decency and decorum.

Thank you.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think this is a convenient time to suspend. When we come back at 2 o'clock Senator Lynch will speak.

The sitting is suspended until 2 o'clock.
1.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed. Senator Lynch.

SENATOR Mrs. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to say something mainly on the subject of education, but I should like to begin by responding briefly to some of what the previous speaker had to say. I think that much of what he said was really based on emotion, and that his memory — we are all getting on in life — is failing in certain respects.

The syllabuses on which the General Paper is based were prepared by committees of teachers for the National Curriculum Development Council and were placed in all primary schools. For the General Paper, there is something like a fusion of some of those syllabuses. All children in primary schools are supposed to be following those courses, and their teachers are supposed to record faithfully, week by week, the lessons which children have covered in their studies.

At the end of each year they will have tests, and certainly at the end of year 4, when students are transferred into secondary schools they will be tested. The Education Officer for each district, used to — I cannot say whether it is still being done so I will have to say "used to" — collect the examination papers on all the subjects and take them away for inspection. They had to be satisfied that the examination questions were of appropriate standard, and that the syllabuses of work had been covered. Therefore, the General Paper should not have excited much comment from the primary schools, since it is based on what they were supposed to be doing,

and since the child would, in any case, have tests in the various subjects.

The writing of the essay in the Entrance Examination, as far as I can remember, was largely due to the comments of the heads of the secondary schools themselves at the time when the Common Entrance was introduced. It was felt that since the examinations were objective tests and the child was merely underlining a word, or writing one word, we should ensure that continuous writing was not being neglected. The child is therefore asked to write a paragraph, not a whole essay usually, so that we would ensure that teachers would continue to train children in continuous writing and not concentrate only on the objective type of question. That is the reason for the presence of the essay.

It would seem to me that in each case, what we are looking at, and what the Minister has been aiming at, is not only the teaching of the child for a transfer examination. It is necessary to ensure that when children have been transferred, their future is firmly based on a sound general education, which they should have had leading up to the examination. We also need to remember where we are coming from. Up to the 1960s, certainly the late 1950s, we had a Lower 1 Form. In fact, we used to have a Preparatory Department which children entered at age 8 sometimes: Later, the age of entry was 9, and still later the entrance form was Lower 1. Most children went to their secondary schools, especially the sixth form schools like Harrison's College and Queen's College.

In that Lower 1 Form, they had to study English Language, English Literature — I say Literature; it sounds ambitious, but English Reading — French or Spanish, Mathematics, Geography, History, General Science, Art, Music, Physical Education. At the end of the Lower 1 year, they did their test papers, like all the other children in the school, and proceeded to a Form 1.

Of course, Government at a certain point was beginning to introduce the Common Entrance. The first step was called the Screening Test, and the children in Lower 1 had to do the Screening Test before they were promoted to the 1st Form, but they still had to do that whole range of subjects. Never has a parent come to me and complained that her dear little girl was not to study all those subjects because she was approaching puberty.

Children in Barbados for many years sat, not on two days, but on four days to enter a secondary school. A girl would sit at Queen's College, St. Michael's, Foundation and Alexandra. She did not usually reach the Alleyne unless she lived in that direction. The boys did the same; they sat at Harrison College, Lodge, Combermere, Foundation, Coleridge and Parry and Alleyne. If girls were fortunate in being selected for the school of first choice, they would take Queen's College or whatever it

was. If they did not get into Queen's College, they would accept a place according to where they lived.

The students thought it was great fun sitting these examinations and being able to tell the teacher at the 5th Form school: "Thank you very much but I have gone to higher things. I am at Queen's College. I am at Harrison College." But they usually sat about four examinations.

It was about 1959 that heads decided they would hold all our examinations on the same day to prevent a waste of time. We would exchange our mark sheets with each other so that when a student was not accepted at the school of her first choice, she was offered a place at the school of next choice. So the heads arranged it between themselves to avoid offering the same student a place at several schools. I think we had two years of that one paper. We had a Committee of Teachers who set the single paper so that we had a little kind of something on our own before the Common Entrance came entirely into vogue. The Ministry of Education was responsible for the Screening Test and the heads of secondary schools were responsible for the second paper.

I mention this only because I am not defending the setting of the General Paper at this time. This is not the place to do it, because I am a member of the National Advisory Council on Education. The Minister may not always accept all our advice, but I have opportunities to express my opinion there.

I will say that enough places are not yet available so that if we set a qualifying examination, all the children will obtain a place. We cannot say that every child can move automatically into a secondary school and find a place. There must therefore be a means of assigning the available places and bursaries, which are still being given at private schools.

Another very important and thorny point is parent's choice. Most parents believe very strongly that they should have a say in determining where their children must go. There are countries where parents have no say, the children are allocated to the secondary schools of their district, and that is that. Therefore, in respecting parent's choice, there is a certain built-in problem of allocation.

While this whole question is being carefully examined there is no use saying that the Common Entrance should be abolished. If it was abolished, the same people who approved of it will want to say that they want their children at a particular school. There is no way of solving that problem except by showing that children earn their places by virtue of the position and the number of marks obtained.

I will end by saying that I agree that teachers should be consulted when important changes are to be made in the educational system, and I further believe that three or four years' notice should be given in any changes in examinations. The first batch of people to sit the examination could not then claim that they had not covered the whole course. I think this is always done by public examining bodies. They give notice of changes some years in advance.

2.15 p.m.

Because of my experience with children, I am very humble in the presence of a child. I never predict what a child will or will not do, because children have a way, if they are properly taught, of performing far beyond what their teacher expects of them. Sometimes the child who is fairly slow will answer a question which only the bright child was expected to answer, while failing to answer easy questions, so I am not going to make any predictions. I prefer to wait and see what the children do with the tests. The people whose business it is to handle the examinations and who are knowledgeable in the particular field of setting and marking examinations will determine what is to be done about the General Paper or the results when they are available. But, quite frankly, we cannot predict what the children will do. I say let us wait and see.

I think I have responded to the last comments. It was really only to jolt the memory of the honourable gentleman, who I am certain was at the age of 9 or 10 studying Meikle John's English History with details about Alfred the Great, Henry V, Henry VIII, and his wives, Elizabeth, proceeding all the way to Wellington and Napoleon. There was Geography, French and a variety of information. If he attended the honourable Mr. Parkinson's School, he would probably have received some applications of the rod to help him along. Then, triumphantly, he would announce that he had won a Primary to First Grade, foundation scholarship or whatever was available at 8, 9, 10 or 11 years of age. So we must try not to forget the past in our anxiety to make the present seem not as bright as it is thought to be.

I want to move from that on to this whole question of our education system. Our Minister of Education must be judged fairly. She is anxious that there should be high standards in education. She is firm and sincere, but I trust that she will learn to be patient and to realise that teachers have some of the same insights and attitudes as the society from which they come, and so perhaps they all need time to adjust to certain changes which might be seen as necessary. It is not advisable to rush any change in education, no matter how plausible, no matter how desirable it seems. It is always a good thing to give people a chance to adjust.

The tensions which we are observing, I think, come from the fact that we are working with certain concepts which, perhaps, were not so clearly expressed or seen when we were children. We see the need to train a much larger number of persons to match the demands of our development. We are very conscious of the claims of social justice. Implicit in what we are trying to do is the concept of democracy, that leadership potential is to be found in many areas and that we cannot predict in what levels of society unusual abilities will appear.

We think that the God-given right to choose is essential in the development of human personality and, therefore, we must have the right to choose, and we must fight vigorously to maintain that right. We think that we must have opportunity as equal as possible, because life is never fair, it is never 100 per cent just. There are always a variety of circumstances for which one has to make special concessions. It is necessary that children should have that opportunity to acquire the knowledge and the experiences which will enable them to share in contributing to the development of the society in which they live.

Finally, we have come to believe that the physically or mentally disabled also have the right to develop their potential. Within our system we are trying to meet these various demands. We are not a wealthy country and, therefore, we will even find that perhaps we have promised rather more than we can conveniently perform immediately. So, the system may seem sometimes to be falling short.

We are moving from a system of education which assumed that we should educate our leading citizens, and that such persons were most likely to be found among the academically intelligent, or those who had the benefit of material prosperity. Formerly, secondary and higher education would be provided for such persons. What we call elementary education would equip others for the world of manual work and other routine tasks. But always in Barbados, or from an early period in Barbados, there was some opportunity for the most able to climb into the upper levels of society.

The older secondary schools, when they came into existence, followed the dictates of special Acts, under which they were established. Their heads were given very wide powers, and at one time the governing bodies were independent, although the schools received a Government grant. Even the then Board of Education, and later the Director of Education, found that they had no control whatever over governing bodies. You can see that it is difficult for persons with a memory of that tradition to occupy positions, which usually carried this weight of authority, and find that they have not got quite the same amount of power or authority which their predecessors had.

In a community like ours, which has chosen the democratic way of life, there comes a realisation that we cannot determine who will become the leaders of the society. We may train one set of people, the voters may choose another. Nor can we say what persons are likely to have the potential to perform certain tasks most essential for the society in any given period. Indeed, we cannot even predict, so rapid are the changes in our own generation, exactly what our needs will be in even the immediate future.

2.25 p.m.

The Common Entrance Examination had to be there because of the need to select the people who would have the places which were available. We are not saying that it is a perfect instrument. We have not yet decided what we will do about it, but we will certainly have to have some means of informing us of what children are doing on their way through the system, and so that we do not find ourselves in the unhappy position of some countries, where children are found to go through the system and arrive at the top knowing very little or nothing.

In a small and poor community such as ours, we have to be prepared to use the opportunities which present themselves. And so, we are not going to set out, I hope, to cause specialization to take place too early. We must be creative enough to detect ways of ensuring our survival in a highly competitive world. We have to be fairly versatile. You would note that other communities with very limited physical resources, like Japan, Taiwan, Korea, have found some interesting and effective answers to a similar sort of situation. We must do the same.

Our own Government has decided that we should move in the direction of social justice; that is, giving to all our citizens the opportunity to develop their own potential and to share in the shaping of their society. In my opinion, the tensions that we see arising in education are rooted in the fact that we have not all accepted the full implications of this decision. It is an important decision, and when we seem to be grappling with the letter of the new Education Act, it is because we are odds with the spirit which the Act embodies.

The opportunity for secondary education is no longer an indication of social status — but there are still persons who feel that way. Our community asks of us that we wish for all children the opportunities and the good things which wise parents wish for their own children. Because our nation is not a wealthy one, it is difficult to meet the cost of realizing this challenging ideal.

We have a duty in assisting the Ministry in achieving its aim, in requiring that it has the machinery and the personnel to monitor the schools and ensuring that they

all achieve standards acceptable to those who wish institutions reflecting the best in educational thought and practice.

We are aware that all the secondary schools are not being successfully managed and developed. Indeed, some schools, once good, are obviously faltering, probably under the weight of the increased size of the student body. The Ministry will be faced with the continuing task of seeing that bad schools do not remain bad, and that schools, once successful, do not deteriorate.

Perhaps, we have failed to produce leadership with the vision and the skills which the organization of the new type of schools requires. We should be able to say truthfully to parents that they can confidently send their children to any of our secondary schools. As long as we cannot make that statement, then we have some way further to go.

I gather from the Minister's statements that not all secondary schools will have every kind of facility, but that all special facilities will be found in each zone. It seems to me, therefore, that eventually shifts from one school to another may occur because the child's potential is best developed at a school equipped for the particular training which the student requires. At the present time, some may not be aware that they can easily jump from the frying pan into the fire unless they have done some careful investigation of the more satisfactory haven which they seek when they change from one school to another.

Mr. President, I think it is important that our social goals should be clearly enunciated. Democracy is not only a form of Government — it is a way of life. In the world of today, that way of life is seriously challenged. Communities which have chosen a different pattern see that their citizens are indoctrinated and prepared for the pattern of life which their leaders have chosen.

We in the democratic countries seem to leave it to chance that our citizens understand what is required by them from the pattern of society which we have chosen. The attainment and the preservation of freedom is difficult. Yet, the human spirit requires the risk of freedom in order to achieve the best to which it can aspire.

An important function of the school must therefore be to ensure for its students participation in the making of a young community assisted by adults. They must learn to handle the tools of democracy, consultation, co-operative effort, concern for others, tolerance, loyal but thoughtful support, collective leadership, willingness to surrender the leadership position to others, and, of course, the attainment of excellence in the things which they attempt.

Our schools are now too large for any one person to control them. All the staff need to be involved, and the schools so arranged that the head can fulfil the most important demand of accountability for every child. The timetable is an essential tool in expressing, in practice, the philosophy and intention of those responsible for the school. The assembling of the essential information is a lengthy exercise, and the task cannot be lightheartedly assigned to someone who has neither the skill nor the essential knowledge to perform this important task.

2.35 p.m.

It is sad to hear of teachers free for more than half the week's teaching periods — Parents sometimes complain of children being unsupervised for several periods or lacking their timetable for several days. These matters, it seems, are not raised during Parent-Teacher meetings, which seem to be devoted to other matters such as fund raising.

Schools needing hundreds of chairs — not a few: 600 or 500 chairs — obviously indicates that the furniture is perhaps not sufficiently well constructed or that the children are not trained to take care of the furniture. There is nothing wrong with telling them what a chair or a desk costs, because their parents are telling them all day long what things at home cost. The arrangements for the repair of this furniture, I think, should be in the hands of persons like the heads, or the Executive Secretary which schools now have, and who can function as bursars and see that the furniture is immediately repaired. At most schools rooms where the children are supposed to be standing are full of furniture which has been accumulated to be repaired.

I think the repair of furniture should be decentralized. A headmistress will get her chairs repaired, because the village carpenter is going to come in the evening or on Saturday. His child is likely to be in that school, and he is going to take a personal interest in getting that furniture repaired.

Parents must understand the essential part they play in passing on cultural values and providing interpretation and meaning to the experiences of the child. In fact, a famous modern educational psychologist has built a whole course of teaching on the theory that children must have a parent or someone as a kind of intermediary for interpreting life if that child is to develop properly. Parents must not feel that the job of helping their children to grow up and to learn is the teachers' only. One of the things that Parent-Teacher Associations should aim to do is to bring parents forward into some of these new concepts and impress upon them the vital role that they have to play in the success of their children. Teachers must also accept that, together with the parents, they can, through the school, enrich the cultural experience of the children.

Teachers are overcome by the sheer weight of numbers. They think: "With six hundred we might try, three hundred, yes. Twelve hundred, we cannot manage it". But we must have faith in the children we teach, and we must have the organizing skill to keep them in touch with small groups of people for a sufficient length of time so as to give them the necessary support and feeling of security that they need in a big amorphous kind of school community.

We are aware of the efforts to cater to the demands of advances in technology — we hear of computers — but we must provide for the development of the inner resources of the child; that experience of joy of being part of a virile community, and of taking into life that confidence and those resources that will stand the test of all the vicissitudes and changes that the young person will encounter. There are the supports which our schools need if the children are really to have equality of opportunity. Let us not only have computers. Let us make certain that the counselling services are there, and that welfare services are available, because in these times of unemployment, there are going to be some hungry children. There are going to be some children without shoes, and all kinds of essentials of this sort.

The school must be sufficiently close to the child, sufficiently accepting, and so staffed that children can find someone to whom they can go to discuss and express any feeling they have. Girls are particularly anxious about examinations and things of this sort, and there are children who take to drugs because they have the false idea that this will cause them to perform better. We have that problem within the schools, and we must not think merely of big projects but how in small ways the school can provide the kind of environment that supports the child and gives it confidence and helps it through the difficult business of growing up.

We know, of course, that unemployment has been increasing, and the two groups most affected I feel are the young school leavers and the elderly. Young persons have to be prepared for the fact that they may be unemployed for sometime. Indeed, in some developed countries there is the feeling that, with the advance of technology, the chances are that young people coming out of school may never be employed, and that some countries will never again see full employment. Therefore, we must encourage children to be versatile to have the initiative to create self-employment and to accept the jobs that they can find until they can find the jobs they like.

Schemes for young unemployed persons through the various branches of the Armed Forces have been set up in Britain. The young persons are bedecked in uniform, which would cheer the heart of Gabby. They are complete with boots and cap. They seem to be enjoying the scheme; they are doing very well, and they are even

taught to use weapons. There is no reason why our young persons should not have training and skills which can be given by the Defence Force. Indeed, when the Force was being set up our Prime Minister informed us that it will be a useful force which will have no time for mischief, and since the Chief Welfare Officer has been seconded to give the scheme his attention, he will be seeing, I am sure, that there is opportunity for community service and leadership training. I think that those of us who believe in a voluntary youth service should all be ready to come forward and offer our voluntary service to the scheme.

I would like to point out, however, that we find it very difficult to find adult leaders for all the various forms of youth work. Nobody complained about the cadets who are taught to use weapons. As I understand it, the National Youth Scheme will provide no training in the use of weapons and, therefore, I feel that we should face the fact of the unemployed young people who easily lose hope. There is nothing to prevent our being critical of any aspect of the scheme we do not like, but we should not condemn it before it gets off the ground, and we must remember that the assistance of Armed Forces in training the young is used in many countries.

2.45 p.m.

I would like to mention in passing the Government Industrial Schools. I know how interested the newspapers were in one of those schools, and I would like to say that it has been making very good progress. I regret, however, to find that at the Summervale School, where the girls stay, there has been a fairly big increase in the numbers. I have never seen so many children there. When last I was there I think there were 18 or 19 girls, and an S.O.S. has been sent to Government for staffing and increased space for the school.

I am surprised that after all that has taken place in those institutions the staffing, though it has been promised, has not arrived and I want everybody to picture what a strain it is for people in an institution of that kind not to have all the encouragement that they need. I feel that if a member of staff is sent, even if the school cannot be given all the space required, the mere fact that the response has been immediate I think will be encouraging.

The big problem at that institution is really rehabilitation after the child has left there. We see children making very great improvement. When, however, they go out of the institution, people who have declared such an interest in them in the Press do not offer them jobs. Nobody fosters them, there is no means of supervising them adequately after a certain period, and so they drift again into the very circumstances which caused them to err in the first place. This is something to which we are giving a very great deal of thought.

As far as the employment of adults is concerned, I would like to point out that unemployment has always been a feature of West Indian life, but nowadays, people are more impatient about such things. I am wondering whether we should not now be thinking of ways in which we can share existing employment rather than turning people out of jobs. Can we not arrange more jobs in shifts and share the work that is available so that everybody will get something though nobody will get perhaps as much as they might like. Significant pockets of poverty do exist. They are not perhaps as obvious as we might think, because Barbadians always somehow contrive to be well dressed, but in a country which boasts of one motor car to every seven people and one telephone for every three, we should find a way to deal with the kinds of poverty which might be avoided.

Housing is the greatest problem, and it is a problem especially for ageing people. They may have kept the roof over their heads during their working years, they retire at 60 or 65, and by 80 the house is obviously decaying around them. The elderly citizens are pensioners mostly, and they find the repair and maintenance of these houses impossible. Even where Government offers assistance, it has a way of not arriving too quickly. In some instances, I have helped them to make applications, and alas, applicants die before the repairs are done. I then very much regret that they did not have the privilege of dying with dignity.

It might be possible to secure woods from places like Guyana or Belize which are harder than the woods which we usually import. I know that our workmen might not yet have the skills for using that kind of material efficiently, because they are not accustomed to those woods, but I think we should be looking at some solutions of that sort.

I know that in the Development Plan mention of special plans for the housing of the old is made, and I look forward to an imaginative approach to this problem. We may not be able to keep all the aged in single houses, we might have to think of linked houses in districts or parishes. Even though there are services for the aged, there is an urgent need for neighbourly assistance from individuals and from groups. When the home helper departs after two or three hours of work, the old person is left there all through the night, and there is ample room for the kind of neighbourly help which we can each give to some old person living near us. I think that some way should be found to arrange that the poor and aged do not have to spend long hours waiting around for whatever services they have to get. They go to clinics and sit there for hours before they can receive attention. It seems to me that the timing of appointments could certainly reduce these lengthy waits and would express what we say in the spirit of democracy, that each person is a person of worth.

Briefly, I want to refer to the Cultural Foundation. I do not understand all the various parts of the Ministry of Culture, but I noticed with some consternation that Community Development Officers seem to have gone across to another part of the Ministry. I hope that we have not relinquished the idea of the need for community development. Culture is expressed not only by the way we entertain ourselves, our leisure time activities – song, drama, dance, – it is expressed also in our work. If you dig up the remains of old civilisations you find the pots and tools that were used. The people left behind their structures and the kinds of things that they used in everyday life, and so our work also expresses our culture.

I would like to remind people that the beginning of what is now the IDC was really craft projects directed by the Social Welfare Department, by persons like Mrs. Thelma Vaughan, Miss Majorie Blackman and Mrs. Marjorie Manning. They were the people who worked encouraging the crafts which, today, the IDC sees as a very valuable form of activity.

The purpose of the Community Development Officer is the stimulating of local communities to attack their felt needs in joint activity. We need to have planned social change. We must involve people so that they can take more of their life into their own hands and not rely only on political initiatives. Countries far more developed, far wealthier than ours, see the need for stimulating and supporting the activities of local communities. These are the strengths of the society.

I know that the Cultural Officers have done a good job with NIFCA – we see a lot more singing and dancing. I would, however, like to see more of our adult professional performers, whether it be in dance, music or singing, have some periods within the festival for performing; not as competitors, but affording the young people the opportunity of seeing the best that our society can produce and so setting standards for the younger people.

2.55 p.m.

I saw the suggestion by one of the artists that there could be an exhibition of work of persons not competing, but only displaying the best that we have in art, and I think that we can carry that forward in all the other activities. I do not think we should make it purely a children's festival, because the children must have something to set their standards by, so we should ask some of our leading professionals who do not want, after all, to be competing with anybody, to give performances.

I do not know if the Ministry of Culture could rise to bringing in some experts from outside to comment on much participation. We know the steelbands of Trinidad made great strides forward when they had top-ranking musicians brought in to tell them how the steelband should sound like a symphony orchestra.

I must admit, in mentioning about Community Development, that I have a vested interest in it, because I was trained in community development but stayed in teaching. I do not know which particular profession benefitted by my presence, whether it was teaching or not.

Finally, I would like to say that I hope that the Minister of Education will be aware that in the effort to obtain higher standards she might contribute in some way to teachers feeling stress and pressure. Their work is difficult. However you look at it, it is difficult, and they seem to be unhappy and to feel that the few privileges which they happen to have are being removed. They envy their friends who do much easier work for much bigger salaries in other kinds of work, and I think that everything should be done to encourage them to bring ideas from the classroom.

Ideas should be coming up from the person in front of the blackboard to the Ministry. Teachers should not only be reading the books that other people are writing about children and the teaching of children. We should be producing some of our own books about what we have observed about our children and what we want to do with them, what motivates them. I think we should give our teachers that kind of encouragement and strengthen their confidence. Whatever we do in education, the teacher is the most important factor in the system.

I note with a little trepidation the publication of examination results. This practice has advantages and disadvantages. Perhaps the intention is to spur effort, but it can also have the effect of making people over-anxious because those results, as they appear, can be misleading to those who do not have the necessary stock of information for interpreting the results. For example, it is not enough to say that a group of children or a school achieved a certain percentage of successes. This does not tell us how many children sat from that school, or how the number of children sitting for examinations at 5th Form level as compared with the number of children who entered school.

I entered school in a form of 28. I sat the G.C.E. in a form of 3. We all passed. Our school jubilantly declared 100 per cent success. Nobody asked what became of the other 25 children who entered the school with us. So a lot more information, more than just the percentage passes is needed. How many children sat the examination? If two children sat the examination and both passed, that is 100 per cent. If 50 sat and 40 pass, that would not be 100 per cent success, yet the second result was harder to achieve. We also do not know the condition of the children when they enter the school.

I was at one of the newer secondary schools when the head stated that a student in the Common Entrance

Examination had scored wonderful totals of 6 and 9. That boy was walking across the platform as the best student of the year with his arms full of books. Therefore even if the results of that school do not appear to be as good as the ones of another school, the fact remains that those teachers have indicated their ability to accept a child where it is, not to be upset by his unpromising performance and to bring him up to a high level of performance. I would not hesitate to send my child to that school. You can send yours where you like.

Some see the publication of these results as a spur to effort, but as you see, they can be misleading. I do not feel that a parent should ever be given a child's quotient. It has no meaning to the parent. A parent does not know that when a child scores 0 he may have a quotient of 140, so when the child scores 150 quotient, a parent brought up to see 100 per cent as wonderful thinks 150 is just fine. Parents have a different picture if they are given the raw score. It might be a very disappointing experience, but when parents have the quotient, they really do not understand what you are telling them, so I feel that using these quotients can be very misleading. Unless we can assess the qualities of the entrants, we do not know how to compare the work of the school on such entrants.

Schools which accept students with low scores may not receive enough credit for what they have achieved. When I talk about being humble, in the presence of the child and not predicting what the child could do, I am thinking of children who enter private schools with low scores and end up achieving a lot and topping their forms. Those are often the children for whom transfers are for, because they are paying fees to attend private schools. There is room for some flexibility in the system, so arrange it that our teachers can, with integrity, make the necessary adjustments with the consent of the Ministry.
3.05 p.m.

There must be accountability for all children, and therefore we must not say that a school is so big we do not know what is happening. We must see to it that we do not have these places which have no warmth. Our children like warmth and they like happiness, and I feel that that is just as essential for them as getting them through an examination.

Mr. President, thank you for the latitude you have permitted me so that I have been able to complete my comments.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. President, I was checking on the Hansard primarily to see the strategy that I have used in this debate over the past eight years, but also that which has been used by other honourable Senators. Over the past eight years I have looked at the

manifestos of the Barbados Labour Party starting from 1976, and I have taken the Estimates and compared the provisions made therein with the promises set out in the manifestos to see if we were heading in the direction that we had set ourselves.

I am happy to report that, by and large, we have not failed the electorate in that regard. We have done most of what we said we would actually do. I must confess that we have done some things which we did not state categorically, but these things, I am also happy to state, have redounded to the benefit of the country as a whole.

I was fortunate this year to receive a copy of the Barbados Development Plan for 1983-88, which I believe, Mr. President, has already been made a document of this House. It is very instructive to consider the provisions of the Estimates for each year between now and 1988 against the background of the Development Plan for Barbados, indeed against any development plan which is charted for this country. I choose to use the development plan as charted by the Barbados Labour Party because the one that was charted in 1976 made sense, and consequently, if we want to be logical, we must assume that the one that is charted for 1983-88 must make sense too. I hope in so doing to offer, where I can and if I can, certain, as I hope, constructive criticism relating to certain Ministries and departments which fall within the ambit of the Estimates.

I would preface these criticisms by stating that I am reasonably happy with the operations of Government, the last year's operation, and the projected operation for 1984-85, and therefore my criticisms, where they occur, will not be large or too harsh.

I note from the foreword to the Development Plan, which incidentally was written by the Honourable Prime Minister, that the triple objectives which have been the bedrock of this Government's development strategy since 1976 are sustained economic growth, the eradication of poverty and broad-based social development, and he says that these remain the primary considerations of this plan.

If one were to comment on each of these objectives, one would have to state that this country from 1976 has achieved a certain level of economic growth which, although it was not sustained at the same level throughout, has been sustained. It is not like when we took over in 1976, when we found nothing in the Treasury and found that economic growth had come to a standstill. Indeed, it had set into a state of decline.

If you look at the question of eradication of poverty, it will be an untruthful person who would make so bold as to state that the lot of Barbadians has not improved since 1976. As I go through the individual Heads, I hope to show how the allocation and spending of

resources each year have led towards the eradication of poverty in this country.

Even in the parish of St. Philip, which in 1981 was not fortunate to score a member of the Barbados Labour Party as a representative, there has been a discernable attempt at the eradication of poverty. I do not want to contribute any gains or benefits accruing to the good people of St. Philip to any attempts that I have made to secure for them their just entitlement, although I must admit that I have tried my best to make sure that they are not hard done by. Far be it from me to seek to arrogate to myself any praise that there may be in that regard. I will leave it to the good people of St. Philip to be their own judges in 1986 or 1985, or whenever the time comes. Be that as it may, I can state that from driving around that parish, which has perhaps been the hardest done by, I discern some attempt to alleviate the suffering and the poverty which had been inflicted upon the people of that parish in the fifteen years before the Barbados Labour Party came to power.

In terms of broad-based social development, if as is often stated we witness in 1966 the transformation of this country from a market to a country, from 1976 to the present we have witnessed the transformation of a large sector of this country from a beggar's bowl to a fountain where coins are thrown and people go and pick them out. We have witnessed a situation where we have been supporting not only our own nationals, but also the nationals of other countries. We have transformed the country because of our broad-based social development policies. It does not therefore behove any member of the Opposition, particularly a member of the trade union movement, who is, or should be, well aware of the strides which the workers have made in this country, to come in here or to go anywhere else, even if it is in St. Peter later on this year, to try to bamboozle the people of this island that this Government has not seriously tackled the crime of poverty.

As if to underline paragraph 1 of the Foreword to the National Development Plan, the Prime Minister in his final paragraph stated that the overall objectives and targets which we have set ourselves are rooted in the ambition of a better life for every Barbadian and a more hospitable environment for those who visit our shores.
3.15 p.m.

I can state without a shadow of a doubt that since 1976 Barbadians generally have experienced a better standard of life, better than it was immediately prior to 1976. The visitors, too, up to a few years ago, have been enjoying a more hospitable environment once they visited our shores. I am going to speak more fully on that when I come to deal with the topic of tourism.

I am also going to query the statistics that are being bandied about, which do not appear to be emanating

from any reliable source, regarding the increase in the number of crimes against visitors, the increase in the number of crimes on the beach. And, generally speaking, the type of time that visitors are having here. I am not going to deny the fact that more harassment is being reported and that we need to pull up our socks if we are to keep on attracting a certain type of visitor to our shores. But I am going to query, at the appropriate time in my discourse, the statistics relating to tourists.

The entire fiscal and monetary policy of the Government envisages, in the words of the Plan: "bold and imaginative initiatives to allocate and manage scarce human, natural and financial resources in a rational manner, and with optimal results". That in fact, as has been said in here time and time again — at least I have said it on more than one occasion — is all that these Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure set out to do — to allocate and manage all of our resources in a rational manner with optimal results. So all we need to do is to have a look at these Estimates and to see if, indeed, they are designed to achieve that fair, large and reasonable allocation as is envisaged in the National Development Plan.

The Estimates are replete with examples of bold, imaginative initiatives to achieve that fair allocation. If we look at most of the Heads, which can be classified as falling under the productive sectors, we find that there has been an increase in the allocations. Except, I think, for a decrease in the Vote which is granted to Education this year — because I regard education as one of the productive sectors as well; indeed, without the education, we might not even have a productive sector — throughout the Estimates we find that there have been increases in the allocations. This not only denotes that there has been some increased buoyancy in the economy of this country, it also denotes Government's desire to achieve sustained economic growth and to eradicate poverty.

Agriculture has been given an increase in its allocation over what it received last year. I am not going to be critical of the Ministry. I think that I have had the opportunity to observe it for several years now, and I am reasonably happy with the performance of agriculture to date.

Notwithstanding that, there are some initiatives which I think the sector can take, which will go a long way towards helping us eradicate poverty. The ideas may seem small in terms of the entire context of agriculture, but if we are going to eradicate poverty, we can only eradicate it from among the poor people. Therefore, once again, I want to urge the Ministry of Agriculture to establish markets in the country areas where poor people, who perhaps raise four chickens, grow five breadfruit trees, twenty pounds of limes and this sort of thing, can go and sell their produce, get their money and go home so that they can buy some groceries.

They are going to tell me that they have the Barbados Marketing Corporation. They are going to tell me that this is the function of the Barbados Agricultural Society and that they can take them to town. A lot of things are wrong with that. It has not worked, and I have no reason to believe that it will work. I do not believe that a person with fifty or sixty limes, five or six heads of cabbage, two or three chickens and a pig will come to the Barbados Marketing Corporation or will go up at the BAS. Those organizations are, in my view, catering to the larger farmers.

I have, on a previous occasion, asked that the slaughtering market at Six Cross Roads be converted into a facility such as I have just been asking for. It has turned out to be a good thing that was not in fact converted, because when the BMC could not be used as a slaughtering point, use was made of the market in St. Philip for the purpose of slaughtering.

Notwithstanding that, I can see a need throughout the country areas, and it will have to be spearheaded by Government if it not going to be spearheaded by the Barbados Agricultural Society, if Mr. Benn, who is at the head of that body, is too blind to see that it is needed. The only thing he can see is to criticize the Government. I do not think he sees anything at all that would help poor people.

I believe it was Mr. Benn's idea to get the President of the Pig Farmers' Association and of the Poultry Farmers Association as well, Mr. Rayside, to ask the banks not to lend poor people money to build pig pens. It was Mr. Benn's idea. I do not think that they have the interest of the poor people at heart at all. The people they refer to as the small farmers are the people who can go to the bank and borrow \$200 000 to build large pens for their animals.

I am concerned about the people who raise poultry and a pig or two in their backyards — country folk. There is nothing against the Health Regulations in that regard, because they dispose of the waste in a proper manner in the country. I do not think that the flies create a problem.
4.25 p.m.

Country people try to be self-sufficient in terms of production of poultry, meat, and vegetables, and we have to try and assist them. I think if the BAS is not going to do it, then the Ministry of Agriculture will have to do it. We have to create small markets in the country where these persons can trade. They may be able to encourage some system of barter, because once the agency is created, God knows what will go on there and how people will make use of the institutions in order to dispose of their produce, poultry and vegetables.

I am all for the creation of big fish markets. There are markets at Oistins and Speightstown — and they even promised one in St. Philip; they promised to put a lot of things up there. But if we are not going to make them fairly accessible to the poor sections of the society, that policy is not going to work. There is really no point in encouraging the fishermen in St. Philip to take their catch to Oistins and then ask the people in St. Philip to catch a bus to go to Oistins to buy fish. We are going to have to create these markets where the country folk can use them.

The Ministry of Agriculture will have to adopt that policy. It cannot be done by the private sector. The people who are running the private sector, a Mr. Rayside and his people, are not interested in the backyard organization at all. As a matter of fact, I have had the occasion to discuss these very matters with the small farmers, and, the small people say that their interest is in having the Government pass legislation which will stop poor people in the country from keeping a pig in the backyard or a sheep. I hope that this message will get across to the Ministry of Agriculture and the various agencies of that Ministry, because if the BAS cannot be persuaded to accommodate the small producers, then the agencies of the Ministry of Agriculture could be used for that endeavour.

This particular commercial agricultural activity used to be catered to years ago by the hawker with the basket on her head. They used to come around the villages and buy two or three chickens from everybody and then go to the central market in Bridgetown or wherever and sell them. I know people in the country used to keep chickens and sell them, specifically at times when they wanted to pay school fees and things of this sort, to the hawker. We no longer have hawkers like that. We are now telling the poor people to take their produce to Bridgetown and, in times of high unemployment, we as a Government, which is committed not only to the eradication of poverty but indeed to the eradication of poverty through the creation of employment, ought to be exploring every conceivable opportunity to create employment for the people, and I am making a cry particularly for country people.

My final point on agriculture relates to meat processing. I have attended several meetings with the Minister, and I am very, very impressed with his capabilities and ability to handle the farmers and meat processors. I will only urge him to continue to keep a very close watch on the pig producers. They want to create a monopoly in this country for their own benefits. From their arguments, I do not think they have the interest of this country at heart at all. If they do, it is secondary to their own interest. I suppose you can say that it is all quite natural — home drums beat first — but if we are going to purport to be espousing national policies, then we should think nationally. We should not

ask the country to restrict the importation of pork or to do one thing or the other which turns out to be to the disadvantage of other small producers simply because we want to benefit as individual producers. We ought to be very careful that when the Pig Farmers Association and the Poultry Farmers Association speak as a body, they are not speaking only in their individual interest but have the interest of the country at heart.

The papers have a way of printing everything they say willingly — without question. In that regard, it is my view that the journalists have their responsibilities. It is not the function of a journalist simply to take a Press Release and put it on the front page of a newspaper without querying it at all. It is the duty of the journalist — they are not going to print what I say; they never do — to question that Press Release, to find out if this is true, to get hold of somebody else who is in the know and ask them if they have a counter-argument. They should not take every Press Release from the Pig Farmers Association and put it on the front page of the newspaper, and then have lawyers or meat processors replying to them by way of a letter. To their credit, they do publish the letters in response. But their duty, as investigative journalists is to get hold of the processors and practise balanced journalism.

I am not accusing the Press of wholesale, unbalanced journalism. But I have been following their trend of reporting in relation to the Pig Farmers Association, BAS and agriculture generally, and they are given to journalism that is not balanced. They never follow up and print an alternative view. Had they done so a few months ago, they would have discovered when the Pig Farmers Association was complaining that one meat processor had been given the authority to bring in a certain amount of meat and to buy pigs from them, and had complied with all the conditions that he had given.

I turn now to the Ministry of Legal Affairs, and I will be brief. Essentially what I want to do is to lend my voice and my weight of support, for what it is worth — I anticipated that reaction to that statement, Mr. President — to call to have the construction of the Supreme Court expedited. I am not going to regurgitate what was said at the Other Place, albeit it is true. As a matter of fact, I will go further. I would like to see the Government rent one of C. O. Williams' bulldozers and bulldoze District C tomorrow. I think it is a total disgrace. No magistrate, no lawyer, no witness, or accused person ought to be asked to go to District C. I believe that in the first place, toilets are non-existent. I know a new one has been in the pipeline for sometime, but it is in St. Philip, and it is not coming. There have been plans to put a fire station and a Magistrate's Court at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, for a lot of years. David Simmons has been calling for them for a lot of years. I do not know if part of the reason he lost is because they have not been forthcoming. I am not even

arguing now for them at Six Cross Roads — I would prefer to have them in Gemswick.

My whole point is to let us do something about the courts at District C. District B is not half as bad as District C. I know it is overcrowded as well, but we are going to have the Court at St. George. I have been in active politics since 1976, and I can understand that. The Minister for Legal Affairs is the representative for St. George. But let us be fair, Mr. President.....

Asides.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Is it not his part of St. George? Is it his colleague's part? St. George is St. George, and I am not going to quarrel about that — I can understand that — but all I am asking is that we do something about District C in the next round.

As far as the Supreme Court is concerned, the Bar Association has recently purchased a table about half the size as this, with half the number of chairs, I believe, as a gift to the Chief Justice's Chambers. As I said earlier, I was checking my past contributions on Estimates debate, and I have spoken on no less than three occasions about the condition of the lobby to the Chief Justice's Chambers. There has been some improvement as a result of the purchase of that table and those chairs, thanks to the Bar Association, but it would not only take tables and chairs to improve that. As a matter of fact, it needs a bulldozer too. The Chief Justice needs to come out. I am ashamed that dignitaries go in there. He needs to be brought out and put in proper surroundings.
3.35 p.m.

We need to get the Supreme Court. I understand we are going to get it possibly next year, but we ought not to defer it beyond next year. I do not want next year to hear that we are building something else so we are going to defer the Supreme Court a bit more. I do not want to hear, for example, that we are building headquarters for the Barbados National Bank or anything of that sort, except we are going to construct the Supreme Court.

We have been driven almost to a situation of despondency now, because the Chief Marshal's building has been burnt to the ground and they are being temporarily housed at Simeon Hunte & Sons' building at Roebuck Street. That cannot continue for too long. We need, as a matter of urgency, to have this Supreme Court constructed.

If we look at the Estimates of Revenue under Legal Affairs, we will notice how much revenue is brought in by (a) the Magistrates' Courts, Civil Jurisdiction; (b) the Magistrates' Courts, Criminal Jurisdiction; and (c) the Supreme Court. That is not to say anything at all about the Registration Office, which brings in about \$2 million.

That does not include the fines imposed in the magistrates' courts, which amount to about half million dollars. In all, the revenue brought in by those courts is quite impressive. It is an amazing thing, so there is no good reason for deferring that. Ironically enough, those courts will pay for themselves in a short space of time.

I want to retort to Senator Lynch's idea about Summervale. If we stop this practice of imprisoning people for what a lot of other reasonable, sensible citizens regard as foolishness, and instead put a fine on them, we will bring in more revenue. Recently the Prime Minister himself publicly commented on the fact that so many people were earning terms of imprisonment. Every lawyer out there shares that sentiment, and really, at least at the magistrates' court level, we are witnessing terms of imprisonment being handed out for what the average reasonable citizen would regard as foolishness, things that used to be settled at village level a few years ago. When you impose a fine in those circumstances, then we will enhance the revenue.

Aside.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: The only sensible thing Senator Hall has said in this Senate since his return from India is to let them pay for the crime.

Still on Legal Affairs, it has become fashionable that when the police are criticised, whether in this place or elsewhere, it does not go down well with them. If a lawyer criticises them in court, or if they are criticised in the Other Place, or if they are criticised in here, it does not go down well with them, even if that criticism is constructive and well meaning. I do not understand why certain members of the Police Force ought to regard themselves as being beyond criticism, and as a result go out of their way to get you, as it were.

We in here are not above criticism. The members in the Other Place are not above criticism, the Ministers are not above criticism, no other Government Department is above criticism. Why then should the police be above criticism? I am going to speak fearlessly, and I am going to take any consequences that might come. They must learn to take criticism when it is levelled at them. If the critic is wrong, they must point out where he is wrong and they will get a suitable apology. If he is right, then they must seek to correct the defects which were pinpointed. It is not good enough for them that because they are criticised, they take it personally, and when you go out there the police think we are getting at each policeman individually. We are not. At least I am not.

There are a few things they have to do. There is still evidence of police brutality. I know it is fairly difficult to win what we call a *voir dire* in the court, that is, a trial within a trial, to prove that the police beat the accused

person. Sometimes the accused person does not even know the name of the policeman who beat him. Sometimes they beat him in such rapid succession he does not know who inflicts which blow. Sometimes they come from behind and beat from behind. I do not care what the Attorney General tells me, I do not care what the Commissioner of Police tells me, I know that there is too much evidence of police brutality. It must stop. There is no need for it.

If we are going to introduce scientific modes of investigation and legal methods of prosecution, then we have a Police Commissioner who is qualified in both respects. He ought to insist that his subordinates follow the example which he sets, or at least operate within the parameters which he gives to them. It is not good enough for him to say he will do this, and ensure that that is done, and then all of a sudden it breaks down at the middle order. We must ensure that this police brutality such as now exists ceases. I do not think it is as rampant as it was a couple of years ago, but it still exists.

The best way to prevent it is by instituting the system which operates in Scotland. As you are arrested you have a right to have a lawyer present. The argument used by the police against that is that the lawyers do not let the accused talk. That is interesting, because 98 per cent of the prosecutions here are only won where the police have a statement from the accused. Something is lacking.

The policy is that the police should investigate and then arrest. Is the policy here that they are arresting and then investigating, consequently they can only secure a conviction if they have a written statement? Because 98 per cent of the cases are won in the Supreme Court on the basis of statements supposedly given by the accused. How come? It is my view that the police are arresting and then investigating, and only they know how they are getting these statements.

I, like everybody else, want to see criminals caught, not only from a pecuniary point of view — from the point of view of protection as well. From the point of view of the society, it is important that criminals are apprehended. 3.45 p.m.

I had to declare an interest, because the more better off I would be, but the point is that I want to see the police have efficiency in their jobs. I want to see the investigative techniques developed further. I want to see more training for them.

Asides.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: They have good prosecuting Counsel. I want to see more training for them. Give the actual prosecutors more training so that they will understand the laws of evidence, and so that the magistrates do not have to bend over backwards to help the police with their cases. If the magistrates did not

bend over backwards, 95 per cent of those police cases would be lost on the type of evidence that they give in court.

Sometimes it is a matter of ignoring the evidence as it unfolded and the magistrate bringing his common-sense and intelligence to bear upon the matter. That is how the decisions are made. But if he convicted on every case on the standard of evidence as it unfolds before him, 98 per cent of the accused persons would be acquitted. You only have to go into the magistrate's court and see. People come out of the court quarrelling every day saying "Man, he should not lock him up."

We need improved training at that level, if we must stop the police from beating people to give statements in order to gain convictions later on.

There are one or two other things they can do to improve the administration of the Police Force. We have a situation where every time you have an accident — and for the life of me I do not know why we in Barbados cannot yet see it fit to institute the British system, of getting the driver, where there is no personal injury, to call the insurance company — the first thing we do here is to call the Police. First you call the police, then you call the lawyer, and then you call the insurance. You waste a lot of time in these instances where there are no injuries and sometimes minor or trivial damage. I think it is wrong.

The police made a statement the other day that where such cases occur and there are no personal injuries, they will not prosecute. I do not think they have been sticking to that. If they have been, I want them to come out and give us statistics, because I am still being called upon to defend persons who have been in accidents where no personal injuries occur. That does not irk me though, because we are getting our pecuniary advantage to that.

What irks me is this. The police is called to an accident, sometimes a straight road accident, one vehicle going northerly and the other going westerly, and they collide for some reason or the other, and they call the police. The police officiate, take measurements and then choose one of them to prosecute — and they do not prosecute the other. It is absurd and it is wrong.

The police are constituting themselves as investigators, judge and jury, and trials reveal to the police that it is wrong. They should not accept that and, most unfortunately, we have some magistrates who would convict the persons that are brought before them. How on earth you can do that I do not know!

You have a situation where a man says to the police, "I was going up the road. I was going up on my

left. He was coming down on his left. He hit me. I do not know how." The other man says, "I was going up on my left. He was coming down on his left. He hit me. I do not know how." And they convict one man! Absurd! They are investigators, judge and jury; they have no regard for the rules of natural justice whatsoever. That practice must stop. The police must stop it. If they are not sure, if they have to charge, let them charge both, but do not charge one.

In any event, some of these accidents are so minor that they should put the trouble on the insurance companies. The insurance companies are making a lot of money. They should have accident investigators to call out. If they call the police and the police ascertains that there are no personal injuries, they should then say: "Call your Insurance, not us. You are wasting Government funds. Call the insurance companies. They are making a lot of money."

In America and England that is what obtains. Sometimes it is quicker, because they decide on the spot who is wrong. If they have to call out a lawyer, then all the better for the lawyers. But it should not have a thing to do with the Police, wasting time, having the police being judge and jury and then not even remember the measurements they took.

I also want to see us introduce a system of fixed penalties. I am tired going to the magistrate's court and finding 80 and 90 cases. Most are that somebody was parked for five minutes on Roebuck Street, they want to plead guilty anyway — and sometimes it has to be adjourned — and the policeman feels smart.

It is a waste of time and money again, making the policeman feel important and harassing the driver when he wants to take someone's name and address: "You are giving it to me too fast. I have to write it down." If the driver is in a hurry and he wants to give the policeman his name and address, get away and go and pay the fine, you have the policeman saying: "You are giving me it too fast. You are in a hurry. I cannot write so fast" — harassing the driver. Stop it. Introduce fixed fines. If a man is illegally parked, give him a fixed fine and let him pay it. If he challenges it, let him take it to court. Create a system where if the driver or the owner of the car challenges that, then he signs the form and says to take it to court. That is the only way we should be going to court. I know it is going to reduce the little monies in the pockets of the lawyers, especially the young ones, but they will have to find some other way of succeeding. The time has come when we have to put the national interest first.

There are certain other areas concerning the police, but I do not really want to appear to be too harsh on them today. I am going to reserve some for later on and see what reaction I get first.

I want to turn to Housing and Lands. I am being urged to turn to Tourism. I have found myself in so much hot water on this one last time that I am treading very carefully on that issue, but I have to say a few words on it.

How much more time do I have, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I will give you fifteen minutes.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I am most grateful to you. I will spend five minutes on this, five on Tourism and five on Education.

I want to speak on the Ministry of Housing and Lands. I am going to restrict myself to the National Conservation Commission — but not to praise it. I think the time has come when we should stop accepting the praises which we have been getting and to try to highlight some of the things concerning us.

I want to just spend a few minutes on this whole question of the beach vendors and the licences. I do not want to create any difficulties about it, because we are now at a critical stage where we are trying to involve the hoteliers and the beach vendors into arriving at a compromise situation which will be beneficial to the beach vendors, will not be harmful to the tourists, visitors or indeed locals using the beach, and will not unduly work out to be a burden on the hoteliers.

In this regard, I must say that the hoteliers are not all that they are coming out to be now. Some of them are too cheap. I am sorry that Senator Seale is not here, because he is one. Senator Ward is one, too. Senator Howell's hotel is not near the beach; he is on the other side of the road.

For about six years we have been trying to persuade the hoteliers to join with us. We did not have any money. We told them that if they put up kiosks where the beach vendors could sell their wares, then we would be happy to confine them to those kiosks. Indeed, we had the legislation for this. I drafted the rules subject to which the licences are issued. Those Rules are shown at the back of the licences. They went to Cabinet for approval. They never ever went to the Attorney General's Chambers. They were drafted in my Chambers and we reserved to ourselves the right to restrict the vendors to the kiosks where they were provided.

We implored the hoteliers to construct the kiosks. Several did not comply. Paradise complied. They built some beautiful kiosks which blended in well with the surroundings, with nice locations which were not a burden to the hotel. It was advantageous to the vendors and it has worked satisfactorily, or relatively so, for the past three or four years. The difficulties we used to have

at Paradise Beach have dissipated to the extent that I am now regarded as a favourite visitor at Paradise. That has worked.

3.55 p.m.

Sam Lords Castle put up a big thing like a cow pen, a high wind came one day and blew it down. It blew off the galvanise top. A fisherman told me he was in the way and he almost got his head cut off when the top blew off. Since then, we have been asking them to put up more and better facilities. They have a facility there, but it is not permanent, and it is barely serving its purpose. They have agreed to put up a proper one, but they did not comply properly when we asked them. They put the thing at the very back of the beach which is not regularly frequented by visitors, out of the way of ready sales, and it was not a desirable design at all — it did not provide adequate accommodation.

Do not talk about Holiday Inn at all ! I said Sam Lords put up something like a cow pen; Holiday Inn put up something like a goat pen. It was about two feet by three feet, with some raw galvanise, as if they had cut down two drums and put on the sides. We went up there one morning. I do not remember who the manager was, but he said: "Look it there." He was more Bajan than me. I said "How do you mean look it there? What is that?" He said "That is the kiosk for vendors." I said "How many vendors do you have here?" and he said: "Eight". I asked how many did he think could get in there, and he said that they have to try and get in there. That was about four years ago, and do you know where they put it? They put it at the point — and here again I am sorry Senator Seale is not here — where the Turf Club members exercise their horses.

That is another nuisance. The Turf Club exercise the horses where the hotel people want to bathe. Right in the people's back yard they want to bathe the horses. I am a member of the Turf Club now and as soon as I start attending meetings I am going to deal with that. They have improved in the last few weeks, but it is not good enough.

Sandy Lane expressed an interest in complying, but they have never done so.

The sum total of all this is that, for years, we have been trying to get the hotels to put up these kiosks. We have the authority and the power to restrict licensed vendors to the kiosks. Indeed, where they have been established, we have managed so to restrict the vendors, but the hotels will not comply. They see it as an outlay of expenditure that should not occur to them; they believe they should not have to meet that expenditure at all. They are wrong, because the benefits to them would seriously outweigh the disadvantages.

About two months ago, I am happy to say, I met with the Chairman of the Tourist Board, Mr. Jack Dear; the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Orville Durant; Mr. Alfred Taylor, the President of the BHA; the Manager of Sam Lords Castle, Mr. Giesbert; the Manager of Sandy Lane Hotel, whose name now eludes me, and about two other hoteliers. I managed to persuade them that it would be in their interest to have these kiosks constructed, and they have agreed in principle.

We have reached the stage where Sam Lords Castle, I believe, have now produced a design for the kiosk. They have held meetings with the National Conservation Commission, I believe with some of the vendors, and I think with some of the members of the Tourist Board, and I believe they have agreed on a site for their kiosks. Paradise's kiosk is working well, and Sandy Lane is now in the process of submitting a design. Mr. Taylor himself runs a hotel, I think it is the Rockley, and he, too, I think has submitted designs. I am waiting for Senator Seale and Senator Ward to submit their designs. But wherever hoteliers have submitted these designs and we have approved them, we have managed to restrict the vendors.

Difficulties arise with unlicensed beach vendors. That is, properly, a matter for the police. The Commissioner's part in this bargain when we had the meeting was that if we can restrict the licensed vendors to the kiosks, the police could then deal with the unlicensed vendors. Consequently, a solution to the problem is in the offing. We hope that as soon as we can persuade the hoteliers to construct these kiosks with due diligence, we can then hand the problem of unlicensed beach vendors to the police. These are in large measure peddlars of dope.

This brings me to Mrs. Carmeta Fraser. She ought to be told in no uncertain terms that, before she speaks, she should try to get her facts, particularly from persons whom she knows are accessible. Had she called me — I think the Chairman of the National Conservation Commission was out of the country — or indeed had she called our manager, who is listed — we pay for his telephone — she would have got the facts. She would have known that the National Conservation Commission does not by and large, get trouble from the female vendors. By and large, they are not the drug pushers at all, they are not the beach bums — and they cannot be regarded as beach studs either.

We instituted the requirement of a police certificate of character for the sole purpose of determining who were convicted drug pushers and users. How else do we keep out the drug peddlars and users? Do we look in your face and say you are a drug addict? The whole purpose of the police certificate of character was to obviate this difficulty.

The female beach vendors have no quarrel about this. As a matter of fact, when they come, they come with the forms filled up, their certificates of character, their testimonials and their money. They are happy to do it.

We get the trouble from the male beach vendors. They are the ones who have convictions. What is more, what we call the beach bums do not only interfere with the visitors, but they harass the female beach vendors too. They push them off the good spots where there are no kiosks erected, they go and shove them away when they are talking to visitors, they do all sorts of things to molest and harass them and to make their stay on the beach uncomfortable.

Part of our laws and our rules and regulations were designed to protect the very female beach vendors that Mrs. Carmeta Fraser says we are setting out to hound down. What is she talking about? She ought to get her facts straight. There is no hard and fast thing to having a police certificate of character. If she thinks it is causing an untold burden, I would be the first person to remove it, because I was the one who wrote it in the regulations. If, indeed, it is creating a burden, there is no big thing about it. I am sure I can persuade the other members of the National Conservation Commission to join with me in removing it. But the point is, what other protection do we have for the same female beach vendors when we remove that requirement? If Mrs. Fraser wants to come and can show evidence that it is causing a hardship, I will be more than willing to entertain her.

If NOW wants to keep a meeting at the Hilton and does not have any real thing to talk about because our record as a Government on women's affairs has been so good, let her stop hitting at the National Conservation Commission and ask to have a chat with me. I would meet her at any restaurant in town, meet her at her office or home, my home, anywhere, and talk with her. I am accessible. She does not have to get on any platform and pass any resolution.

What can a resolution do? It would not move me one iota if I was opposed to it. As it turns out, I am not opposed to it; I am willing to accommodate the lady. As a matter of fact, I have spoken to one or two members of NOW since she passed the resolution and told them that we are willing to accommodate them. It is not our desire to create hardship for the poor people when it is a plank of the Barbados Labour Party platform that we are here to eradicate poverty. We want to help the poor people, so let it not be said by Carmeta Fraser, Senator Hall or Senator Greaves — they are all of the same kind....

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I will have to object to that. How do you mean all of a kind? Does he think I am

a female? He cannot say we are the same. We are biologically different.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think it is pretty obvious he could not think you are female.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Finally, Sir — unfortunately I do not have time to turn to tourism.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have one minute.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I just want to mention that, in accordance with certain requests by Mr. Roy Brathwaite, who is a member of the Other Place, the National Conservation Commission has inserted in these Estimates a provision for the erection of a facility in St. Lucy. Mr. Brathwaite showed us an area of land that should be provided for the erection of this facility for his constituents, we agreed to it, we have inserted a certain amount of money, and our architect at the NCC is in the process of providing plans.

In response to a request from Mr. Bernard St. John, Deputy Prime Minister and the Member of Parliament for that part of Christ Church, we have also agreed to erect one at Rockley. We have money in the Estimates for it. In response to a request by the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown, Miss Billie Miller, we have put money in the Estimates for the Bridgetown beautification programme, and I think that, as a first phase of our development, we have been granted \$60 000. I hope that by the month of June this year, you, Sir, will be witnessing potted plants along Baxters Road, Broad Street and areas like that, and ginger lillies growing from the back of Queens College right up to the Globe roundabout.

It is my eternal regret that I do not have any further time.

Thank you.

4.05 p.m.

Applause.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Ward.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, not being an economist does not prevent one from forming an opinion on financial matters. I must confess my concern about the finances of the major foreign currency earners of this country, the sugar industry, manufacturing and tourism. I feel that all three of these are in financial trouble.

Senator Seale, in his contribution to this debate, said that the Government cannot support sugar indefinitely. We debated the sugar industry at length when we

were looking at the support loan of \$10 million for the industry a month or two ago. Senator Arthur, in his very able speech, said that Governments worldwide subsidize their agriculture. I do not think that he put any time limit on subsidization of agriculture. I believe that it is an ongoing thing; it has to be done whenever it is necessary.

Looking at the Government's support that has been given to the industry in 1982, the Government guaranteed \$17 million in bonds that were raised by the industry. Government did not put up the money to buy those bonds, but gave a guarantee to the people who invested in the bonds, in the industry. In 1983, they supported the industry with the issue of bonds to the tune of \$10 million, which in the two years total \$27 million. By the end of this week, we expect to redeem \$5 million of the \$27 million, so we would have outstanding bonds of \$22 million. Our interest on those bonds has been fully paid.

If we look now at other manufacturing, because, after all, sugar is a manufacturing industry also, the Minister in his introduction to this Bill told us that the foreign reserves were \$266 million, of which about half was tied up in the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility. If you divide that \$266 million by two in order to get a half, you would find that it is about \$133 million that can only be called support of the manufacturing industry.

I should like to know if this money that is locked up in the Facility is bearing a rate of interest, or if we are just hoping to get back our \$133 million so that it would not be a charge to the taxpayers. If we had a 10 per cent interest on that \$133 million, the interest over two years, which I believe must be about the time that we have had this money locked up, would be more than the entire support of \$22 million that is outstanding for the sugar industry, and which the sugar industry is committed to repaying.

The sugar industry that Senator Seale wonders how long the Government will be able to support is the only industry, to my knowledge, that supplies its own raw material in Barbados. In fact, it not only supplies its own raw material, but it also supplies raw material for the rum industry.

Senator Greaves said that when the Democratic Labour Party was in power it was blamed for land going out of production, and he enquired how much of this land Government had been able to bring back in. I did not hear any answer to this, but I do feel that the Government is making an effort to bring this land back into production by placing a levy of \$500 per hectare on any unused arable land. But, to my mind, this is not going to bring unused land back into production.

If a person who operated land of whatever size, and gradually found himself in a lost position to the

point where he could not raise working capital to continue the operation of that land, I cannot, for the life of me, see how a levy of \$500 per hectare, when that land has gone out of production, could ever bring that land back into production. Financial pressures are such that have put it out of production. If you take land that has been out of production for ten to fifteen years and you put a levy on it, how can \$500 a hectare on that land bring it back into production. It is bankrupt. The owner of that land has not got the wherewithal to work the land.

Although it may be difficult for the Government to do, it would seem to me that the only way that Government will be able to get that land back into production would be to give an incentive to the person. When one cultivates land and produces a crop, they could be given perhaps \$500 a hectare, not a levy of \$500 a hectare, but given \$500 a hectare to assist the person in bringing this land back into production.

If the value of the land is already owed to a bank, and you put that land up for sale and it is abandoned land you do not even get an offer. It happened last year to an estate that was abandoned for ten or twelve years. Senator Linton would know it. It is in the area which he has spoken so strongly about, St. Philip.
4.15 p.m.

I had some financial interest in the area about twelve years ago, and I found it in an abandoned state. It is an entire estate, and the bank put it up for sale last year to see if they can recover some of the money that the owner owes them, and I do not think they had an offer at all for that land. To pay a price for that land and the cost of bringing it back into production, is something that, in these difficult days, I do not think any agriculturalist would risk doing.

I would like the Minister of Agriculture to look at this again and consider whether he thinks there is any merit in the thought of giving an incentive instead of placing a levy for the non use of land. As it is you are only creating more debt against something that is bankrupt and it will be a case of whether the tax collector will own it or the bank will own it. It will be a fight between the two of them.

I regret that Senator Arthur is getting out of sugar on three of his estates and is converting them to other profitable uses, and I cannot do the same.

I would like to say a few words on Tourism. Senator McClean said yesterday that hoteliers could reduce their charges right now and make Barbadian hotels competitive. In the depressed state of the tourist industry last year, this was done. Hotels slashed their charges. They were told by the travel agents that unless they did

this they would not be able to send people to Barbados, especially those tourists from Europe and Britain where the value of the European currency and the pound sterling has fallen to such a degree that adjustments would have to be made in Barbados for us to be competitive.

As Senator Linton said I am connected with a hotel, and I should declare an interest.

Last year the hoteliers — I am not saying all, but quite a few of them, including one with which I am connected — did reduce their rates considerably in order to attract tourists to the island. So much so that one hotelier did his arithmetic and came out with the answer that he would have to achieve 90 per cent occupancy to break even in the summer. The rates have been adjusted downwards, and I am sure this will reflect in the foreign currency earnings when we relate the earnings against the number of tourists that are coming to the island this year.

Senator McClean also said that charges could be reduced for longer stays. I do not know if Senator McClean is as close to the tourist industry as some of us are, but the European traveller especially, and the British traveller — not so much the North American, because our dollar is tied to the American dollar and he has not felt the strength of our dollar like the British or European traveller — since last year the hotels have been giving three weeks stay for two weeks pay. This is fairly regular in the island. The third week he has to pay for his food and drink, but he gets his accommodation free. That answers Senator McClean's suggestion that we should do something. It is being done, I can assure him.

There is one thing Senator McClean drew to my attention and that was the increase in Land Taxes from \$20 million to \$26 million. Mr. President, I hope that this does not mean higher taxation for the tourist industry. The hotels are already finding it extremely difficult. As Senator Seale mentioned not in this debate but in a previous debate, there is the cost of erecting a hotel, and then to put a one per cent local Government tax on the value of the hotel means that the tax bills are extremely high. I think he said that Heywoods at \$60 million must have a bill of \$600 000. People in the tourist industry, the hotels, and, I believe, most thinking people that are anywhere near the hotels, know that they are in a lot of financial trouble. The liquidity of the commercial banks is practically non-existent. The banks are not liquid at the moment, and in my view, hearing hoteliers talk now at the end of a winter season where they have had their best earnings, hotels are going to need increased levels of financing for the summer season.

The utility charges in the industry are high. The water rates for hotels are the highest, I think, paid by any water users in the island. These hotels are the ones who are servicing the tourist industry from which we hope to get our largest portion of foreign currency. If

the hotels were to reduce their charges further, I am sure they would not be able to pay their utility bills at all. There are some which are finding it extremely difficult; in fact, most of them are finding it difficult to do so. The danger in the tight economic condition in the tourist industry is that we run the risk of having our tourist plant run down and perhaps we will have an unsaleable product on the world tourist markets.

4.25 p.m.

Mr. President, we have heard quite a bit about unemployment. Unemployment is the concern of any thinking employer in this country, but I cannot see how the tourist industry can employ the levels of workers that they have had during the winter season at lower occupancy and income rates. I feel that it is going to be inevitable that hotels will have to lay off some of their staff, let us hope not many, to be able to employ staff at all. If not, the hotels may have to close because they would not be able to continue to operate.

Finally, Sir, Senator Linton spoke about kiosks. When a hotelier or an investor buys land and builds a hotel, and in his design he lays out for shops in his own hotel to service his own guests in his hotel, to put in boutiques, mini markets and things of this nature, I wonder if it is reasonable to ask people to construct kiosks for people who will be selling in competition with the hotels' own shops. Some of those hotels — I believe the Government's hotel at the Hilton — have many rented shops, and if you go and accommodate these people in nice kiosks, as Senator Linton described, that match the architecture of the hotels and so on, you are taking the rent from your existing shops to build kiosks for competition that will pay you nothing. I think that for hoteliers to decide to go and borrow further money to build kiosks that will be in keeping with the architecture of the hotels, to bring people in competition with the hotels, would have to be given careful consideration.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Miss J. CLARKE: Mr. President, I believe that every country around the world that is going through a budget exercise of any kind, has to do this against the background of the global economic scene. We in Barbados, as a very small and poor country, must pay serious attention to what is happening around us in the immediate region, as well as further afield. We cannot therefore do other than face the reality of the situation which has existed for the last few years.

The world, as we all know, has been hard hit by recession, and there is no easy solution to the problem. Big countries, little countries, developed as well as developing, are all facing hardship of one kind or another. That we have so far been able to weather the storm as well as we have is good. It is encouraging, and it must be maintained. I think

that the Minister of Finance and his staff, indeed the officers of all the Ministries and Government departments, must be complimented for their efforts to keep costs down. I would, however, like to make an appeal that even though these Estimates are approved, that constraint and restraint still be the order of the day, so that, hopefully, when we meet next year, we will be able to see that the business of Government has been conducted with such care as to be able to achieve certain savings.

Now, the budget exercise, whether it be personal or whether it be corporate, is always difficult, and at a time like this it means that there will have to be cuts. I have no doubt that every department of Government has experienced a cut of some sort which they would very much prefer not to have had to experience. Be that as it may, I would urge caution in recognition that if we fail to continue to hold strain, we are in the long run going to be very much worse off than we are today.

I would have liked to see a substantial diversion of funds towards the productive sectors this year, but I do not honestly see how this is possible given the circumstances. However, I think that it is something that we must work towards eventually, in recognition that it is the productive sectors which produce the fuel which is necessary to run the affairs of Government, to run the affairs of the corporate community, and therefore to support the entire country.

We have all been feeling the pinch of taxation and we would all prefer to have that burden lifted, but I think we all recognise that this is not possible. Taxation is unavoidable, and we will all have to continue to feel the pinch for some time to come. This is a burden which we have to carry ourselves. No one will do it for us. Hopefully, the day will come in the not too distant future when the Minister of Finance will find it possible to ease the burden and grant us some concessions, but until that time comes, we have to continue to face the reality of the situation.

Some people would argue that the Government can reduce personal taxation and increase corporate taxation. Some people will argue that the spending power of the people has been so curtailed as to make life too difficult for them. Some people would suggest that we can increase spending power without doing irreparable damage to our foreign reserves and ultimately to our balance of payments position. I question this, because the minute we increase spending power in the present world situation, it means that we are going to be increasing imports and therefore we are going to be decreasing foreign reserves, and we will have killed the results which have been achieved in recent years by the policies which were put in place to protect the balance of payments situation.

Unemployment, Mr. President, is a problem which faces the developed as well as the developing world. It is

a concern for all of us. I do not think that there is anyone here in this room, or outside, who is not concerned about the impact of the economic scene on employment. But there is no simple solution, and we have to recognize that there are times when Government has cash flow problems in the same way that businesses and households have cash flow problems.

4.35 p.m.

It is to be regretted, I think, that the people who shout the loudest about employment often do the least to assist, but I believe that our workers are intelligent people and will understand that a cake of any given size can only serve a certain number of people, no matter how carefully it is cut. When the money supply is limited, it is impossible for private enterprise or Government to venture into large scale job creation. Instead, the focus has to be on job preservation, and, therefore, we have to find ways and means of sharing the cake as best we can, even if this means, as suggested by Senator Lynch earlier today, the question of sharing work. This is something we may well have to consider seriously.

The Industrial Development Corporation and its predecessor organization has done much for the development of this country and, in so doing, has led the way in job creation. It is therefore unfair for anybody to cast aspersions or to try to discredit the IDC. More particularly, when people hold themselves up as leaders in the community, they ought to be more careful about what they say and they must be more honest in their pronouncements.

The Development Plan for 1978-1982 of the Industrial Development Corporation planned the creation of 5,000 jobs and achieved 5,400. It planned growth of manufactured exports to the level of 20 per cent and it achieved 26 per cent growth. The Corporation's 1983-1987 Development Plan aims to create 6,500 jobs, and to do this it recognizes the need for capital provision to the tune of some \$34 million. This is mainly for land development and factory construction.

The IDC is primarily concerned with the wooing of investors for industrial development and therefore it is in the forefront in job creation. It recognizes, as does the National Development Plan, 1983-1988, to which Senator Linton earlier referred, that our future development has got to be export-led. It recognizes that we can no longer focus our attention on the CARICOM market and, therefore, it is setting about its business in order to try to stimulate future development which is not heavily dependent on CARICOM. We can only hope that their efforts will continue to be successful and that the world economic scene will so improve as to allow them to achieve their full objective with as little delay as possible.

Unfortunately, the work ethic of our people is not the same as that of certain other cultures, and we have to

recognize that we are competing against markets which can beat us in certain areas. We, therefore, have to be able to beat the exports of Taiwan and places like that by skill, by quality and by other mechanisms, since I do not think we can beat them in terms of labour costs.

I think that the Industrial Development Corporation has done a significant job, and I have every confidence that it will continue to do so in the future. The impression must therefore not be given that the Corporation is doing anything which is harmful or detrimental to the workers of this country. This is not so, and people must not be misled into thinking this.

If we could turn for a minute to Capital Works, which is one means of generating employment, and which is perhaps the main tool used by the Government in this area, I think that even Senator Seale, our local wizard, would not welcome the task of having to do the impossible, which is virtually what this Government as well as other Governments around the world now have to do. I am sure that Senator Seale would not welcome the opportunity to take the Estimates as presented and redefine the emphases in order to keep everybody happy and achieve stated goals. We would all like to do this – but it is impossible.

I welcome his call for \$25 million for the Tourist Board. Indeed, I think the Board would be most happy if they could be presented with such a gift, but I do not know where we would find it right now, certainly not within our local capacity. We may have to go to external sources in order to raise it.

I do not agree with Senator Seale when he says that road works and projects of that nature would not bring immediate results. It would not bring immediate results in the sense of earning foreign exchange in the way that tourism can, but it can certainly bring results immediately in so far as our job retention is concerned, and this has also got to be a concern.

Neither do I agree with him when he calls for a discontinuation of the promotional trips undertaken by the Tourist Board. I know that some people refer to these as bandwagons, and I have never been on one, Mr. President, but I happen to know from people who have been that they are not joy rides, not by any means. It is hard work and it is work which is necessary. Even if, by magic or otherwise, we could find the money to allow the Board to do all the advertising that is useful, it would still be necessary to maintain those trips. When all is said and done, two promotional trips to North America a year or one to Europe is by no means excessive, and when it is borne in mind that the participants on those trips meet their own costs, we certainly cannot suggest that this activity is in any way a burden on the budget of the Tourist Board. As I understand it, the Tourist Board budget is mainly related to the cost of its own representative and to perhaps a reception for 100 people.

We know that tourism is a significant earner of foreign exchange, and we want to retain this. We know that advertising is necessary, and we can, in fact, state categorically, a word which has been used very frequently in this session, that the Board has embarked on a programme of advertising, quite apart from the promotional trips. In fact, I understand that for the fiscal year 1982-83, the Board spent U.S.\$1 370 million, which is more than double what St. Lucia spent, and which can be said to have produced more than four times the number of visitors that St. Lucia received. Undoubtedly, there is room for improvement, and there is scope for enhancement in this area, and I have no doubt that it will come. But do not let us believe that we can stop the promotional trips, because while the advertisement on T.V. or in the newspaper may do much for the impulse traveller or John Citizen, it is not enough. We must do more. We must market the product.

4.45 p.m.

A manufacturer does not rely on advertisements in Europe or somewhere else to market his exports. He has to hire a marketing team, or he has to establish an agency contact somewhere who will do this for him. So I maintain that the Tourist Board should be complimented on its efforts and that we must allow them a bigger budget as things improve, so that they can do more.

Turning to the matter of housing, I think that this is an area of concern for all of us, just like employment, because Barbadians have traditionally wanted to own their own homes, and this is to be encouraged. It is very much better for people to be helped to own their own homes than to have them rely on Government to fulfil their needs in this regard. However, having said that, we have to recognise that the restrictions, which had to be imposed in order to protect our balance of payments position, have had an adverse effect on housing.

There is a significant part of construction cost which is imported, and we have not always recognised this — or we conveniently ignore it. There is also the fact that, as Senator Ward said earlier, the banking system is not particularly liquid. Again this is one of the restrictions which was particularly put in place to protect the economy of the Island, so we cannot have it both ways. We have to protect the economy, and at the same time we have to try to do what we can with such limited resources as we have.

Perhaps I should declare an interest, Mr. President, in the matter of mortgage financing, and point out that, despite the limitations which have faced the country in recent years, the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company has still managed to play a significant role. I think it was Senator Seale who mentioned the figure in the Estimates which is intended to be shared between the BDB and the BMFC, and I believe he was hoping that he would get a reasonable portion of it. I am not going to attempt to say

who should get what, but I would say that the BDB has done very well so far, and we commend it for its work. However, I would just like to let him know that there has been a long-standing promise of equity for the BMFC to which we look forward to having fulfilled. Even so, that equity injection is not enough. In order for us to continue to service the needs which are there and to entertain a steady flow of applications for housing finance, we have to be able to generate very much more money than we are doing at the moment; and bearing in mind the existing demands on the economy for whatever money is there, we have had to take a back seat for some time.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I am happy to be able to say that between 1979 and 1983 the Mortgage Finance Corporation was able to put out a little over \$36 million in mortgage finance. Indeed at the end of 1983 we had about just under 100 applications pending and approved for about \$6 million. So far this year we have already on-lent about \$2 million of that, so there is scope, subject only to the availability of money. People are interested, but until the money becomes available, we cannot do much more than we are doing at present.

Now when we look at the housing guarantee fund which was covered to some extent yesterday, we have to recognise that this is a very useful fund which hopefully will produce worthwhile results in due time. I was most interested to hear Senator Arthur say that the fund was designed for the poorest of the poor, but I would like him to tell me how the poorest of the poor would be able to generate savings of up to \$11,000. With the household income being limited to a maximum of \$16,000 per annum, and with the maximum property value of \$35,000, the maximum loan available is \$24,000. So if you are hoping to purchase or build a property for the value of \$35,000, in order to be able to benefit under the scheme you must have saved \$11,000, which, I am sure you will admit, is a little bit difficult.

I believe that part of the problem is that, unfortunately, international agencies do not always like to listen, and I would here like to make an appeal to the agencies which assist this region, to change their positions somewhat for future assistance, and to recognise that there is a fund of superior knowledge available from our own local experts. We do not deny that the officers of funding agencies are expert in their own fields, but we believe that, to a large extent, their expertise is more relevant in the country from which the funds may be coming, and we definitely are of the opinion that our local expertise in some situations is better, and should be adhered to.

The scheme is a good one, but it needs to be modified. I think it is more appropriate to a North American situation, or maybe even a Latin American situation. It

is not entirely appropriate, as worked out, to our local situation.

If I may be permitted, I should just like to share a little information so that you will better understand what I am saying, Mr. President. It is known that the Mortgage Finance Corporation is not the only agency benefiting under the Housing Guaranteed Fund, but at the end of January we had received almost 1 000 enquiries. We had actually interviewed 873 people; and of that 873, some 485 received application forms, which, if they are brought to fruition, will allow the company to lend just over \$10 million. The other 388 could not qualify for one reason or another because of the terms and conditions of the fund. So the interest is there, and undoubtedly once we work out the difficulties of the scheme, we will be able to make sure that the conditions of any further schemes are better.

In the area of agriculture, we always have sugar being the whipping-horse, or whatever you like to call it. Everybody is an expert on sugar, and everybody knows that the answer is to stop producing sugar. But what is the easy solution? Nobody can identify it. If we could wave a magic wand now and say as from tomorrow there would be no more sugar, what do we put in its place? What transformation can we bring about overnight that will produce the foreign exchange earnings of sugar and that will provide the jobs that are provided by the sugar industry?

4.55 p.m.

The efforts made in the last few years through the Sugar Support Facility were long overdue, in my view, and I should like to think that we will continue to take a positive stand in regard to the support of sugar, as indeed we should in regard to the support of any productive sector in this country.

As far as non-sugar agriculture is concerned, I believe that there is much potential for future development, but, again, this is not going to be easy. One of the points I should like to make in that regard is that the matter of praedial larceny is a serious concern which must be faced. You cannot encourage people, small farmers, medium-sized farmers, peasants, to produce food only to find that other people come to reap the fruits of their labour.

I believe that the Ministry of Agriculture must move expeditiously, via the route of the Ministry of Legal Affairs, to bring down appropriate legislation to deal with this. I understand that in Montserrat there is a system which works well. It is not something that would be easily and immediately acceptable, but it is something that is worth a trial. As I understand it, the system is one whereby producers are registered. As a result people who buy produce need to be sure that they are buying from a

registered producer. Hence, I could not steal Senator Arthur's cabbages and try to sell them to Senator Seale, because I would not be able to produce my licence, when asked, as a legitimate producer.

We have to find a means of dealing with this. This business of praedial larceny has been going on for too many years, and it is not getting better, it is getting worse. We therefore have to take positive steps to eradicate this scourge.

On the matter of Foreign Affairs, I think it was Senator Wickham who touched on this yesterday, I should like to say that I support his stand, but I should also like to add that there is need for continued action insofar as consolidated representation is concerned. As far as the export sector is concerned, I think that we have got to do more through our Missions abroad. And we must explore all possibilities even if this means that we must consolidate and co-operate with some of our CARICOM partners.

The person who is marketing tourism can also be involved in marketing manufactured goods and so on and so forth. The developed countries place heavy emphasis on the commercial and trade aspects in their overseas Missions, and while we cannot expect to have the spread of representation that they have, we have to ensure that the level of representation that we have, no matter how limited or how small it may be, is of a very high standard. We must continue to focus on the matter of trade and to work towards an enhancement of the situation.

I should like to touch on Education. Education continues to enjoy a significant slice of the national budget, and I have no doubt that it will continue to do so for some time to come. This is important, because, as has been said on more than one occasion, this is the means by which we cultivate our human resources. The recent Education Act, which has been criticized from time to time, or commented on in one form or fashion, is a means by which we can bring education and the management of education into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

I did not entirely agree with Senator Wickham yesterday when he suggested that there was need for more to be done, because the Act was new and it needed time to adjust. I grant you that this is so to some extent, but when you look at the size of the Act, Mr. President, it is about a third or a quarter of the size of the new Companies Act. I do not hear anybody calling for more time for people in business to become aware of, or to adjust to, the Companies Act. The Education Act is not that difficult, and, after all, we are dealing with professionals — we are dealing with people who are entrusted with the business of teaching our children. They

are intelligent people by and large and, therefore, I do not think they have any difficulty in understanding the Act and adjusting to it.

Obviously, change is something which we reject and which we try to fight, but, in time, we have to face it. We have to accept it. It is unavoidable. The Act, to my mind, is not that difficult, and I believe that every serious teacher, who sees himself or herself as a professional, should by now have acquired a copy of the Act and Regulations and studied them.

I understand that as part of its effort to bridge the gap between the old and the new, the Ministry of Education arranged more than twenty meetings with the unions, that is, the BUT, the BSTU, the Association of Headteachers in secondary schools, the association of private schools and the National Parent Teachers' Association. Copies of the Act and Regulations were given to the unions. Extracts of relevant portions of the Act and Regulations were sent to the schools for distribution. Since the passage of the Act, further discussions have been held with the unions and the Association of Headteachers. I understand that there are quarterly meetings held with the unions.

The Regulations set out very clearly the duties of the Headteacher, the Deputy Headteacher, the departmental heads, the senior teachers and so on and so forth. So, it is nothing too difficult to comprehend. I hope that those teachers who may not have applied themselves to this task, if there are any, would try to do so with some speed.

I also hope that in time, as the economy improves, we can see where the Government is able to do more for the handicapped child and for other areas which at the moment cannot be given priority attention.

I must confess that I do not agree with Senator Jones on his comments on the Eleven Plus General Paper. I feel that by and large the problem rests in the minds of adults. I believe that that General Paper is an attempt to improve the capability of our children, and to ensure that certain private or primary schools do not simply concentrate on teaching children English and Arithmetic. A child of eleven today is not a fool. A child of five is not a fool. They are very wise, and I think that we sell our children short when we imply that they are incapable of handling this kind of Paper.

I do not think you can look at the syllabus which has been set out for guidance of the teachers and take this to mean that a child of eleven is expected to understand it in the way that an adult would understand it. I would expect that every syllabus that is provided within the school system is such that it would lend itself to the initiative of the teacher, so that in time, the child, having been given doses of what it can take at the particular point, will eventually be able to grasp the mature end of things.

Education is a very costly matter, but we cannot afford to continue to subsidize mediocrity. We have got to take a firm line on this. We see the evidence around us daily. In my mind there is this question as to whether the taxpayers of this country are necessarily getting full value for their money from education.

I know it is not an easy task, and I know that there are a lot of dedicated teachers out there. But we have to set our house in order if we are to be able to educate our people, and to train and retrain where necessary in order to be able to continue the development of this country, for the benefit of the very same people.

We are not developing Barbados for people outside of Barbados, we are developing it for us. We are the taxpayers. We are the people who enjoy the privileges, and we are the people who have to pay the price. Hence, we are the people who must see that higher standards are maintained in all areas of life.

5.05 p.m.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the debate, as usual, is one which has to be general by virtue of the time which is at our disposal and by virtue of the volume of Heads and departments with which we have to deal. I do not think there is anyone in this room who would envy the Minister of Finance or his staff the task of curbing the ambitions of the various Ministries and departments. Everybody wants more and with good reason — not to spend frivolously, but for further development. Regrettably, we cannot do more now, but we must pray to God that we can continue to hold strain and recognize that the pain that we bear now is for our own benefit in the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Reece.

SENATOR MRS. M. O. REECE: Thank you, Mr. President. First let me say that I am satisfied with the performance of the economy of this country over the past year. Everybody seems to be touching on tourism. I want to associate myself with the remarks made by Senator Seale, although my own suggestion is not as ambitious as \$25 million. Around this table he is the one person who knows how to make money.

Asides.

SENATOR MRS. M. O. REECE: Yes, Senator Ward, too. In order to make money, you have to spend money. If you have something to sell, you have to advertise it. I have no interest in a hotel, but worked in a hotel eight or nine years ago. At that time it was called the Village, a new hotel and successful, and part of the Trust House Group. I happened to be part of the management team.

There was a lady there who ran that hotel named Jillian Grant. She went on one of these Tourist Board's trips the first year the hotel was open, and I do not think she went back after that. She found it advantageous to go immediately after the Tourist Board went. She went after they had left and knocked on every travel agent's door, and that hotel was always full.

We need to change our strategy for advertising. The belief that you can go to North America or Europe, get a group of travel agents together and sell Barbados, is outdated. You need to do more advertising on the television. Visual aids have always been the means and ways of putting over a case for whatever you have to sell, and I believe that the Tourist Board might need to re-examine the strategy used in advertising Barbados.

I am sorry that Senator Greaves is not in his seat. I believe that the voters of this country might have an idea that Senator Greaves might not want to sit in here very often in this part of the building. Senator Greaves made mention of employment. He gave figures for 1982-83, stating that the employment had dropped in 1983.

I am not an economist, I am a lay person, but common sense tells me that there are other indicators. You cannot isolate that. You need to have some analysis of the number of people employed, what age group they were in, and so on, before you predict what is coming for the next year. You also need to know how many persons are coming on the job market. That hinges very much on our family planning. There are some years that you get more people on the job market than others. Before getting into that he should have had his facts together.

The Senator was very careful to note what was said in the Other Place of spending plenty of money on "Let's Go To The Races", and he said that this was done out of desperation. I use the Spring Garden Highway to and from my home, and over the past three weeks, late at night I have had difficulty in passing the upper end of the Spring Garden Highway. People are spending lots of money at Coney Island. I wonder if it is out of desperation. I do not think that they look desperate to me. They look happy, and they must have the money to spend.

I thank Senator Greaves for the comments made about the Sanitation Service Authority. Government is supposed to be the employer of the largest number of people in this country. Government has to set the example to the private industry. I believe that the Sanitation Service Authority and the Board, and I must declare that I am the Chairman of that Board, will make sure that that Board is a model in the Government sector.

The Sanitation Service Authority, along with the Minister of Health, care about people. We severed some 70-odd people within the last three weeks, and, as

Senator Greaves said, it was done in the most humane fashion. I want to mention this, because I noticed that the *Nation*, in an editorial, made mention of the severance of the Sanitation workers, and stated that it was done without any humane reasons attached to it. That is not true. The Board gave written notice to the employees some time before they were severed. After that, each one, in turn, was seen by the Personnel Officer personally, who had a chat with them before they were severed. That cushioned the shock of having to be severed. Then when they were eventually severed, a letter was given to them, as Senator Greaves said, stating the vacation pay accruing to them, their pay in lieu of notice, and what they could expect as pension or *ex gratia* payment. In most cases, the money they took home amounted to about six weeks pay. They will not have to wait six weeks for the severance pay. Come April 1 or 2, they will have their money in their hands. This is Government policy, and the Sanitation Service Authority intends to carry out the policy of Government.

The Minister of Health is not in here. I am sorry, because I must take this opportunity to make an appeal for headquarters for the Sanitation Service Authority. I notice that in the Estimates there is a lot on "building". I heard the Minister talk about the Psychiatric Hospital. He talked about the almshouses now known as District Hospitals, but I heard no mention of the Sanitation Service Authority.

The Sanitation Service Authority operates in a building which has been verbally condemned, and there is need for a headquarters for the authority. People can only function at peak if they are working in good surroundings and a proper building. We have not had the good fortune of having a building, nor can we hear when we are going to get a building. I know the Minister is new and he understands what it is for people to work in good conditions. I notice his office is particularly well taken care of since he has been there, so I expect the same thing will pass on to the Sanitation Authority.
5.15 p.m.

I turn to Prisons. I believe Senator Hall mentioned that there is a figure in the Estimates for extending the prisons. I want to state here that if something is not done about some of the young people in this country who are ruining it, we will have to build more prisons.

We have to turn our attention to rape. For some time now we have seen cases of rape before the courts of this island. I have noticed in the Press people appealing for these cases to be tried *in camera*. They have been asking that they not be reported so that people cannot identify who the victims are, but yet we continue to see the cases reported with either the parents' names or an aunt or some relative. In a small community like ours, it is not hard to identify who these persons are. It means

that they are raped twice, once by the person and the second time in the courts.

I do not think the Government might be in favour of the cat, but I personally would not hesitate to put a vote in for the cat to be returned to this country. I believe it is one thing that people understand. The days of the tamarind rod are over; it is not effective, as one Senator said. Some of us around here have had the tamarind rod, and we are good citizens because of that. When the cat was used in this island, we did not see the amount of crime that we are seeing today. I would plead that if this current trends continues, we should bring back the cat for the young people who are unemployable. It is not that they cannot get employment, they are unemployable. There is employment out there, but some of them will not be employed.

My father who died the year before last was 83 years old. I believe Senator Barrow can vouch for the fact that he was strong. There is a parcel of land at Hope on which a kitchen garden is kept in perfect condition. He is gone, and not one of these unemployable lads would even say, "let me work it and take the crops from it." No, but if you plant it up, then they can help themselves to it! So I make that appeal to Government to consider bringing the cat back to the country.

The Ministry of Information and Culture. I believe that some time ago I made mention in here that Government's performance is very good. The Minister of Information and Culture has done a first class job in that Ministry. He has done better with Information than any other Government or Minister before, and he must be congratulated. Before, when the Government Information Service came on the air, I turned it off and went elsewhere. Now, I am driven to listen to and to watch the programme.

However, there are Ministries out there that need to use this service. I believe that if this was being done, Senator Simmons would not have made the point he made this morning. Senator Trotman in his reply stated that the Foreign Affairs Ministry has updated the High Commission in London. If you are going to do a good job, you have to advertise it. The Democratic Labour Party did not do a quarter of what we are doing, but they advertised whatever they were doing. We are too lapse in this. We are doing a good job, but nobody knows about it unless it is right at their door step. You have to tell people what you are doing. Do not be afraid to sell yourself. We are selling ourselves short now, so we have to put our case to the public, and let them know what is in their favour. We should not have to come here to hear that that Commission has been updated.

There is great concern about video in this country. The Government has to do something about it. There is a Film Censorship Board. I do not expect that Government can set

up a Video Censorship Board. I am the President of the Business and Professional Women's Club. We are very concerned about it, and would want to ask Government if they could not put some machinery into motion where films coming into the country must come with a synopsis, so you would know exactly what is on the tape, or that the shops be asked to provide a preview service for these tapes.

I am told of a parent who, during the summer vacation, rented a tape and left it at home for her children to watch. It was called Red Riding Hood. I am not a parent, but I am an adult, and there are children around where I live. I would have done it myself, because Red Riding Hood, as I know it, is a children's story. But this seemed not to have been Red Riding Hood at all, it was a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. M. O. REECE: It was a bare riding! It is pathetic, that a parent would take that home to entertain the children.

I am told that in the afternoon when she went home and asked the children how they liked it, they said it was good, but something on their faces told her that all was not right. After they had gone to bed she put the tape on and watched it herself and it shocked even her.

People must be free to look at whatever they want to look at in their homes. I believe that, but I believe that the children of this country must be protected, and Government must do something about this before it gets further out of hand.

Sir, last but not least, I was searching the Estimates to find where Women's Affairs was, and could not find it. I probably did not have enough time to look. Anyhow, I want to commend the Minister of Information and Culture. He has all the praises this evening. I want to commend him for appointing a woman to manage the Department of Women's Affairs, a young, intelligent woman, who I believe can do a good job. We believe that she has a good job on her hand, that the women's organisations on this island need to be examined to make sure that they are functioning according to the constitutions that they are supposed to be observing. I commend them on that and also the appointment of an Advisory Council which was recommended by the National Committee on the Status of Women.

Sir, those were the only few points I wanted to make. I thank you.
5.25 p.m.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Mr. President, I believe that there is very little that I can say in relation to the debate on these Estimates, but I think I will be failing in my duty if I did not express my sentiments about them.

I would like to congratulate the Government on its performance during the past year, considering the tight economy of the world — I would not say Barbados. I think they have done an exceedingly good job in tiding this country of ours over the rough seas.

I know the members of the other side will try to tell the people of this country — and the world, for that matter — that nothing has been done for this country. I am not an economist — I have never had the opportunity; I only know how to count as far as 10, maybe, but if you are going to be practical, if you would just look at certain things in this country — the number of people in this country who own motorcars, the amount of people who have in telephones, just take the people walking about with the transistor radios, some as big as juke boxes and such things, that in itself, is an indication as to how well people are living. If you want to see, go into the supermarkets on Thursdays and Fridays and see how people are buying their foods. We know it is not all honey, but in this life you have to get the bitter with the sweet, and I will say that the Government has done an exceedingly good job in the past year.

For the coming years, as you will see in the Estimates, I would like to compliment them, even though allocations are not as great as I would probably like to see. There is nothing perfect, and we cannot get 100 per cent in everything. I would like to compliment them for the amount set aside for capital works. My contention is that if we have capital works, the other services must benefit, because if people are working in a particular area and they are getting money, they are going to spend in other aspects of community life.

We have had a few criticism from the members of the Democratic Labour Party in relation to housing, unemployment and things like that saying that nothing has been done. It is regrettable that Senator Greaves is not here, but I would hope that Senator Hall would tell him that in the 1960s the Democratic Labour Party promised the workers of this country to build a shoe factory where the shoes would cost something like six shillings. They had promised to build seaside homes for the workers. I do not know what has happened. They were in power for 15 years. I do not know if they could not get the material to build the homes, or if they did not get the necessary tools to build the shoes, but these are the people who are walking about and telling people that the Barbados Labour Party has done nothing.

Whether you are a member of the Barbados Labour Party or not, and you are a true Barbadian and you are honest to yourself, you can see that, considering the economic situation of this country, this Government has done a tremendous job. I have had the privilege of speaking to Barbadians overseas for many years, and they

are surprised to learn of the life we are enjoying here, with such a small economy as this.

Senator Hall, I think, was bowling, but he was flying all over the place yesterday. He could not find his line. He bowled a few no balls in relation to the National Housing Corporation sending out notices to people to rent. It is regrettable that, very often, even the Press put out things that are not true.

I must declare that I was an employee of the National Housing Corporation. I used to supervise the arrears. There was a system that you would send the tenant a letter if he owed up to, say, \$100, that is for approximately four — six weeks. Then he is asked to come in and make an agreement to pay the arrears off.

They do not levy for \$100. People have gone up to \$3 000, and, very often, when these levies are made, these people are given all the opportunities to pay, but some of them do not even pay attention to the notices which are sent out. As a matter of fact, people cried out that we should not have levied during the Christmas week, but some of those people went into town and took up a lot of furniture and other household items — and some of them have not even paid for them. The very owners had to plead for them. So the people's priorities are wrong. Instead of trying to pay the house rents, which are very cheap, they do other things, like buy videos.

I went into a home only last weekend, and I was shocked. The old man, who is supposed to be a pensioner — he has a young woman in there who is living on him — had in a television and a radiogram. Not only that, the condition of the place looked as though someone took an axe and was licking that flooring out. He owes the Corporation some \$2 000. With the items he has in the house, those of you who are economists will observe what the Corporation will have to do, because he owes \$2 000 in rent, and the place needs repairs.

This is the condition which exists, Senator Hall, so what you mentioned about \$50, I doubt that very much. I accept that you are a very honest man, but you were not true in that respect, because it has never happened.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Address the Chair.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Sorry, Sir.

Senator Seale mentioned sugar. I hope he is not using a phrase which was used some years ago by a former Leader of this country, that he does not want to see a cane blade. Do not let us fool ourselves. All of us here, with few exceptions, have benefitted from sugar. I believe that even today, you as a merchant are benefitting very much from sugar, and as such, I would hate

to see the day that we talk about not wanting to see sugar in this country.

What are the substitutes? You talk about the beet beating us. This is a thing over which we have no control, but the day we talk about not having sugar in this country, I think we are going the other side, because there is no substitute, as I see it. However we live, if we live to be 200 years, sugar must be one of the first industries of Barbados, because when you think of sugar, you have to think of your by-products, your rum – about which I know Senator Seale knows very much – and your molasses, plus the 7 000 people who are now employed in the sugar industry.

Even if you had to phase out these people over a period of three or four years, where are you going to find employment for the younger ones? Not in tourism! Even though I am very much a believer in tourism, as I see it, with the world situation as it is, it is going to take us a long time before tourism becomes very much viable again, and I think one of the things in our failure in tourism is the attitude of the average Barbadian to the tourists.
5.35 p.m.

I am not one of those people who would tell you that the tourist is an angel and a Barbadian is a devil. What I mean is that you are dealing with people, and I feel that if you treat a tourist well, you should treat a Barbadian well. But there is an attitude with some of our people that the moment you are a tourist, you are an outcast. All sorts of things are done, they are ripped off and, in some cases, I think they are treated with very much disrespect. People do not only treat tourists badly, but they treat Barbadians badly. The young men on the beaches try to molest even the Barbadian women and things like that, so I am speaking of the general attitude of our people.

I was very glad to hear Senator Trotman mention what he did in relation to Carlisle in view of the fact that there is a case pending, because there are a few things I would have liked to say about Carlisle. Nevertheless, I hope that Government will institute an investigation into the activities of Carlisle. I am one of those people who are against the activities of that club. I have seen an article in the Press trying to vindicate what they have been doing, but that was the mother of the proprietor, so I could not expect anything else from her. It was a straightforward sort of thing. Even though we want the tourist dollar, we cannot sell ourselves that cheaply.

In relation to housing in general and loans for the lower income bracket, I, like Senator Clarke and other Senators who spoke on it, hope that Government will have a second look at the USAID scheme. They used

to have at the National Housing Corporation, when Senator Simmons was the chairman, what was known as the General Workers' Loan. This catered to people who were looking to build a chattel house for \$15 000 or \$20 000, and those who already had a chattel house but wanted to put on a wall kitchen, toilet and bath at the back. That used to operate very well. Regrettably, the Government did not see fit to plough back any more money in that.

I hope that this aid will be looked at and part of it will be more or less ploughed back into the National Housing Corporation scheme, so that people in these income brackets will benefit from it. Very few people can qualify for this loan under the conditions it is being lent. There are a lot of legal fees involved, there are plans involved, a whole lot of things, and I do not think that the people who negotiated it or who put up the conditions know the conditions of the Barbadian way of life. It suits North American countries where people have a different way of life and maybe bigger salaries, but, honestly, if you really want to help the people whom it is intended to help, I do not think the conditions are quite favourable. I will appeal to those who are responsible to have a second look at it, and, if they can, ask these lending agencies to amend the conditions in the interest of the real low income bracket people. I think that that will do us good.

As a member of the National Sports Council, regrettably, I must say, Senator Hall will not be sharing with us in what we intend to do. There is a five year plan for sports in general in Barbados, but for the coming financial year, the National Sports Council is negotiating for more coaches for sports and there is a programme to build pavilions and hard courts. There is provision for playing fields at Checker Hall, St. Christopher in Christ Church, Valerie in St. Michael, Bayleys in St. Philip, Content in St. Thomas and Bridgefield in St. Thomas. With respect to hard courts, Grazettes, Ellerton and St. Christopher will also be refurbished, and changing facilities will be put at Orange Hill. We are going to have rehabilitation programmes at the National Stadium and the Netball Stadium. These are some of the things which the Government is doing for the young people of this country in relation to sports and social amenities unlike the other Administration, whose members are saying that we are not doing anything for young people.

There is very much more I can say in relation to what has already been said, but I would just like to offer my congratulations to the Government for a job well done, in my opinion, and I hope that all the citizens of this country will give it the support which it needs to see that these proposals are carried out for the welfare of all Barbadians.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Sir, it has fallen upon me to speak as the penultimate speaker on the Government side in this debate, and before I move rather quickly into the three Heads on which I would like to make a contribution — I must obviously keep my eyes on the clock — I should like to join, with my colleague, Senator Clarke, and really pay tribute to the public servants, particularly those in senior positions, who, year after year, and this year is no exception, go through the very difficult business of putting these Estimates together in order to guide Government through another financial year. As Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, I have seen it in progress. They work very long hours in trying to meet the demands within a reasonable time, and I think the civil servants in this country must be commended for coming up to this very high standard year after year.

I do not really intend to say a lot about housing, because I had the privilege last year of introducing what has been talked about a lot this year, the \$20 million housing programme from USAID. I will also be looking at the capital programme for 1983–84, with particular emphasis on road construction and road rehabilitation.

First of all, I would like to start with the manufacturing industry, and the emphasis on the role played in this country by the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation. I am happy to see that the Government has increased the vote to the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation by 100 per cent, from \$750 000 last year to \$1.5 million this year. To my mind, it is a sensible move, and one which clearly enables the Corporation to do a better job in assisting the manufacturers in penetrating extra-regional markets, something I believe is very necessary indeed if we in this country are to maintain the standard of living which we have today.
5.45 p.m.

Often we are told that Barbados is a surface economy. We were told this yesterday by our distinguished economist, my friend and colleague here, Senator Arthur. No one quarrels with this. This is perfectly true. It is also true that it is not a 100 per cent surface economy and that we equally rely most heavily on export earnings from sugar and from the manufacturing sector. So just as Government has come to the aid of the tourist industry, just as Government has come to the aid of the sugar industry, Government is now looking at the most meaningful ways by which it can do more and give further assistance to the manufacturers of this country.

The additional \$¾ million is only but one example expressed in the Estimates of this year. Another example that Government has decided to go all out to assist the manufacturing industry in this country is the very positive step which has recently been taken, the joint venture scheme in the furniture manufacturing industry with some

of the furniture manufacturers, with a view of trying to penetrate and capture extra-regional markets.

The difficulties experienced by Barbados with CARICOM trade within the last two years or so is now history. Non payment of debts, protectionism in the form of import licensing restrictions and unilateral declaration of currency devaluation are but only three of the main areas which Government has had to contend with with our CARICOM neighbours, as Senator Simmons pointed out earlier. I do not believe, indeed Government does not believe, that this is because of any wickedness on the part of our CARICOM neighbours. But in the true spirit that home drums must beat first, in times of economic depression, there is always this tendency of protectionism, and that is what we are faced with today.

I have nothing but praise for the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation and the direction which it is currently taking in trying to penetrate the extra regional markets. The latest Annual Report of the Corporation shows the following: that the Corporation has captured the Venezuelan market of Marguerita, carried out field research in St. Thomas, US Virgin Islands, Venezuela, New York, Curacao, Aruba, Martinique and parts of America, not including New York, which I earlier mentioned.

In addition, some six exporters have benefitted from the USAID funding programme at the World Trade Institute in New York to acquaint them with the entry requirements and distribution channels for their products in the United States of America. All of this clearly demonstrates the Corporation's commitment to do all that is in its power, giving, guidance, the appropriate market research facilities, along with the other usual advice that the experts in that particular field will have to give, to our manufacturers, particularly those who are coming into the business for the first time, and would obviously encounter some difficulty in the ramifications involving the export trade.

Mr. President, I was very impressed with the statistics given by Minister Trotman when he looked at the performance of the Ministry of Trade and Industry. I want to repeat one of the statistics he gave, his final one, and I give it by way of comparison to show what is the justification of the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation in looking to extra-regional markets. It is that in the year 1982, trade with our CARICOM neighbours totalled \$141.2 million. For the same period, trade with the United States and Canada was \$163.4 million. That, to my mind, clearly justifies and indeed should act as an impetus to the Corporation to go all out to increase our exports to the extra-regional areas.
5.55 p.m.

At the moment we are clearly having service, export trade manufacturing, and sugar, and we must push all three of them. I know that there is a lot Government would like to do, but it cannot do all at one time. I am attracted to the performance of our manufacturers aided by the EPC, and I would urge Government that, as soon as it is possible, they give more financial assistance to this institution so that it can continue to press ahead with penetrating extra-regional markets.

I indicated earlier that I do not intend to spend a lot of time on Housing. As to the USAID programme itself, I see people from the constituency two times a week, and there has been some concern that things are not going as well as they would like them to go, and I think Government is concerned that things are not going exactly as Government would like them to go. But Government has put \$20 million into the economy to assist the poor people with housing. We have no intention of seeing this fall to the ground and fail. I think what is happening is that this is a new dimension and, I think I said this last year, there will obviously be some teething problems. I would like to see more money coming from this source and similar funding institutions to assist people in housing. We will iron out these problems and, in the final analysis, we hope that we will be able to house the poor people of this country at a more rapid rate.

In ending my contribution on housing, I should say that the constraints are the same. The major problems are the inadequacy of long term mortgage funds, scarcity of residential land, the ever-increasing cost of developing housing areas, and the actual cost of building houses. The cost of the various components, including labour, increase every year. These continue to be the major constraints in not building as many houses as this Government would like to build.

I move on, Mr. President, to Government's road building and highway rehabilitation programme. If my arithmetic is right, in this area Government's expenditure for this year is some \$24 million. The existence of an adequate infrastructural base is necessary if a country wishes to accelerate its economic development, and this is particularly so of an adequate road network. That is why when you listen to some of the criticisms of the Government in its handling and management of the economy as a whole, one cannot take such criticisms seriously. Government has continued to demonstrate its ability to come up with a package that is best suited for this country, given the constraints under which we must operate from day to day. As Senator Clarke has said, there is evidence in the last Development Plan that Government achieved most of what it had hoped during that period, and I have no reason to doubt that Government will not do so again.

The basic thing I want to say about the construction of roads and the rehabilitation of roads, and the fact that

a large sum of money in these Estimates will be going towards that, is that the idea is to put people back to work as quickly as possible. The programme and expenditure here obviously and naturally coincides with employment and unemployment. The type of artisans and unskilled labour that would be used in such programmes would mean a considerable cushioning of the effect of some of the layoffs we heard so much about in the building industry elsewhere.

We have heard time and time again — it is not true, and our record, as I said yesterday, speaks for itself — about layoffs. Yet, I seem to recall that in 1982, and again last year, the very people who seemed to be shouting most about these layoffs were telling us then something that I never really understood — that Government was bunching its capital projects, that we were borrowing money, even though we were borrowing at very low rates indeed in order to keep the projects going. We said all along that Government was embarking on this policy, conscious of the fact that we had a duty to keep people at work.

6.05 p.m.

They wanted us to stop borrowing, to stop bunching the projects, which meant closing them down and sending home people. That was the only obvious outcome. Government did not do that. Heywoods was only completed this year. When people are laid off from these same projects, we hear cries and charges of inhumanity. That is inconsistent. Indeed, Sir, it is downright foolishness. Government was right at the time to continue its programme then, and I am sure Government is right in its plan for 1983–1988, and in the Estimates for 1984–85, to try to put as many people to work as quickly as possible. Our policy in the Barbados Labour Party is that the people come first and everything we do is in the interest of the people of this country.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, it has been a long two days, and I will try not to use the time allotted to me. However, I have a duty to reply to those matters that are still outstanding.

Before I launch fully into my reply, may I first of all say how very thankful I am to speakers generally for the quality of their contributions to this debate. There has been one particularly bad speech, and I am going to deal with that in the course of my reply. That speech, for some strange reason, was the speech that fascinated and titillated the Press, and therefore filled our newspapers with fairly noxious reading.

I am told also that he said that CBC was making Government propaganda, and that I had to decide what goes in the news. Yet the CBC television news last night, I am told, was also full of it. I wish to make it very clear

that I would never have chosen such nonsense to put in any newscast.

I wish, however, to thank Senator Arthur, in particular, whose contribution escaped the notice and perhaps overpitched the intelligence of the Press, because it was the outstanding contribution of this debate, to my mind, and I am amazed to see that where it was reported at all, it was reported almost as though something had to be said. That, in spite of the fact that Senator Arthur has a rare gift, the gift of dealing with complex issues very directly and in a very comprehensive manner!

After all, a second reading speech on the Appropriation Bill is about economic policies, and my submission is that the only speech that dealt fully and extensively with economic policies was Senator Arthur's contribution. I am not saying that other speeches were not good speeches, but I am saying that that speech was outstanding, because that speech, and that speech alone, dealt fully, comprehensively and extensively with economic policies. If, therefore, he has been unable to get the attention he deserves from those who indicate to people what goes on in here, I would at least like to try and make some little amends by placing on record my appreciation of his outstanding effort.

In fairness to some members of the Press, I am told that it was difficult for them to hear him. Perhaps because of the way in which the equipment was functioning at the time — I do not know — they had difficulty. That I consider a great pity, because it means that space that would have been filled by intelligent argument came to be filled by the stupid mouthings of Senator Greaves.

I also wish at this stage to say thanks to Senator Reece for the kind things said about my Ministry, even though I cannot agree with her that the cat should be brought back. I happen to be one of those opposed to capital punishment, to brutal forms of punishment. I think that brutality only demeans human beings and leads to further brutality. I am aware that there is a wide divergence of view on the subject, and I do not pretend that I am right. I can only tell you what I believe. My colleague, on the other hand, is a great defender of the faith of brutal and even original brutal punishment.

As to the point made by Senator Reece in relation to control over video, I would welcome any contributions outlining experiences in this area. If they are sent to the Ministry of Information, we will look at them seriously and see whether a case has been made for control, and if so, control of what sort. I would not wish to prejudge the issue.

I am sure that the Director of Women's Affairs would be grateful to Senator Reece for the kind things which she said about her.

Senator Lynch made a speech which was not only particularly instructive to all of us, but unsettling to those who share Senator Jones' views on the Eleven Plus. I do not pretend that I am competent in these matters — they are a little too high for me — and I will not get into a debate between people who have been educators for so many years, so I am sticking safely to Senator Lynch's comments relating to the National Cultural Foundation.

We in the Ministry of Culture do not intend to play down the role of the Community Development Officer. As you know, Mr. President, at the base of our cultural policies is that involvement of the community, what will ultimately make a success or failure of the whole enterprise, but genuine community development work remains to be done.

Within the Foundation, there are two kinds of officers, although all are called Cultural Officers. There are those who deal with the arts and there are those who deal with community development. For those at the community development end, we still require, as a priority, qualifications, degrees or certificates, either a certificate with experience, or a degree of one thing plus a certificate in social work, and/or a degree in social work, or a degree in sociology, that kind of related discipline. Those people we assume to have had the academic basis for the skills which they must inculcate if they are going to go out and work in the community and help the leadership. We have set the qualifications higher than they were before, and we are paying them much, much better than they were ever paid before. It would be a false impression to believe that there has been any weakening of the community development thrust.

In relation to the support which Senator Lynch gave to Miss Goldie Spieler's suggestion, I must say that I am very much of that view. One of the recent comments of the Director of the Cultural Foundation at an exhibition which he opened recently indicates quite clearly that that view is very firmly and commonly held.
6.15 p.m.

I now wish to deal with Senator Wickham's contribution. There were a number of points, but I have elected to deal with three of them directly. One of them has been dealt with already. There was a mistake in the Estimates — it was corrected in the Other Place — where the Richard B. Moore Library was listed in two places. It used to be listed under the Ministry of Education, and it was again listed there this year, even though responsibility for it is now transferred to the Ministry of Information and Culture. It seems as though that policy decision pre-empted Senator Wickham, and I am very happy to see that we are of the same mind.

As regards to the restructuring of the university, I would not at this point wish to read the full extract, but

to seek permission to pass to Senator Wickham the relevant section of a brief which I hold here from the Ministry of Education, which clearly sets out what the restructuring is all about. In this way his question would be answered more fully than if I attempted at this point to do the answering. The relevant information is to be found on pages 26 and 27, Sir.

As regards Barbados Scholarships, no limit has been placed on the number of Barbados Scholarships to be awarded each year. Awards are based on the results of the "A" level examinations of the Cambridge Examination Body, and to qualify for an award of the Barbados Scholarship, a candidate must gain at least two Grade "A" level passes, plus a Grade "B" and a pass in the General Paper in the examination. It is quite clear, therefore, that if there are not people winning scholarships in the Humanities, the explanation lies other than in the legal provision, and I must confess not to know. I am sure that both Senator Lynch and Senator Jones would have a clearer idea as to why this may be so than I would have, but I must say that I, too, am disturbed that every year, as you look at the list of scholars, one sees Science and Technology recurring.

I do believe that if the worst implication of this kind of result is true, we will soon be providing, at the highest levels of society, people who will show all of the reason why it was important to have a rounded education, and why it was good for people to be exposed to things other than Science and Technology, as so many leaders were in the past. I hope that I am not being thought to be saying anything against scientists, but the fact of the matter is that, generally speaking, the persons who have shown the kind of review that we regard as *sine qua non* of a civilized society have not been the scientists. That, at least, is my view, Sir. There are obviously exceptions to the rule, but, as a general rule, I think that is true.

The other point raised by Senator Wickham had to do with the increase in expenditure in Foreign Affairs. He wished to know whether this related to Washington, and, more specifically, representation at OAS level. I am sorry to disappoint the Senator, because it is accounted for almost entirely by the establishment of a Mission in Trinidad and Tobago.

Senator McClean is not here, but there is a point which he raised — I notice that Senator Ward is also out of his seat — in connection with Land Tax Estimates.

The explanation to the estimates is (1), the expectation of increased collection of arrears, (2) revaluation of properties. This happens every three years. The last was in 1981 and, therefore, the next triennial will commence in 1984, and if valuations are increased, even though the tax rate itself remains the same, it will

obviously mean an increase in tax yield. Thirdly, there are also specific valuations which take place when a land development area is proclaimed such as was recently the case in St. Barnabas, the Harbour, Heywood's and Spring Garden.

Government, with the construction of new roads, may declare the surrounding area of land as a land development area, since Government, in fact, would have spent the taxpayers' money to develop it. Therefore, it would be unjust to bring a boom to the owner of the land which he would not otherwise have enjoyed unless he, himself, had spent his own money.

That has been on the Statute Books for a little while. It is, I suspect, 1963 or 1964 legislation. I cannot remember the exact year, but it has been there in between the period that the Labour Party lost power and regained power. That does not make it bad, of course. The tax is imposed when properties of that sort change hands.

Fourthly, there will be a number of new houses which will soon be, or have recently been completed, which will be included in the land tax role for the first time.

The performance in land tax revenue over the period 1979/80 to present is as follows:—

	\$11.7 million for 1979/80
	\$11.5 " " 1980/81
	\$15.8 " " 1981/82
	\$19.8 " " 1982/83
Projected	\$20 " " 1983/84
"	\$26 " " 1984/85

Senator McClean raised questions about the schools which, at this stage, I do not propose to go into, but I do wish just to make reference to a couple of points.

If what I read in the newspapers today about what I said about policies having the impact of reducing inflation is what I actually said, then Senator McClean misunderstood me, but I am not too sure how I expressed it. If I expressed myself badly, then he could have been correct in taking me to say that the same policies that caused unemployment caused the reduction in inflation. Although I am not an economist by any means, I am familiar with the phenomenon of stagflation, and, therefore, I could not deliberately have made that statement. So the point which perhaps I ought to stress is that our policies, for example, our interest rate policy, are designed to protect the balance of payments, to pre-empt capital outflows and to encourage capital inflows. This has really nothing to do with employment policy.

6.25 p.m.

Senator Arthur emphasised that measures taken to create employment can sometimes cause balance of payments problems, and that, of course, is something which economic planners always have to watch.

I think there is general agreement with Senator McClean's thesis on devaluation. It certainly reflects the position of the Government and therefore there is nothing to argue about.

Mr. President, most of the points which were made by Senator Seale have been dealt with in one way or another, and indeed most of the points made by Senator Hall have also been dealt with.

I thought that Senator Hall really put himself in a very serious trap. He spent so much time complaining about only having one hour to speak that I think he failed to recognise how long a period an hour is, and how useful that period can be if you really have something to say and work out how you ought to say it.

I am taking the liberty to play schoolmaster to Senator Hall, because I would like him to use his time better next year. It would have been much better to have concentrated on one or two areas and to have given them careful and deliberate treatment. In that way, I think he would have had a far greater impact on the debate. As it was, I sat here at one point and heard him referring to dengue fever and then as I looked around and said, "What is that", I heard him on the Prisons, and then he was down to the Hospital Casualty, and I cannot remember where next. But it was a matter of moving so fast, I thought the big man had taken up his white shoes again and was kicking off from near the sight screen. It was an exercise in speed, but it was not an exercise in direction and control.

I believe that he was misled into that approach because of the rather ingenious approach to debating which his colleague Senator Greaves employs, which is to say nothing. It does not matter what it is, it does not matter how outlandish, as long as you feel it will give you a headline, and Senator Greaves succeeds with it. I must tell you I do not know how, but I know he does.

Senator Hall called for a full-time Minister of Tourism. I do not know what he means, except that some stupid fellow in the Hotel Association has called for a full-time Minister of Tourism. I wonder if he would wish to tell me if being responsible for more than one subject area becomes part-time in respect of each subject area, because to call for a full-time Minister of Tourism, to call for a full-time Minister of Women's Affairs, to call for a full-time Minister of Youth Affairs, to call for a full-time Minister of Finance, to call for a full-time Minister in respect of just one area because the person is responsible

for more than one area is really not to understand at all how Government functions.

We would like to believe that in the allocation of ministerial responsibility, areas are looked at, and it is observed that, in some cases, what might appear to be a single subject can represent a full ministerial load. In some instances, it can represent a full ministerial load at one time and not at another, because of the state of the work. For example, I remember when there was no such thing as a communications policy in this country, and at that point the Ministry of Information constituted enough load certainly for one person, but having set communications policy on the road, we are able to expand even that aspect of the Ministry and also to add to it Culture. But does this make you a part-time Minister in respect of one or the other? Clearly that is foolishness!

I believe that Senator Hall, someone who does not aspire to be in Opposition for all his life, should become a little more familiar with the way Government functions and not be misled into making that kind of facile statement which when made by a member of the Hotel Association can be overlooked, but really not when made by a serious practising politician. If the truth be told, the Deputy Prime Minister, who is the person being criticised by implication, is worth at least two of any of Senator's Hall colleagues, and he has the performance to show it. The record is there, so anytime he wants to talk about a full time or part-time Minister, pardon me if I believe that a quarter St. John is better than two Taitts.

Senator Hall was concerned because he was moved from one Board or two. Let me set the records straight. I am not concerned at all with the merits or demerits of the matter, because a Minister has a right to determine whom he shall have on his Boards, whom he has confidence in. My point is that in 1976, after winning the elections, the Barbados Labour Party Government invited the Democratic Labour Party Parliamentarians to participate in the administrations of Boards, and they refuse to serve. We seem to have short memories. You cannot have it both ways. If as a party you refused to serve, when somebody else decides that you do not really want to serve, so he will relieve you, you cannot get vex. You cannot have it both ways.

6.35 p.m.

The other point raised by Senator Hall has to do with the National Youth Service. About twelve days ago, Cabinet took a decision in respect of the establishment of a voluntary service. More and more information will shortly be forthcoming, but, clearly, it is expected to bring the services into operation in the coming financial year, and renovation of the National Youth Service Training Scheme at Harrison, St. Lucy, will be undertaken. The plans include not only civic and community

duties, but also trade training for those youth who will most benefit from that kind of training. That is a brief reply, which I hope Senator Hall will be satisfied with for the time being.

Mr. President, it is customary for Senator Greaves, having made his statements, some of them bordering on the abusive, to depart from this Chamber. I presume that it is a good ploy in that if you do not see him, you are probably tempted not to reply to certain things he said. But some of the things Senator Greaves said, yesterday were dangerous in the extreme, and I do not intend to leave them unanswered.

He started out with a great contribution to economic thought, by reconstructing the unemployment situation merely by reading out a list of layoffs. Having read a list of layoffs, he then concluded very profoundly that, unemployment was no longer at 15 per cent, but at 22 per cent – and in the time it took him to read that list, unemployment had moved by seven percentage points.

We understand the significance of 22 per cent. Twenty-two per cent is what unemployment was under the Democratic Labour Party. I really did not think that the intelligence of this Chamber would have been trespassed on so in the way that Senator Greaves sought to do. Not a single shred of evidence is presented in support of any of the contentions which Senator Greaves makes! He reduces everything to the level of the ridiculous!

It is my view that unemployment is a very serious matter and not a matter for jokers. When people are unemployed, there are all sorts of serious social consequences. On this side of the table, we do not regard unemployment lightly. That is why we do have policies designed to put people back to work, and to create additional opportunities for those who are out of work and who have not perhaps even found jobs as yet. We cannot treat unemployment in the way that Senator Greaves would treat it. We cannot simply toss around figures and believe that it is a matter of scoring some cheap political points. But then, that approach is only reflective of the quality of the mind from which it comes.

He then moved on, Mr. President, in what I can only categorise as a totally false and misleading presentation, to accuse Government of interfering with the Public Service. He made comments which reflected rather badly on the Public Service Commission. And when one expected to hear some substantial claim being made because one really does not expect that kind of abuse of parliamentary time – he then produced as his example of this abuse, sending people on special leave. As this was new to me, I really could not help challenging him to say

exactly what he was talking about, because he is clearly misleading the Chamber.

One of two examples which he quoted was the Government Printer. He said I would know about the Government Printer. I would indeed know about the Government Printer. The other example he gave was Mitch Codrington of the Transport Board.

It would appear that Senator Greaves had no such concern for the Public Service when Branford Taitt sent home a public servant, if you want to know about interference in the Public Service. At the time Harcourt Lewis was exercising his high powers – a public officer, yes, but a street canvasser for the Democratic Labour Party – and if your politics were not right, you were obstructed.

If he wants to talk about interference in the Public Service, I will start talking about it. But I am not going to hide behind anybody and say that I might reveal my source or endanger my source. I will talk about it.

Let us deal with the two cases that Senator Greaves mentioned. It is a fact that a Government Printer in this country was put on special leave, that the Public Service Commission had a full enquiry into the matter, and that the Public Service Commission then recommended to the Governor-General that he be retired, or be allowed to retire. I cannot remember which way they did it, but whichever the formula, the formula was the one in which he would keep his pension from the Public Service.

The facts at the time were that Debates of Parliament were two years behind schedule. The Inland Revenue Department was forced to go outside to get its forms printed. At least one judge of the High Court complained that if prosecutions were brought under certain legislation, they could hardly be successful, because in accordance with the Law, the necessary gazetting of legislation had not taken place. In other words, I am talking about chaos. The Bar Association wrote to Government complaining. There is more, but I believe that is enough.

Subsequent to that, one public officer was put in as a Special Assignments Officer, and he pulled the Printery around. More recently, a permanent appointment to the post was made, and I can tell you what the position is today. Ever so often when I come to Parliament, I ask the Clerk of Parliament, "Are you having any problems with the Printery?" He says, "No, things are excellent." Debates, as we all know, are up-to-date. All Government printing is up-to-date. Government departments are no longer going outside to get the printing done, and that includes Inland Revenue, which has to have its printing done on time. I have not heard any

complaints either from the Bench or from the Bar Association. More than that, additional printing has been taken on. Some of the printing that the Attorney-General's Chambers used to have to send to the United Kingdom to have done is done now in the Printery. They have also recently been doing some printing for the University of the West Indies' Department of History. We can leave the list there. I believe Mr. Greaves has been answered.

Mr. Mitch Codrington. I thought that the Transport Board was a statutory corporation, and I am assured it still is. Mr. Codrington was a public officer seconded to the Transport Board. When his secondment was terminated, he had leave due to him and that was the leave that Mr. Codrington took prior to resuming a job in the Public Service.
6.45 p.m.

I do not know why Senator Greaves finds it necessary to come in here and conceal the truth from the Senate. I dare say I do not know why he finds it necessary to come in here and inflict falsehoods on this Chamber. But I am more concerned by the kind of reckless behaviour which is typified in this, because this running down of the country is encouraging people like that mad boy Herbie Arthur, who went to Jamaica to write an article, which appeared in the *Daily Gleaner*, about which somebody telephoned me from Jamaica and started to read to me. I asked them to send the article, which has embarrassed every Barbadian in Jamaica who has seen it and ever heard of it, in which he has run this country down and has presented a picture of Barbados as a country which has no Press freedom. If Herbie Arthur takes his inspiration from Senator Greaves — that part which he does not take from the moon, of course — there is absolutely no doubt as to why he should write things like that. We have to be very careful. It is not just a matter of the cut and thrust of the debate. This is a matter of making reckless accusations that tend to be to the eternal discredit of the country.

Senator Greaves obviously has a problem with the new Education Act. I have had occasion to point out in here before that the trade unions breed their own brand of reactionaries, and I was amazed to find that Senator Greaves should be numbered among them. People who are opposed to the new Education Act have to be people who are basically opposed to change, and this is really Senator Greaves' basic problem.

He tells us that the Chief Establishments Officer is not allowed to function in negotiations with the union. It is not just that the statement is untrue, it is that it is foolishness. Senator Greaves is reacting to a statement made by the Prime Minister about his meeting with the NUPW. If the NUPW happens to be representing the

majority of the public officers, that is a matter of competition between the NUPW and the BWU. But certainly if they are representing the bulk of the public officers and they ask to meet with the Prime Minister, who is the Minister responsible for the Establishments, and the Minister, therefore, ultimately in charge of what Government's bargaining position is going to be, then what could be wrong with that? I do not know that there is any situation in which the Minister can refuse to say what Government's bargaining position is going to be and what are the limits to which we can go in any settlement. This is his constitutional responsibility, and he has to carry it out.

Then, in cheap political foolishness, he talks about a charter for the public servants and accuses us of murdering training. I am really amazed that Senator Greaves does not understand the difference between Training Leave and Study Leave. Let me just put it as briefly as I can. When the big fight came down at the BWU over whether Senator Greaves should go first or Mr. Lawrence Nurse should go first to do their Masters in Industrial Relations, that fight was not over Study Leave, but Training Leave. As the union perceived it, people being trained in that field were efficient in the functioning of the union. That is what Training Leave is about. Senator Greaves should know about Training Leave, because he was in the "basa-basa" with somebody over who would get the first opportunity to be trained. You have to determine what you need and then train people in accordance with those needs.

If you are talking about Study Leave, you are talking about something completely different. You are talking about where people perceive that they need to study something, and where they, of their own accord, initiate that. In this society, where there were very limited opportunities for University education, a lot of people who had external degrees from London University did those degrees without the benefit of Study Leave. This is something that people do not know. They had to work and study as best they could.

Senator Greaves said that the Democratic Labour Party's enlightened policies enabled the Government agencies to be staffed. Long before the Democratic Labour Party was conceived in 1955, the Barbados Labour Party had introduced into this country an enlightened regime which facilitated those persons who, otherwise, would have had little opportunity for adequate training. Not only did it have the component of ever extending scholarship facilities, moving the Barbados Scholarship from one to four, then to five and so on, but there was the encouragement of having Study Leave so that people could improve themselves.

Now in 1984, when we are dealing with a situation where people are coming out of school have the opportunity to benefit from a university education, can the same

dynamics be said to be there that informed a very liberal policy of Study Leave? After all, leave costs money whether it is Vacation Leave, Training Leave, Special Leave, Sick Leave, Maternity Leave, or Study Leave. Where you are running a business, and Government is a business, how do you justify leave provisions that are so liberal?

Do you know what actually happened under these so-called Study Leave provision? An engineer serving in Government on a two-year contract was given Study Leave. Anybody can work that out. I will say nothing more. What Government needs is to clearly define its Training Leave policies. Some progress is being made, but it is time for us to have the Training Leave clearly defined. If Senator Greaves had said that, it would be something to agree with, but not the foolishness he has been talking.

As far as the Foreign Policy is concerned, we had another example in ignorance. Every country operating under the Westminster model has three areas to which Prime Ministers pay attention outside of any area of responsibility which they may carry. One is Defence, another is Finance — like in Britain the First Lord of the Treasury is the Prime Minister — and the other is Foreign Affairs. Senator Greaves sat down in the House of Assembly when, in keeping with that, the Democratic Labour Party had the Constitution amended in 1974 to give to the Prime Minister substantial powers over the Foreign Service, but comes in here with his foolishness. Obviously, when he was down there he was no less ignorant than he is now. That is obvious to me. He has learned nothing all this time.

He also said something about the bad relations in CARICOM beginning before Grenada. I do not understand. When he is a member of a political party with which Dr. Eric Williams had refused to have any more "truck" with, his party leader and his two buddies, Burnham and Manley, how can he come in here and talk foolishness like that?
6.55 p.m.

Evidently, he does not understand that since the Democratic Labour Party went out of power relations in CARICOM between States have vastly improved. Only recently have heads in CARICOM started meeting again, and it is because they have been able to start meeting again that they were able to come together over the matter of Grenada. There is the renewed confidence which contact gives. Certainly, even Senator Greaves can understand that. That is a little too elementary not for him to understand.

Then he talked about the IDC. If Senator Greaves had said that the Industrial Development Corporation should be careful to advise people that they must recognise unions when they come in here, that is something

none of us could disagree with, but why accuse the IDC of telling investors that they do not have to care about the unions? Obviously, not only is it false, but it is foolishness.

Senator Greaves, for all his talk about the unions and about workers, belongs to an organisation whose Secretariat, the Secretariat of the Barbados Workers' Union, employs some of the most unsavoury employment practices. You only have to look at the people like Lester Greene, Lawrence Nurse and Floyd Branker, whom Senator Greaves would know, because he is the one who is fixing up the jobs down at Heywoods, and Francis Belle. You only have to look at these people to understand something of what is the price of having an opinion different from that of the ruler. Senator Greaves would not be in that, he does not have any opinion. Leroy Trotman was a blue-eyed boy until he tried to negotiate on behalf of the employees of the Barbados Workers' Union. As of that day he is in serious disfavour.

Sir, I am not supposed to pay attention to an aside, but my friend, Senator Williams, was amazed to discover what I was going to say and begged me not to say it. I had to tell him if Senator Greaves is going to come in here and talk foolishness, then let him come face to face with the truth. When Senator Williams has been in politics long enough he will understand that if you get cuffed you cuff back and not worry because you are a member of a union to go easy on them, because they are not going easy on you. If Senator Greaves will come in here and tell falsehoods, I will tell the truth on him.

When Francis Belle was employed, his communism was well known in connection with MONALI and his links with Bobby Clarke, and none of this changed anything. But Francis Belle made one mistake. He, too, went trying to organise the employees of the BWU. Francis Belle was thrown out summarily. That is when he got into trouble. None of that will happen with Senator Greaves, because he is that rare specimen, a trade unionist who negotiates for nobody and who can negotiate for nobody, so none of this will happen to him.

I want to refer, finally, to this gentleman's comments about me and CBC. I denied them when he said them, I tried to stop him and he would not stop. I do not have to go all the way back to Peter Morgan to talk about CBC and political domination. If he wants to talk about people running from CBC, I would have to ask whether the following people were General Managers in the days when the Barbados Labour Party ran CBC: Watson, Vance, Freddie Forde, Ian Gale, Tom Clarke and Ian Gale again. I would have to ask him what happened to the Minister who was responsible for CBC and who objected to the appointment of Mr. Ian Gale. We all know the then Prime Minister took the portfolio himself, had Mr. Gale appointed, and then gave it to Mr. Morgan.

It is today that I can talk about. I could talk about Rueben Best and Tony Best in the teachers' strike of 1969 and what happened to them, but it is today. You do not get headlines in the news now and then you get a telephone call from the Minister and the news is minus certain items. But you do get Richie Haynes telephoning the CBC news room whenever they do not carry a Press Release that he puts out, and not only questioning staff, which is all right, but threatening them as to what and what he would do. I would like to know what he could do, because you all are not going to win anything, so you are quite right. What can he do?

Again, Sir, there is a great deal of play made about Senator Hall — it is not Senator Hall making the play, it is Senator Greaves, he made it — not doing commentary. Mr. Waldo Emmerson Waldron-Ramsay was made a Senator, nominated by the Prime Minister. He used to do commentary on CBC. One day he asked to see me and he had a conversation with me. I discovered that CBC had stopped him from doing commentary. I enquired and they said that it was their policy not to use active politicians to do commentary. That, to me, seemed fair enough. That is why, much as Glenroy Straughan was doing a good job, they brought that to an end when he declared himself to be a candidate. That is why if they stop Senator Hall from doing cricket commentary, fair enough. That is why when they had the 20th anniversary celebrations and they had Leroy Sisnett and Maisie Welch, the DLP candidate for St. Joseph, on the programme, after the celebrations that was over. So it was untrue for Senator Greaves to say that Mr. Sisnett is on the one to five programme or whatever he said. This is why they have not asked Senator Griffith to do any cricket commentary, because they have a clear policy. They tell me that Senator Griffith was not as distinguished a player as Senator Hall, but he would have been an infinitely better commentator.

Mr. President, let me in these last few minutes just tell you a couple of things to do with CBC which Senator Greaves made so much noise about. We have had a situation in which audits were hard to come by. The present Board has taken a very active hand in trying to get CBC's audits out, and there has been a marked improvement in this respect. In March 1981 we got the 1979 audit; there was no audit at all done in 1982. After the pressure by the Board started, the 1980 audit was concluded on March 11, 1983, and the 1981 audit was concluded on January 5, 1984. Today, March 27, 1984, I am told that the Board has been given the draft of the audit for the 1982 year, and the Board set its accounting staff a deadline of the 15 May, 1984, by which time the accounts for 1983 will be ready for audit.

7.05 p.m.

The situation with which one is faced, and I mentioned it in here last week, has to do with the rigorous

position being taken to get the audits up, because Planning and Priorities Committee has taken the position, since October 1980, that the CBC project is not to be brought to them until the financial information is up to date.

The project involves not only the new building of a radio and administrative building at White Park, and refurbishing of the television studios up at the Pine, but it also involves an earth station. Permission has been given, so we hope that within three months we will have an earth station operating so that Barbadians will be able to see the Olympics live.

It also involves the provision of an alternative television station. So in the not too distant future, we will expect to see at least a couple of additional television channels, so that Barbadians will have a choice, not only in their radio listening, which they never had before this Government, but also in their television viewing. If Senator Greaves wants to interfere with me for what he calls interfering with CBC, then he will understand that I am interfering to get results which the country will want and appreciate, and not interfering in the sense that only he and his party would know how to interfere.

Mr. President, I thank you, Sir.

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

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be not committed.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING OF \$3.6 MILLION FROM CABLE AND WIRELESS (WEST INDIES) LIMITED

SENATOR THE HON. N.A. BARROW: Mr. President, the relevant Standing Orders have already been suspended. The matter which I rise to deal with is the Resolution which had already been circulated with respect to Government's borrowing \$3.6 million from Cable and Wireless Limited to finance the purchase of 10 percent of the shares in the new Barbados External Telecommunications Company.

When last we met, Sir, I introduced the amendment to the Cable & Wireless (West Indies) Act in order to make possible the devolution of interest from the Cable and

Wireless (West Indies) Ltd. to the Barbados External Telecommunications Co. and in the Estimates before us there had been a move-in of the \$3.6 million which form the subject matter of this Resolution.

Accordingly, Sir, members, I believe are quite familiar with the subject matter of the Resolution and I accordingly move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.

7:10 p.m.

CONTENTS

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 45(2) AND (3)	227
--	-----

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW	227
-------------------------------------	-----

Estimates 1984-85.

A Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SEVERANCE PAYMENTS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984.	227
---	-----

Senator Trotman, 228, 232; Senator Greaves,
228, 229, 231; Senator Barrow, 229; Senator
Linton, 230; Senator Howell, 231; Senator
Seale, 232.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGE- FIELD, ST. THOMAS	233
--	-----

Senator Trotman, 233; Senator Linton, 233.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS AT WEYMOUTH, ST. MICHAEL .	234
---	-----

Senator Trotman, 234.

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1984	234
-------------------------------	-----

Senator Barrow, 234, 321; Senator Greaves,
237; Senator Arthur, 250; Senator Wickham,
258; Senator McClean, 259; Senator Seale,
265; Senator Williams, 268; Senator Hall, 272;

Senator Simmons, 281; Senator Trotman, 287;
Senator Jones, 292; Senator Mrs. Lynch, 294;
Senator Linton, 301; Senator Ward, 309;
Senator Miss Clarke, 311; Senator Mrs. Reece,
315; Senator Jemmott, 317; Senator Howell,
320.

BORROWING OF \$3.6 MILLION FROM CABLE AND WIRELESS (WEST INDIES) LIMITED.	328
---	-----

Senator Barrow, 328.

SUSPENSIONS.	244, 280
-------------------	----------

ADJOURNMENT	329
-------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S.
BARROW, Hon. N. A.
CATO, His Honour Sir Arnott
CLARKE, Miss J.
GREAVES, E. E.
HALL, W. W.
HOWELL, St.C. E.
JEMMOTT, C. E.
JONES, Canon I. McK.
LINTON, H. R.
LYNCH, Mrs. E. M.
McCLEAN, A. W. A.
REECE, Mrs. M. O.
SEALE, C. D.
SIMMONS, D. A. C.
TROTMAN, Hon. O'BRIEN
WARD, L. A.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.
WILLIAMS, J. E. D.