

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday May 2, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, May 2, 1984, at 11.05 a.m.

PRESENT

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

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

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secre-
tary 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., and

Senator O. S. Arthur.

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

ABSENT

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

EXCUSE FOR ABSENCE

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

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Senate is now in
session.

MESSAGES

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable members
of the Senate I received a communication from the
Governor-General concerning his absence from the
island during the period of 25 April to 11 May on
private and official business. The Governor-General
says:

24 April, 1984

Dear Mr. Deputy President,

I am aware that you have been informed of my
forthcoming absence from the island during the period
25 April to 11 May 1984 on private and official business.
It was my intention to send down a formal Message to
The Honourable The Senate about this, but it was not
possible when your Chamber last met since approval of
the designation of an Acting Governor-General had not
been received.

Please bring this to the attention of The Honourable The Senate when next it meets, provided that this occurs before my return on 11 May.

I have the honour to be,
Yours faithfully,

HUGH W. SPRINGER
GOVERNOR-GENERAL.

His Honour
The Deputy President
The Honourable The Senate

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable Members may I take this opportunity of informing you formally that our President Sir Arnott Cato, K.C.M.G., has been appointed to act as Governor-General during the absence of the Governor-General between the 25th of April and the 11th of May.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

Law Revision (Rectification of Omissions) Order, 1984.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 8 months ended 30th November and for 9 months ended 31st December 1983.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 7 months ended 31st October 1983.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 10 months ended January 1984 and for 11 months ended February 1984.

The Rules of the Supreme Court (Amendment) Rules, 1984.

The Barbados Economic Report, 1983.

The Betting and Gaming Duties (No.2) Order, 1984.

MOTIONS RE BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I presume that Honourable Senators are prepared to clear the Order Paper today in view of the fact that while 2 or 3 items are now down for First Reading at this stage, they have however been around in Senators' hands for a long time.

I therefore wish to move suspension of Standing Order 45(2) to facilitate dealing with these matters in all of their stages.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Order No. 2 is a Bill to repeal the Druggist Act and make new provisions; Order No. 3 relates to a Bill to amend the Administration and Audit Act; and Order No. 4 relates to a Bill to amend the Child Care Board Act.

Sir, while notice has been given of these, they now fall to be read for a first time.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that these Bills have been read for the first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, Order No.1 has apparently come back to us. It is a Bill to make provisions for insurance of certain persons employed abroad. Both Orders Nos. 1 and 2 will stand in the name of Senator Trotman. Order No.3 will stand in the name of Senator Griffith, Order No.4 in the name of Senator John Williams, and Order No.5 in the name of Senator St.Clair Howell. We propose to take the items as they stand on the Order Paper.

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 1 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision for the insurance of certain persons employed abroad and for an improved method of collecting unpaid national insurance and other contributions.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, the National Insurance and Social Security Act provides coverage for persons who live and work in Barbados. However, it does not cover persons who are under the non-established staff in the Missions abroad, or who work for the Industrial Development Corporation or the Tourist Board.

11.15 a.m.

We have been finding that as a result, there are persons who serve in the Public Service of Barbados who, when they come to retire, will not be covered properly, because in some cases they are not covered by the social security systems of the countries in which they serve, nor are they covered by our own National Insurance laws.

The Bill as passed in the Other Place, in Section 2, did not take into consideration the fact that in some countries the non-diplomatic staff are covered by social security schemes, and therefore there is an amendment before us which I will move formally, which will allow the application of this Act not to operate in those cases where the non-diplomatic staff of our Missions are in fact covered in certain countries.

Mr. Deputy President, the amendment has not been circulated, so I propose to seek your leave to suspend further consideration for some time. After the amendment has been circulated to members, we will return to the discussion at a later point in the proceedings today, if it is acceptable.

It is not an amendment of great substance. It allows persons who are covered, for example, in Britain, where the benefits are exportable back to Barbados and persons will be covered when they retire, from being insured a second time.

SENATOR E. E. Greaves rose.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I have not seen the amendment. I do not know what it says and it will be difficult for me to simply agree that it should be passed.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, the proposal is not that we take the Bill now.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I understand that, but it may very well be that when I see the amendment I may require more time to study it. If we are going to be doing other business in here and an amendment comes, I might not have time to look at it to see how it is going to fit in.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think, Senator Greaves, that we will deal with that as it comes.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: All I am saying is that Senator Trotman indicated that he was asking for a postponement to deal with it later on in this session. I am only making my position clear.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not propose to allow the Bill to go through if any member is dissatisfied with the arrangements made. If after circulation of the amendment the House feels that sufficient time has not been available, then we will suspend any discussion on that Bill until a further date.

THE PHARMACY ACT, 1984

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, there is no evidence that druggists as

we know them today operated in Barbados prior to 1825. A Newspaper called *The Barbadian*, on 24th January, 1825, announced that three druggists in the persons of Richard St.Hill, Christopher St.Hill and Richard Healis, founded a firm of St.Hill, Healis and Company, and that that firm was going to operate as a firm of druggists at No.3, High Street.

Since then, the business expanded into the firm of John Gill, who was a man of Bristol, who started his business in 1857 and lost it in the fire of 1860, when the fire burned down the Ice House as well as his business. I am sure you know the famous song, "Save John Gill, save John Gill, let the Ice House burn."

Just before the new century came in, in 1898, the firm of Collins started a company of druggists in Roebuck Street with a branch in Broad Street, which is still there today.

For the first 70 or so years, there was no particular law governing the operation of druggists in Barbados until 1911, when the Medical Registration Act came into force and allowed medical practitioners to supervise the operation of druggists in Barbados, and indeed to fix the allowances which they were to get for that purpose.

In 1972, we had a further improvement on the law in Barbados when the Druggists' Council was established for the purpose of supervising druggists in an even more organised fashion under the Ministry of Health. It was around the time that it was considered necessary to have a new Druggist Act, and a Mr. Curran of Canada was recruited to draft the legislation for us.

That was done over five years ago, but it was never brought to Parliament, because we had no facility to train pharmacists in the way the Bill before us envisages. Now that we have the Community College, with the Health Services Division functioning fully, we are now in a position to train pharmacist in the way as prescribed by the Bill, and we are now in a position to bring the Bill before Parliament.

I would just like to point out one or two things about the Bill before the Senate. Section 10 of the Bill establishes the Pharmacy Council, which is charged with the responsibility of approving registration of persons as pharmacists and issuing of the necessary certificates. The Council will comprise of the Director of the Drug Service, four pharmacists, one medical practitioner and one other person appointed by the Minister.

Section 11 sets out in detail the functions of the Council. 11.25 a.m.

Section 15 of the Bill sets out the manner in which premises will be registered and the qualification for certificates to operate a pharmacy on any particular

premise. It also sets out the fee which may be payable for the certificate.

Section 27 provides for the sale of drugs at wholesale under the control or supervision of a pharmacist. This section, in fact, is probably one of the most important sections because this is the section which says that "no person shall compound, dispense or sell by wholesale or retail any drug unless the following requirements are complied with" and the requirements are set out in subsections (a) — (d).

Section 28 controls the sale of poison, and Section 30 provides for the restriction of the dispensing of drugs by unauthorised persons.

I should also draw attention to Section 32, which provides for the inspection of premises to be registered as pharmacies under the Bill. It is expected that with the passing of the Bill, the Ministry would be in a better position to supervise the dispensing and the sale of medicines and medicinal preparations in Barbados, because, in the first place, the Council is now somewhat more powerful than it used to be under the 1911 arrangements.

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

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. Deputy President, I beg to propose that Senator Linton be Chairman of Committees for today's meeting.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clauses 1—4 inclusive were called and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, before we go any further, may I move that the next 35 sections be taken in groups of five.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 5—39 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

11.35 a.m.

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 3 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Cap. 5.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, under the current Section 37(1) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Cap. 5, the Minister of Finance is empowered to dispense with probate or letters of administration in respect of a deceased public officer, and direct, upon an application being made to him, that any sum not exceeding \$1 000, which was payable to such deceased officer on account of his public service, be paid to the person who appears to him best entitled to that thousand dollars. That limit of \$1 000 was determined some twenty years ago when the Act was first passed, and the Government feels it is about time that a more realistic figure be arrived at for the benefit of the dependents of such deceased public officers. Thus this amendment would raise the limit from \$1 000 to \$5 000.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill; Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE CHILD CARE BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 4 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Child Care Board Act, 1981.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy President, when the Statutory Boards Service Commission was abolished in November, 1982, by virtue of the Statutory Boards (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act of 1982—45, the old Child Care Board Act Cap. 381 was amended, among other things, to preserve the existing terms and conditions of service for the staff of the Board, who were at the time appointed by or on the advice of the Statutory Boards Service Commission.

The new Child Care Board, which was enacted by Parliament in 1981 and which was brought into effect by proclamation on 1st October, 1983, contains no provisions for preserving the rights of staff to which it refers, and it is now therefore necessary to make such provisions at this time.

The Bill also makes provision for the appointment of the position of Deputy Chairman, who is now to be appointed by the Minister rather than the Board, as previously existed.

Regulations which of course will be governed by the Act, are now in the process of being written.

The Board operates eleven children's homes which accommodate some 254 children and it runs 15 day care nurseries, which cater for some 1,100 children. Recently, a decision was taken to close New Castle Children's Home in St. John, and already some of the children have been transferred to Sayers Court. Others will be transferred to Haynesville. During this financial year it is hoped that the day care centre or nursery at Haynesville will be completed and put into use.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I just want to make a few brief remarks on this amendment to the Child Care Board Act, 1981.

I noticed that Senator Williams in his introduction indicated that the original Bill was passed in 1981, but did not come into effect until 1st October, 1983. That seems to be a fairly long period for any bit of legislation which has passed Parliament to be hanging in the balance, as it were. I want to find out if during that particular period before the Bill came into effect the amendments which are now being sought could not have been brought down at that time. October is just months away in the past, and no sooner have you brought the Bill into effect than you are in a matter of months coming to cover up a fundamental error which obviously was made.

I also want to find out, and Senator Williams did not give us any indication as to the reason, why they would want to depart in this Bill from the norm, which has been established in legislation relating to statutory

boards, where the Minister would normally appoint the Chairman and it is left to the Board to appoint a Deputy Chairman from amongst the members.
11.45 a.m.

I want to refer to the general conditions of employment of the workers of the Child Care Board. Representation has been made over the last four years by the Barbados Workers' Union on behalf of those employees of the Child Care Board for the improvement in their working conditions. The last such communication from the union to the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare was dated 10 April, 1984. The problem is that no response whatsoever has been forthcoming, and the workers feel very frustrated that problems relating to their general working situation have not been dealt with.

My understanding of the situation is that there seems to be some uncertainty in the Ministry as to who is responsible for making decisions. I think the Child Care Board has been shifting from Ministry to Ministry; it seems now, for the time being, to be listed under the Ministry of Health, I believe.

Aside.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: At one time, it was under the Ministry of Community Services. It is now under the Ministry of Health.

(SENATOR THE HON. N.A. BARROW: That was a long time ago.)

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: At one time, it was under the Ministry of Community Services and now it is under the Ministry of Labour.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Ministry of Labour and Social Services. I think Labour is the important aspect, because of the kind of work which is expected to be done, pre-school education.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I said there has been some talk. I am not saying that the Board has discussed that, or that the Government has discussed that.

I think we have to be able to settle exactly what we are doing in the children's homes. What are the objectives? We have to settle whether the children's homes are institutions, whether the Child Care Board is responsible only for the children's homes or those day care centres, and whether the day

care centres are only concerned with keeping children in the ordinary Barbadian parlance, keeping children for mothers who have to go out to work. In districts, people had to take children to neighbours if they had to go to town or to work. You took something for them to eat, some milk — there was no preparation. I think we ought to settle very clearly what is the objective of the day care service — whether emphasis ought not to be put on the pre-school.

The workers at the day care centres are dissatisfied with the salaries they are being paid. In my view, it reflects the whole attitude of the Government, because my information is that the wages of the attendants in the day care centres are no higher than the wages of maids.

The Barbados Workers' Union has made representations to put these workers at levels compatible with the kind of work they do and the training which they have to undertake. Our appeal seems to be falling on deaf ears. If you have workers who are dissatisfied, the dissatisfaction will fall somewhere, and it could be to the detriment of the children under whose care they fall.

I want to read for the Record, the letter to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Social Welfare dated 1984-04-10, re: Child Care Board and relating to the matter:

"Dear Sir,

The Barbados Workers' Union has on several occasions written the Child Care Board on the matter of increments for the employees of the Board, especially those who have to undergo varying levels of training. The Union has had the repeated reply that the Ministry responsible was dealing with the matter; whilst the employees of the Board have been left frustrated and feeling severely disadvantaged.

The Barbados Workers' Union's submissions for Scales 1 have been based generally on the need to have some progressive salary movement, which would allow for advancement of Staff. Specifically the aim was to have the workers rewarded for the nature of the work they have to perform and the levels of training they have to undergo.

The Barbados Workers' Union considers that it is highly discriminatory to have child care workers paid at the level of Maids, when they have to feed and provide general nursing care to their charges, to administer medicine under prescription, to stimulate babies into natural development, to prepare preschoolers for the class room and to teach the handicapped as well as to work with their parents. To be able to do these things they undergo

initial training as well as advanced training, for which there is certification but no pay reward. Following this there is on-going, on the job training."

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Greaves, I assume you are going to make that a document of the Senate.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sure.

"The Barbados Workers' Union is at a loss to understand how in the face of this type of quality of work, the Ministry has been unable in four years to respond to a proposal to have salary scales apply. It may well be that our submission before this time did not manage to engage attention at the highest decision making levels.

The Barbados Workers' Union wishes however to reassert our claim for salary scales for these workers at the Child Care Board into proper alignment with persons performing work in Barbados of comparable quality.

The Barbados Workers' Union believes that a reply should be forthcoming speedily, especially since this matter has been raised over a frustratingly long period."

I want to make it a document of the Senate.
11.55 a.m.

We would like to think that when people are performing a job, they feel reasonably satisfied with the level of compensation which they get for the job they do. I know that people, generally speaking, are hardly very satisfied with what they are paid, but at least I think people are reasonable in this particular regard, and if they feel that the compensation which is given to them is of the level to match what they are required to do, then reason is brought to bear on the situation. But where people are called upon to perform all sorts of tasks for which training has to be done and they feel that their employers are not concerned — in this case, the Child Care Board or the Ministry of Labour, or the Government — and have demonstrated a total lack of concern for their problems, then you can understand the frustration about which I am speaking and which the workers employed by the Child Care Board in the various centres have been expressing. I hope that since we are now looking at this matter relating to the whole question of the continuous existence of appointments in relation to the Child Care Board, that the Board would pay attention to this matter and will deal with it as expeditiously as possible.

Senator Williams in his presentation indicated that there were eleven child care homes and fifteen day care

centres. The provision of day care centres in Barbados, I believe, to a large extent has to do with the increasing numbers of mothers who were going to work, whether they were working in the hotel industry, the industrial parks, or in other areas of employment where more women were finding employment in Barbados. This is not to say that there were no day care centers in Barbados before that. I just wanted to make that point because somebody will get up and ask me if I did not know that there were day care centres in Barbados before maybe 1961, or some nonsense like that. The point is that I think it can be fairly well established that the proliferation of day care centers came as a result of more mothers having to go out to work and, therefore, needing some place to put their children during the time they were working.

This means that, from time to time, we have to review the whole overall policy towards the establishment of day care centers in Barbados, and particularly since the Government has taken this responsibility. I can well recall, if my memory serves me right, that in Indian Ground in St. Peter, there was a private day care center that was established and going for a long time with a little Government subvention. I do not recall whether the Government has taken it over or not. But we have to review the whole approach of establishing and placing day care centers.

I would like to think that the Government will look very favourably towards the establishment of a day care center to serve those working mothers of the north who have to travel from St. Lucy to work in town and other areas, so that at least when they are traveling the children would not have to travel that far with them. I think we ought to look very carefully at that. I would like to see some provision made for the establishment of a day care center somewhere in St. Lucy or on the St. Peter border, because I think that there are a number of mothers who have to travel to work and who require this particular service. At present, some have to take their children into St. Michael with them while some cannot really get a place in some of the day care centers, so I hope that the Government would look favourably at that proposition.

I say in St. Lucy or probably somewhere on the St. Peter border because if you take the bus route, you will find that there is a natural place around the Colleton, St. Lucy/St. Peter area for the establishment of such a day care center. It would take in the people who are coming from the Josey Hill, Pie Corner, and Checker Hall areas, because they have to pass through that area. Furthermore, if, as we are being told, Government is embarking on projects to create more employment for women, then we would hope that there will be women from St. Peter and St. Lucy who will be getting jobs and who would not be prevented from accepting jobs because they cannot find some place to leave their children.

So I would like to think that in planning forward, the Government would make that kind of provision for those people who need that particular service. If you would look and see where the day care centers are concentrated, generally speaking they are concentrated in the metropolitan and suburban areas.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The Salvation Army has one in Checker Hall, too. All I am saying is that the Government has a responsibility in this particular area, and I am urging the Government to consider seriously establishing a day care center in St. Lucy or along the St. Peter/St. Lucy border.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The minutes are ticking away.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir. I can take care of the minutes. Do not worry about that.

I would like to think that we can get some movement in this particular direction, because there is a need. I am sure that the Government would not be that hard-hearted against those mothers, because I have asked for it, not to provide it.
12.05 p.m.

Apart from that, I believe we should encourage the provision of a continuing improved quality of services in the centres. I am glad to know that there is an on-going training programme, and that employees are required to undergo special training, because the rearing of, and caring for children is a specialised area.

As I said, I can see the movement. In the early days when the centres were opened, you recruited people who might have been maids, who were required to do small things related to children, but now I think there is a greater understanding of the problem. Every effort should be made to ensure that those who look after children who are in the homes, and also those children who go to day care centres, are given the best treatment, and that the best conditions exist in those centres. They, presumably, would be involved in the early training of children, and we know how children in their formative years learn quite a bit and a lot of impressions can be gained and a lot of habits can develop from those early years, and we want to encourage proper habits among children of that age so that they could develop into good and useful citizens.

I hope that my comments will be taken in the spirit in which they have been given. They have been given, not in any critical way, but mainly from the point of view of

constructive observations. I would like to think that those observations would be taken seriously.

Thank you.

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Mr. Deputy President, I would like to declare an interest in as much as prior to my present position I had some three and a half years' association with the Child Care Board; for 18 months as one of the Directors of that Board and for two years as the Board's legal adviser.

I must say that I share some of Senator Greaves' earlier observations as to education and remuneration. I have always shared the belief that people should be encouraged to go on and study to better themselves in gainful employment. I have advocated over the last three to four years that this could be applied also to the Child Care Board and to statutory boards in general, particularly those boards which are doing a very good job, such as the Child Care Board, and happen not to be income generating Boards, like some of the more recent ones.

It used to be the belief that any good mother could look after a child. I myself also shared that view until I had the privilege and the experience to be associated with the Child Care Board. I would like at this moment to congratulate my friend and colleague for quite a few years, Senator Reader, in her appointment. She guided me in the early days on that Board. She is a woman who has served this country well for many years and has given that Board in particular yeoman service.

Education in the Child Care Board is, as Senator Greaves said, a continuing process, and I would like to say that, as far as I know, it is the people who have associated themselves with that Board over many years, people like Mrs. May Hall; the former Director, Mrs. Gittens; and the present one Mrs. Phyllis Roett, who have taken it upon themselves, I know, during their vacations to take refresher courses for the more efficient running of the Child Care Board, and then, on top of their everyday work load, to take up training courses to make the Board more efficient, particularly in looking after and caring for the children, especially the very young children, before they enter school.

From my experience and association with the Board, I cannot say that the Child Care Board is in any way insensitive to the people. I have sat through negotiations with Senator Greaves' union, and I thought that union had always understood the position the Board was placed in until about November 1982, when the Statutory Boards Service Commission was abolished. I think I can say that I played a very important role in advocating that, because by that time I think that Board served to look after the Commission, to look after two

Boards, that was the Child Care Board and the National Assistance Board.

The policy informing new statutory boards has been to, as far as possible, give autonomy to the new boards. I think one good example is the National Bank. The difficulties which had been experienced up to 1982 certainly meant to some extent that the Child Care Board was not in a position at that time to employ anybody, or to make any wage increases. They could only make recommendations, but their hands were literally tied in comparison with other statutory boards.

I think the Board has always made it clear to the union that they were not in the position of negotiating like, say, employers who were in business for making profits, but that the Board understood quite well that the children of today are the parents of tomorrow and we must do everything in our power to see that they are well looked after and well trained from a very early age. Therefore, no one wanted more than the Child Care Board to give proper wages and working conditions to the people. But, as I said, they were in the position of making recommendations and could not do much more.

Apart from the fact that under successive Governments, boards such as the Child Care Board, which are not income-generating boards, are not looked upon as favourably as the other ones which could generate some money, you had the obstacle of the former Statutory Board Service Commission. That Commission is now out of the way, and it is really a question of a new line of thinking, not as far as the present Government is concerned, but coming Governments. I think we must really pay more attention to those people who are looking after the children of today, who will be the adults of tomorrow. I do not think it is fair to say that the Government is insensitive, or that the calls of the union have fallen on deaf ears. The negotiations that I have been associated with over the past three and a half to four years have always been very cordial.

Asides.

SENATOR ST. C. E. HOWELL: My understanding was that the union understood the problem of the Board. Their hands were really tied. I think the Board itself would like to do more. I understand the problem, as I have said, and I sympathize with them.

Senator Greaves is all for the training of the Child Care Board staff and all of that. I want to make this point clear; the training started by the Board was at the initiative of the Board — not the union. The union was against it. I can recall at one meeting when the Board was insisting on certain minimum standards, and said that people who are looking after children must have the

ability to at least write plain, simple English, the union's attitude then was, if you are a good mother, there is nothing wrong and you could look after the children. I am glad to see that the union is supporting that now, because they were not doing it all the time.

I agree with him that they should get some more money. I think that looking after children is a serious business, and I think this Government and successive Governments must pay more attention to the care of children.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR Mrs. G. G. READER: Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support this Bill. I am going to declare my interest, which has already been declared for me, that I have been a member of the Child Care Board since its inception in 1969.

The Child Care Board took over several day nurseries from the then Housing Authority. We inherited a lot of workers who had no training whatsoever in child care. They were not particularly successful with the children, and the Child Care Board had to shuffle them around and get better qualified and more trained people to mix in with them in order to get better care for the children.

We have had problems with Child Care Board workers fighting in the day nurseries. You cannot have this type of behaviour in front of small children, so we had to eliminate those persons whom we considered not fit to have for the guidance of small children.

We have started an on-going training programme. All Child Care Board workers are now being trained. They have initial, intermediate and advanced training. The workers have done a magnificent job. Child Care Services in Barbados are now considered one of the best in the West Indies, and we are very proud of them.

We are trying our best to upgrade these services to keep the high standards, but times are tough for everybody and it is unfortunate that we do not have, at the moment, the wherewithal to increase salaries as we would like. What we would like to do is give increments to those who have successfully completed training courses, but at the moment this is not possible.

We have several privately run day care centres. Their workers are being trained along with the Child Care Board workers. We also have inspection of all private day care centres.

Since the passing of the Child Care Board Act, the work of the Board has been tripled. Instead of having 52 cases of child abuse reported to the Board a year, so far this year there have been over 368 cases of child abuse

reported to the Board, 60 of these relating to the sexual abuse of children under the age of five years. This is a very serious position, and the Board has to have workers out all day looking after these things.

You cannot have homes where the mother's paramour is having sexual relations with a two year-old child without doing something about it. But it is sickening that the mothers of these children will not give evidence. This is very serious.

The Minister — thank him very much — remarked on this in his address on the opening of Child Month, which is the month of May. We are having a seminar at the Dover Convention Centre on the 16 and 17 of this month on sexual development in children and what we can do to guide and help them.

We are very keen on pre-school education. We have pre-school education at each of the day care centres, and we are also training pre-school educators in the private day care centres. We have women now trained in assessing children, so they can find out early cases of retardation or lack of learning ability that these can be rectified before the children go on to school. Early assessment of the children is very necessary.

The women and the men in the Child Care Board who work with us have done a terrific job. We have now all the responsibility for adoptions in Barbados, and for fostering. I have heard many people say lately that they think fostering is wrong. But fostering is a normal process for a child, and it is easier for a child to live in a foster home with loving parents than it is to live in an institution. It is much easier to run home to mother with a cut knee than to run to the matron. It is much easier to go to school being Miss Smith's child than it is to go to school being a child from the Nightengale Home.

There is no stigma attached to fostering. Fostering is not unnatural in Barbados. People have been fostering children in Barbados for hundreds of years. Many people have been brought up by foster parents who gave them the love and attention that they needed.

What is really worrying the Child Care Board at the moment is the lack of parenting in homes. We are not seeing the parenting that children really need. Parents are leaving their upbringing of the children for the schools to do, and the schools are not equipped to do it. Schools are there for teaching, not for parenting. There is nothing better for a child than a good home and a good school combined. If the mother has to work, then a day care centre is the best substitute, if there is one in the area.

We are also looking into private day care centres to see that these will be of good standard, that the children

are getting the care and attention that they need in the areas of play and work.

Senator Greaves remarked about the lack of child care facilities in the north. Indian Ground was there for a long time, and we now have Checker Hall.
12.25 p.m.

We have been thinking about the siting of centres for a very long time. We have found that for St. Thomas, the best place to put a child care centre would be in the bus stand in Bridgetown, because that is where all the bus routes converge. This sounds stupid, but it is so.

In some of our parishes, it is very difficult. We had a day nursery in Six Roads in St. Philip. We had four workers and two children, and both of those children were the children of the workers in the centre. It was closed as a day care centre and opened as a small children's home. It has been a very successful children's home. It is small, the children feel that they belong together, they have a mother figure there and they are really happy in a small home.

Children in large homes never do as well, and we have found throughout the world that, where possible, the child care trends today are to put children into small family groups. We are trying to do that at the Nightengale complex. We have a reception centre where new admissions are examined before they are assigned to the various homes, so that the children can be chosen to fit the correct home environment. There is no sense taking a child from the slums of Bridgetown and putting it at Stirling in St. Philip and expecting it to be happy. It cannot work. We have not only to match the children to the environment, but we have to match the children with the workers with whom we feel they would get on best.

The Child Care Board is deeply sensitive to the needs of the children of Barbados. The child care workers and the Board are a very loyal and hard-working group of people, for whom we should have the greatest respect. They have done a magnificent job, and when I can bring visitors here from Sweden and take them to child care institutions in Barbados and have them tell me that they are nearly as good as the ones in Sweden, I feel happy. I would hope that the problems that we have, which are problems of financial restraint mostly, will soon be overcome and we will go on to bigger and better things.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Deputy President, I wish just to respond to a point made by Senator Reader regarding the former day care centre in St. Philip which, I believe, was situated at Stirling. I want to make the suggestion that there is really in fact still a need for a day

care centre in Six Roads, which is located in the centre of St. Philip as it were.

At the moment there is a very nice little house, which used to be occupied by the agricultural officer and then was taken over by Rates and Taxes, adjacent to the public library, which can be put to such use. I have had approaches made to me to have the Child Care Board to have it converted. So if perhaps Senator Reader can take up the idea, it would save me having to write her, and the people of St. Philip South in particular would be eternally grateful for that accretion to the social facilities up there.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. Deputy President, I am not going to advocate that a day care centre be put anywhere. I notice that we have had cases put for St. Lucy and St. Philip. One must then ask, why not St. George, or St. Michael West Central for that matter.

I would like to speak basically from the point of view of a Barbadian who is proud to be a Barbadian, and one who is cognisant of the fact that the kids of today obviously would be the men and women of tomorrow, the parents so to speak, and therefore we need to make sure that those who are privileged do well and those who are under-privileged have the opportunity to do just as well. I say this because, as Senator Reader remarked, some kids, although they are in a home, will obviously not be as happy sometimes as those who have parents to go home to every day. I think that is important. For those who are unfortunate that they cannot have that wonderful experience of having mummy and daddy at home every night, we have to make sure that everything is right with them.

The problem is that so many mothers are out, and fathers too. What is even more regrettable is that fathers are not only out in the day but they seem to be out at night also. The kids have no real parental guidance, so to speak, not only from the point of view of the rod of correction or anything like that, but also from the point of view of their homework and of their being disciplined. I think that punitive measures in effect against children who have done wrong would be the type of thing that should be in the hands of children's parents, and if the parents are not there, it then only goes to show that the children are not corrected in the way they should be.

We are living in a society where — not particularly that we are not *au fait* — I do not think we care as much as we should. Every year at Christmas, and perhaps at Easter, Barbadians of all walks of life go to these children's homes and tend to make the children feel good. What I am putting out to Barbadians, and I am challenging all Barbadians, members of this Senate

included, is that we should all think in terms in doing what we can do for the betterment of the children in the nursing homes. We have to ask ourselves in this Honourable Senate how many of us have ever been to a children's home, or know of a children's home, or are in any way connected with the unfortunate children of this country? If we have not done so in the immediate past, then I would implore all Senators and all right-thinking Barbadians to do so, so that when we talk about children's homes and such things, we can speak from a platform where we are one of example, where we are worthy of emulation. But it is idle gossip for some of us to get up and talk about children's homes, children and things like that without having the opportunity of going to see exactly what is happening.

It is regrettable, it is horrendous, it is unreal when one thinks in terms of the figures that Senator Reader called out. I saw Senator Griffith almost in disbelief. But this is the truth. Even Ministers and Senators are not aware of the wicked acts imposed on young kids in this country, and I think we have to do something about it, and not only as a matter of the law. The people of this country have to understand that children must not be abused. Abuse is not only sexual, it can be physical. Some of our children are so badly abused physically that it is a mark on their whole life; their life is tarnished. Some of them bury themselves in trouble-making because they become so neurotic. That is a fact.

You need to look at it from the point of view that there are sick people in this society. Only the other day I was looking through my window and I was horrified, just at 10 o'clock in the morning, to see an act of bestiality being committed by a young boy of about 19 years. These are wicked people, perhaps sick people.

Asides.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Yes, with a cow. Imagine that! So what is going to happen to your daughter or even your son, because if it is going to be a cow, your son could be fair game. I feel that these are the sort of things we need to look at as Senators. It is important for all Barbadians that we look at it very seriously. If people are sick, then we have to address the situation, we have to look at it more closely and make sure that they are helped. I do not think that putting them in gaol is going to help very much; I think it is a sickness of the mind.

Sex abuse of children is not something that is peculiar only to Barbados. I was browsing through a magazine yesterday evening while flying back from Jamaica. Being out of the country is why I was not aware not only that the Senate was meeting today but what we were going to speak about, but this is so important and I

was stirred to speak by Senator Reader's comments, that I feel I should say something.

12.35 p.m.

I noticed in the magazine that there was a letter where a man was boasting that there was not only sexual abuse, but family love; that he had sexual intercourse with his daughter for years and that it should not be seen in a derogatory way. Even in Australia, where the nomadic tribe, for instance, is rampant, this practice is extinct. One is lowered to the extent of animals. When one commits incest, it is a very serious thing.

I think that all right-thinking people in Barbados should wake up. We have to watch our little boys and girls and the groups they are going in — even the church groups — the girls more so than the boys. I do feel that we have to make sure that this sort of thing is completely eliminated from our society.

What Senator Reader said is true, that you cannot take children from the slums and expect them to live in sterling surroundings; no more can you have adults from Emmerton. We need to talk to them. They need counselling. If this is done, it will help them in no small way to adjust to the conditions to which they are not accustomed.

All Barbadians should wake up and address themselves to the situation where very young children, two and three years old, are molested, not only by fathers-in-law but by grandfathers as well. We in this Chamber should be the leaders. We should be able to say that we have gone to the children's homes. If every one of us in this Chamber confine to our areas, we would have twenty-seven. If we were followed, we would more or less address this problem.

I am not going into the semantics of wages. I believe that people are to be paid. If you are going to get the best people, and it is a special area, you will only attract the best people if you are able to pay them properly. Let us hope they can do something about the constraints. When we look at what obtains in the world, you cannot carry a sympathetic view to the supermarket, and if people are happy in their work, they will do their best.

If a woman is living with a man and he abuses the kid, when that kid reports the problems, it goes to reason

that she will side with the father-in-law, and in some cases, the children are not believed. And because we are looking at a situation where the family is telling the kid, "You are bringing a name into disabuse," you will have the family holding a family meeting and saying the child is not true.

We have to be concerned. We are uncles and aunts. I would hope that not only the Government and the Opposition would help, but everyone in Barbados would assist in stamping out this animalistic practise.
12.45 p.m.

SENATOR MRS. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, in rising to support the measure before this Chamber, it is not my intention to make a lengthy speech, but I would like to make some observations which will be of a practical nature. It is apparent that as soon as there are difficulties in finance, the tendency in education is to cut back on provision of nursery education. That is not peculiar to Barbados. If you go to Britain, you will find that a lot of the work being done in nursery education is voluntary, and is done by parent groups.

We need to make the community much more aware of the importance of the earliest years of the child. We are told that anything done when a child is an infant is never completely eradicated in the whole life of that child, even as an adult. This is an amazing discovery to a lot of people and I think we would be doing a very great service to the community if we keep hammering away at this, that the very first year of the child is of overwhelming importance. Therefore, public opinion must bring pressure to bear on Government, at a time when we know that education is costly, and we know that a lot of money is being spent on it, that even in times of difficulty we must somehow find a way not to neglect those early years.

As soon as we speak of education in Barbados, we hear about the Common Entrance examinations and Barbados Scholarships. That is what we hear and that is where people think the emphasis should be. But there are some children whose performance at that level will suffer because of the neglect which they have experienced in their earliest years. Some will not even reach there.

Some of this neglect is not intentional. People really do not realise the importance of communication, for example, when children are very small, and very important work is being done now on this question of having the parents involved at every level in the education of the child. So even where the parents go to the clinic for post natal care, from the very very beginning parent education should be going on.

I do not think we pay enough attention to adult education. The fact is that whatever we may find to do in

the society, it must be done with three generations at the same time. We must not forget that an important part is being played by the grandparents. So a lot of the work we are trying to do in schools is entirely negated by the fact that we have not taken the parents along with us. There are some schools where parents are hardly interviewed, or not interviewed properly, where the interview is very casual, and so parents are not sufficiently involved and they do not understand the importance of their role. They think that the teacher educates the child. They do not realise that it is the parent which gives the child its concept of life very early. We need to do more about getting this across to parents and urge parents to do the job of parenting.

As much as there are nursery schools which parents sometimes find very difficult to use, because the children go to school half day and, therefore, a parent who is working all day will not be able to use that school unless there is somebody in the family to fetch the child at mid-day, there will always be a considerable number of children who will have to be taken care of at the day care centres rather than at the half-day nursery schools. I would like to see all those ten new primary schools have a little nursery component. It is traditional in our primary schools for children under four to go along to school, and heads, especially of rural schools during the crop season very often kindly took the smaller children off the parents' hands so they could go to work and the older child would not be deprived of its school education by having to look after the younger children while the parent goes to work during the crop season.

I really must stress that public opinion must be stronger about this attention to children. It is under-estimated, and that is why the Child Care Board will have trouble to get the money it needs — the community does not consider that important. If the community does, it will get the money, because politicians respond to public opinion. The only way to get the politicians to move is to let them know that we are serious about having our younger children have careful attention.

This business of protecting the child in the home, and at the school too, is also a very serious thing. It is difficult and now that we have video in the home, children are exposed to all kinds of influences and see all kinds of pictures they ought not to be seeing. Very often the parents have them, they are not put away carefully enough, and the children get hold of them. It is almost impossible to control video, and it is something that we have to think seriously about. We can, to some extent, protest about films which we saw at the cinemas, but we have no way of knowing what children are seeing on video at homes. I think we have to give serious attention to the video industry to see if there is any way we can protect the child population. I am afraid adults will have

to make their own decision, but there are signs that the children are in danger.

More attention obviously need to be paid to the rearing of boys. People have spoken a great deal about co-education, and I hope that their expectations will be met, but a co-educational school is more difficult to run than a single sex school. If it is a bad school, the girls are the ones who tend to suffer. I would like to appeal to people who have the supervision of education in their hands not to take it lightly when things are going wrong in schools today. It is more serious now because the schools are co-educational.

12.55 p.m.

I do not think that we are doing enough for the rearing of our menfolk. You see the mothers diligently bringing their little girls beautifully dressed to church and to Sunday School, and the boys are missing. It does still seem to me that more attention is being given to the girls in the home than to the boys. There is still this tradition that somehow boys rear themselves; you can just let them loose and somehow they will grow, that there is nothing more to be done about them.

I still think that some of those community based programmes on the radio could be much better handled by panels of people who are experts in their fields, and who can talk to people after some of the issues have been raised and give positive guidance. We do have a big job to do in informal adult education, and that is also an area in which you are likely to find that not enough money is spent. In those two vital areas — adult education and early childhood education — I do not think we are paying as much attention as we might.

I should like to suggest that one of the senior people in charge of early childhood education in the Ministry of Education should be a member of the Child Care Board, because it means you are giving some of the same kind of education, some in school and some in the day care centres, and you want the same kind of outlook where the early care of the child is concerned. I think there may be some connection between what is being done in the nursery school and what is being done in the day care centre, and I would like to see some tie in, although not necessarily that the Child Care Board's schools should go under centres. It seems to me it has a better chance with people concerned with community services, but I would like to see a link with the section of the Ministry of Education which looks after nursery education.

I should like to point out that the same way people feel about early childhood education, they feel about education in general. You are going to have a lot of difficulty, because the teacher is underrated, and the community does not understand what the teacher does. It does not understand how powerful the influence of the teacher is, how much good the teacher can do, and how

much damage the teacher can do. The tendency is now to be very sorry for you if you happen to be a teacher.

I hold my head very high when I say I am a teacher, because I think that next to the job of parenting, the teacher's job is the most important. I should like to see the Parent Teacher Associations used in such a way that the parents understand the way in which the school is disciplining children, the way in which children learn. They may be spending a lot of their time helping the schools financially, but I think that by coming together, not by lecturing at the parents, but by successful parents meeting the more unsuccessful ones, and by teachers using parents as partners, that the parents would learn what is necessary and how to improve their parenting. I can assure you that there is no greater unhappiness as a parent than to look back and discover that as a parent you failed your children in their earliest years when they were most vulnerable and most dependent on you.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I rise not so much to add my voice to the condemnations of child abuse, because, quite clearly, what has been said represent the general view of the Senate, and I do not rise either to do any special pleading like my friend, Senator Greaves.

There are always more facts to any employer/employee situation than either one side is prepared to give, and I believe that Senator Greaves in the fullness of time is going to move his discussions back to the bargaining table, and the union and the Child Care Board will arrive at reasonable decisions. So all the grand charge that we had this morning was exactly that — a grand charge. We do not know precisely what the facts are.

Aside

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Apparently, Sir, he was using the opportunity to put the Minister on notice. I suppose that is reasonable.

I rise to reply to two points, both made by Senator Lynch; her reference to community based programming and the need to use people with some expertise on that kind of programme. I take it that she is referring to the call-in programmes, and I rise to endorse her point of view, because call-in programmes can be a very powerful force for education if they are used properly. On the other hand, they can become a mere vehicle for abuse and for slander if they are run in the way that the programme "Feedback" had been organised and run, where you just call, let go your share of abuse, and then you are told thank you for feeding back.

That kind of programme does absolutely no good to the society. It runs the society down in a most terrible

way, and if the operators of it have been lucky so far, it is because perhaps the right people have not been listening at the right time, so that actions for slander have not resulted. I believe that at least one such programme did result in an action for slander.

As long as you are in the broadcasting or publishing business, there is the danger that you may have defamation. Everybody has that problem from time to time. I am talking about the way in which the programme "Feedback" was organized where there was no responsibility to put on a moderator to explain and enter into discussion and seek to enlighten people in relation to the points at issue.

1.05 p.m.

The programme indeed is not contrasted best with the CBC programme "Gutterperk", it is contrasted best with the Rediffusion programme "Share", in which the moderator showed a great deal of understanding and concern, and generally sought to inform people as points of view were raised. I said I would not compare it strictly with "Gutterperk". I would compare it with "Share", because "Feedback" and "Share" are organised by the same owner, and yet one is so well organised and the other one is really so badly run.

It is my view that Senator Lynch is entirely correct when she maintains that the introduction of a panel of expertise into such programmes is highly desirable. It is my view that then we would be taking a professional approach to broadcasting. In that respect, she would be moving the format even away from "Share" and closer to what is done with the CBC programme "Gutterperk". Unfortunately, they lost one of their panellists recently, and, certainly, the most popular of the three panellists, but the fact is that they were able quite discreetly to choose three-able persons to anchor the programme.

I believe that had the gentleman read the stars properly, he would still be anchoring the programme rather than wasting time.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Oh, I see, Sir. Apparently he is called to higher service, so we cannot deal with that!

The other point to which I rise to advert has to do with censorship. I think we must recognize that the business of censorship is, at the best of times, a very difficult business. We had an example of this last week when two censors went to the Globe Cinema. As you are probably aware, Sir, the Film Censorship Board divides itself up into teams of two for the purpose of viewing films before they are released to the public. The two persons may be in agreement and the result may be to allow the film to be shown to a general audience or to a restricted audience, or, indeed, that certain things be

exorcised from the film and that it be shown to a restricted audience — those are the general options — or they can have a total ban.

Last week what we had were two censors looking at a film at the Globe Cinema and not being satisfied. They then asked for their colleagues on the Film Censorship Board to see the film. In the meantime, in the *Nation* newspaper, there appeared an article in which there was talk of the two censors banning the film, and an attempt to put a case for the film, with a photograph relating to a scene of the film.

First of all, the article was false and, secondly, it was highly irresponsible. The next thing that happened was that on the Saturday morning when the Film Censorship Board went to view the film, they became aware of the presence of an additional person. They invited this person across to sit with them, and in this way they discovered that this was the lady who had written the article and that it was not as they thought — another of the censors arriving late for the viewing.

I mention these things, because, really, such unethical behaviour should never take place, and the newspaper that encourages that is hardly going to contribute much to the general upliftment of the values in this society. What obviously was happening was that somebody claiming to be an impartial film critic, or writer, or whatever, is obviously operating as a public relations officer for the cinema, which is despicable. There are too many instances where people can get a little draw-back just to come and put somebody's case and to mis-represent what other people are trying to do.

The position is that even there, where it is generally accepted that we do have a responsibility to protect the general public taste by ensuring that all sorts of prurient, violent, and sordid business is not just simply shown to the public at large, you can see the attempts of the censors being undermined — and wickedly undermined. It is nothing accidental. It is quite deliberate.

I would therefore like to refer to what Senator Lynch said about somehow seeking to protect children against what they see in their own homes, because I do not know how we will achieve this. We are talking now about parents and what they take home to show on the video, and the circumstances where they may not draw a distinction between what they show before the children go to bed and what they show after the children go to bed, or, as I understand it, what is more common, what they leave in the machine and go out.

I believe that it is not a matter necessarily of bringing these things within the purview of the censors, because it is very difficult really to see where you draw

the line between people's enjoyment in their own homes and what they do in the privacy of their homes and what is served up for the public. I believe we would really all wish to appeal to parents, guardians and other adults, that when they know they have children around, at least think a little bit about the children and be careful. What you want to enjoy, what you want to do, is not in all cases appropriate for the child.

That may be a weak position, but I believe that an attempt to censorship in that sort of situation is likely to be counter-productive; so although that may be a weak position, that may well be the best we can do. Anything else is going to call for a level of policing. Even if we could do it effectively, the level of policing which would be required may even then be defeated. So I believe that we ought, necessarily, to appeal to adults to behave like adults and understand that we all have a responsibility to children.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I would like to thank those Senators who, generally speaking, made good and informative contributions to this Bill, and to that end, I want to congratulate Senator Reader and Senator Lynch for very informative contributions.

1.15 p.m.

Senator Reader has from time to time been drawing to our attention that there is indeed massive child abuse in Barbados, and as a matter of fact, she did so when I daresay a lot of people were unaware of that. Recently the Minister of Labour has also drawn to the attention of the public that it is something which Government is extremely concerned about. Senator Hall also took the opportunity to record his abhorrence to the massive child abuse that we have in Barbados.

The questions which were raised were raised mainly by Senator Greaves. One question which has already been dealt with by the Leader of the Senate was to do with the negotiations which are going on between the Union and the Child Care Board. At one stage I was tempted to jump into it and to make a response, but at least I recognise that even the tenets of good industrial relations dictate that unless all recourses have been exhausted, then indeed negotiations ought not to be brought into the public domain. I think it would be particularly irresponsible of me to make reference to any negotiations that are going on between the Child Care Board and the Barbados Workers' Union, no matter how critical they are. I just trust and hope that they are resolved expeditiously to the benefit of all concerned.

Senator Greaves asked why the Act itself took so long to be proclaimed. I did mention that it was proclaimed on 1st October, 1983, having been passed in 1981. The reason for that is that the new Act having repealed Cap. 381, there was indeed no provision for a

transitional change-over which would have allowed the by-laws which existed and which govern the conduct and management of the child care institutions and dealt with things like admissions, discharge of children and such to remain in force if the Act was proclaimed. You need to have had the regulations in place before you proclaimed the Act, and during that period of time efforts were made to come up with regulations which would govern the Act itself before it was proclaimed. That is why it took so long.

The other question that he raised was to do with the fact that the Minister now will be given the responsibility for appointing the Deputy Chairman. Generally speaking, you will find that on most statutory boards the Chairman and Deputy Chairman are appointed by the Minister himself. In the National Service Commission, on which I had the honour to sit, the Deputy Chairman, who is Senator Linton, is also appointed by the Minister. At the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, which is a statutory body, the Chairman is also appointed by the Minister. At the Industrial Development Corporation, the Deputy Chairman is appointed by the Minister. As a matter of fact, I may say that in the case of the Child Care Board, it was more the exception rather than the rule, and it is just a question of rationalising the whole thing and bringing the Child Care Board in line with all the other statutory boards.

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

On motion of Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendments, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT DOVER

Order No. 5 was called — To move the passing of a resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the junction of Dover and Highway 7, Christ Church.

SENATOR ST. C. E. HOWELL: Mr. Deputy President, this resolution seeks the approval of the Senate for the acquisition of land situate at the junction of Dover and Highway 7 in Christ Church. It is really a straightforward resolution. The total amount is 167.7 square metres, the properties of Victor Prescott and Doreen Niles, both of Dover. It is an area along the Maxwell Main Road which is well known, where traffic entering Highway 7 from Dover experiences some difficulty in trying to negotiate access on to the main road.

1.25 p.m.

The main road itself is quite narrow, and there are two walls, one particularly to the right which go quite close to the highway itself and therefore impairs considerably the vision of traffic travelling from Oistins to Bridgetown. I beg to move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy President. I am going to match Senator Hall in play and say that I agree.

I congratulate the Government on the road programme which is going on. We have seen a lot of good work. The Bridge Road bridge is nearing completion. This is a good example of Barbadian construction of bridges and roads, and I think it would be a great asset.

I believe that a few years ago, the Government embarked on a programme in which they erected village and district signs to utility poles. The signs have disappeared. I know that the sign in my district where my business is, in Tudor Bridge, disappeared through a bus. We are a tourist society, and it is very necessary that we have good sign posts in Barbados.

The other point is that we have heard a lot about new sign posts, and I am going to get at Senator Barrow. Now I think it is time that the Government came and showed us the route — get the television cameras out there — so that we can see that this new highway is going to be good for Barbados. It is going to increase our traffic flows, and I for one should like it to start tomorrow.

I know that there are going to be a lot of problems with dislocation, and I am glad that I am not in the way because I should hate to move. But, these things happen all over the world.

We the public should like to see what the road looks like. I believe the other day when they did a road by Government House that the Government got an artist to do a drawing, which was put by Bridge Road, to show what the road would look like. You just had the Speightstown By-pass Road. Let us honour Barbadians. Let us know the name before hand.

I congratulate the Government on its transport policy and in using the Transport Levy in a wise manner. I think that Barbadians can look forward to great benefits from these new roads.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I would disagree with Senator Seale. I think he is putting the blows on the wrong Minister. The signs are not done at Bay Street, but at the Pine.

The GIS has been instructed, since I became Minister, that once there is a project, they should get their visual materials so that people can see the two things. You ought to get the sense of what was there before, some sense of the change and, at the other end, what is there now; and also, from the other angle, to be able to give to the public as comprehensive as possible, a picture of the project.

Certainly, it does no harm at all for it to be raised in this manner. There is a GIS representative at the table. They will see that I am not the only one who feels this way about these things.

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

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, before we either suspend for lunch or take the next item, if there were an indication that there is not likely to be debate on it, we can go through with it and end one time.

Mr. DÉPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Barrow. I was going to test the Senate on that. Since it is agreeable that the Second Reading is done, if we are prepared to go ahead now, I would ask Senator Greaves to make his —

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I will put the question.)

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, I rise formally to put the question.

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

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that the Bill be now read a second time. Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am glad this matter has come at this time, because there has been some concern expressed about Barbadians who are sometimes recruited to work overseas, and not necessarily in the diplomatic service. I know that the question of their eligibility to National Insurance, the whole question of severance pay and the question of where they are employed have raised their heads.
1.35 p.m.

I have a particular case in mind relating to those persons who are employed as members of staff of a Diplomatic Mission or Consulate of Barbados, but who are not entitled to diplomatic or consular immunities and privileges. If a person is a chauffeur or a maid, the person, in my view, should not be deprived of any benefits which she or he would be entitled to under all aspects of our National Insurance. The reason why I say this is because, as I understand it, employers make contributions to National Insurance for severance pay and various things, and I know of one or two cases where people have been recruited and have been denied access to severance pay by the employer concerned.

I am not really happy with the particular arrangement. I hope that this matter will be highlighted and that there will be some clarification, because there are a number of persons who have been working with our overseas Missions who are not diplomats and who sometimes find themselves in fairly difficult circumstances. I hope that would cover this particular loophole, in which case I would be very happy.

We have to recognise that not only diplomats are important, but also other people who are working. They all go to make up the diplomatic staff or give support to the particular Mission and, therefore, they ought not be denied any access to any benefits to which they are entitled, whether it is severance pay or any aspect of the National Insurance Scheme. I am glad to see that at least the legislation is now being amended to bring them into the fold. The problem now is that having done this, and not knowing when this will become operative, it may well be that the particular case I have in mind might not qualify.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I am very glad to see that the Government has taken some action which I was proposing for a long time in my tenure as a representative of the Government abroad, where particularly in New York City there was this view that people who worked as support staff were well taken care of under the Social Security System in the United States.

This has never been so, and I think that the Government has come to the realization that we ought to do something about bringing these people under the aegis of our National Insurance System.

We have to appreciate that there is a certain prejudice against people who are not permanent residents of the United States of America, and I think this piece of legislation will seek to address that problem. London and Canada, I think, are the countries where non-diplomatic staff are brought under the aegis of the domestic Social Security systems. In the United States this has not been the case. All support staff, those people who are paid from the public purse, including those staff who are personal to the Senior Diplomatic Officer, such as the maid or chauffeur, should benefit from this type of National Insurance.

The United States Government has been insisting that all people who are employed by the Diplomatic Missions in the United States in particular should have permanent residence, or be in status. Being in status simply means that once upon a time if you came into the United States on a visit and your permission to stay expired, and you were hired by an embassy as a clerical officer, driver, or what have you, you could still get a change of status through the State Department. That has been stopped. What they then said was that you can only get that change of status if your permission to stay in the United States was legal — if your time had not expired — or if you had a green card. Indeed, they were insisting that all clerical and support staff, non-diplomatic staff, should have green cards, which I thought was a bit unreasonable, given the fact that, ideally, in particular in small embassies in the United States, Caribbean nationals tend to look for work in their own embassies.

In the Barbados Missions in the United States, I do not think you would find a national from any other Caribbean country which have offices abroad. Governments tend to recruit or search for people who are nationals of their own countries, for obvious reasons. I think it is very important that we recognise that because those people are nationals of our country, they ought to have some type of protection in terms of Social Security arrangements, because they are not protected under the American Social Security system.

The other thing relates to Income Tax. No provisions for Income Tax are made for under the present arrangement. For instance, a permanent resident of the United States is by law required to file Income Tax returns in the United States. A lot of this does not happen in many of the small Missions operating abroad simply because the staff is paid on a net salary basis. The United Nations have recognised this, and pay Income Tax for all of those people who are permanent residents or nationalised citizens of the United States.

who are employed there; they accept the tax liability for those people.

I believe that in the near future that the United States Government is going to be looking at these small countries and asking them to make good on the income liabilities of those people who are permanent residents, who carry an Alien Registration Card. But I am happy to see that the Government has taken the step to bring those people under the umbrella of National Insurance. For a very long time I know some of the staff were interested in getting some protection under this umbrella, but they were denied that. It is good to see that this problem has been addressed.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill. Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, clause 2 is the clause with the amendment

which was circulated. I beg to move that Clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clause 3 was called and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was reconvened and the Bill reported as having been passed in Committee with an amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn sine die.

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

CONTENTS

MESSAGES

Message re absence from island of Governor-General	331
--	-----

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements re President of Senate to act as Governor-General	332
---	-----

PAPERS

Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW	332
-------------------------------------	-----

Law Revision (Rectification of Omissions) Order, 1984.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 8 months ended 30th November and for 9 months ended 31st December 1983.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 7 months ended 31st October 1983.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 10 months ended January 1984 and for 11 months ended February 1984.

The Rules of the Supreme Court (Amendment) Rules, 1984.

The Barbados Economic Report, 1983.

The Betting and Gaming Duties (No. 2) Order, 1984.

MOTIONS*

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 45(2)	332
--	-----

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW	332
-------------------------------------	-----

Bill to repeal the Druggist Act and to make new provisions.

A Bill to amend the Administration and Audit Act.

A Bill to amend the Child Care Board Act.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY ... (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984	332, 346
--	----------

Senator Trotman, 332, 346; Senator Greaves, 333, 347; Senator Griffith, 347.

PHARMACY ACT, 1984	333
--------------------------	-----

Senator Trotman, 333.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984	334
--	-----

Senator Griffith, 334.

CHILD CARE BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984	334
--	-----

Senator Williams, 335, 345; Senator Greaves, 335; Senator Howell, 338; Senator Reader, 339; Senator Linton, 340; Senator Hall, 340; Senator Lynch, 342; Senator Barrow, 343.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT DOVER AND HIGHWAY 7, CHRIST CHURCH	346
--	-----

Senator Howell, 346; Senator Seale, 346; Senator Barrow, 346.

ADJOURNMENT	348
-------------------	-----

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Hon. N. A.

GREAVES, E. E.

GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.

HALL, W. W.

HOWELL, St. C. E.

LINTON, H. R.

LYNCH, Mrs. E. M.

READER, Mrs. G.

SEALE, C. D.

TROTMAN, Hon. O'B.

WILLIAMS, J. E. D.