

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, July 10, 1985.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, July 10 1985, at 11.15 a.m. today.

PRESENT

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

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

Senator the Hon. O'B. Trotman, (Minister of Health and Social Security)

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State (Planning) and Leader of the Senate)

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Senator H. R. Linton

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

Senator Miss J. Clarke

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece

Senator E. E. Greaves

Senator W. W. Hall

Senator A. W. A. McClean

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

Senator C. D. Seale

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones

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

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

Senator J. E. Jordan

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

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following:

Report on the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for the year 1983.

Report on the Fire Service for the year 1984.

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

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, on the Order Paper today there are two items that were given notice of last week, but honourable members were circulated with a Notice Paper consisting of seven items, two Bills and five Resolutions. The Government would like to have these dealt with today, and I will, at the appropriate time, move the suspension of the Standing Orders necessary to do so.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Sir, notice has been circulated and there are two Bills

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

A Bill to amend the National Health Service Board Act, 1984–22.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, in view of the fact that on the Notice Paper there are five Resolutions and two Bills, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 22(1) and 45(2) for the remainder of the day's sitting.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, in the arrangement of work for today, I would just like to make a few adjustments. Item 1 will be a Bill to amend the Health Services Act and that will be introduced by the Minister of Health, Senator Trotman. Item 2 will be a Bill to amend the National Health Service Board Act, 1984-22. That will be dealt with also by the Minister of Health, Senator Trotman.

Item 3 will be a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of \$25 000 000 from the Orion Bank. Item 4 will be the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance. Those will be dealt with by me.
11.25 a.m.

Item No. 5 will be to move the second reading of a Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of the sale of minerals; Item No. 6 will be to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act; Item No. 7 will be a Resolution to approve compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue — that will be moved by Senator John Williams; Item No. 8 will be a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Church Street, Speightstown, introduced by Senator John Williams, and Item No. 9 is a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Dayrells Road, which will also be introduced by Senator John Williams.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT)
(NO. 2) ACT, 1985

Order No. 1 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, the Minister of Health, in accordance with Cap. 44 of the Laws of Barbados, is generally responsible for the promotion and preservation of the health of the inhabitants of Barbados, according to Section 3. Section 4 says that "the Minister shall be responsible for the administration of this Act, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, his functions shall include the control of food and drugs in the interest of the public health....."

Over the last few years we have had food service establishments growing in Barbados where people are processing food. People are now making hamburgers in Barbados, hot dogs, and we now have, I believe, ham and bacon, and there are several other of these institutions which are coming up in Barbados. The matter to be considered is whether private enterprise should be allowed to establish food businesses and produce food for the consumption of the inhabitants of Barbados without any monitoring from the Ministry of Health. It is clear that

the Act intends that the Ministry of Health should supervise the quality of food which is being served to our people.

In most countries where food processing plants exist, it is normal for the food processors to have quality control inspectors who ensure that the food produced is of such a standard that it would meet the requirements of the Ministry of Health or food administration, as the case may be. However, in Barbados none of the establishments in this business has any quality control inspectors. The Ministry of Health therefore has to use its own staff to put on the premises of the producers to ensure that proper standards are kept, and it is not a matter which can be passed over lightly, because our experience in the Ministry has shown in one case, with one establishment in Barbados, where, according to the public health inspector's report, material which he had condemned as unfit for human consumption and had put away for disposal, during the time when he went to lunch and came back, they had managed to get it out of the disposal tray and back into the production line for us to eat in Barbados. So ongoing monitoring has to be done in Barbados.

Our position is that if a manufacturer has his own quality control, then our only function is to make spot checks to see that the quality controllers are doing their work effectively. As it is now, since there are no quality controllers, our own staff in the Ministry of Health have to be the quality control staff for the producers, and we are saying that it is none of our business to do quality control for private enterprise. We are only to inspect. In one case, at present there is an officer stationed at one factory for eight hours a day, so we are using the taxpayers' staff to do work which that producer should be paying somebody to do. We say that that is not right and that the Consolidated Fund should be reimbursed by the amount of the man's salary so that we can pay somebody else to do his work, because every time we take someone off their regular inspection and station them at a factory, it means our own inspection team becomes weaker.

The question of having public officers on private premises is not new. It already exist in the Excise Department where excise officers work full days at the distilleries and the distillers make the necessary contributions to the Consolidated Fund to reimburse the Government for their time. It is that same concept which we propose to use in the Ministry of Health. The Bill therefore seeks to do two things:

- (1) To empower the Minister to designate and assign public health inspectors to the private premises.
- (2) To prescribe the fees which the manufacturers should pay to the Consolidated Fund.

In the second case, the regulations setting out the fees would have to be done in conjunction with the Ministry of Establishments since the matter of Public Service employees' pay is one for Establishments.
11.35 a.m.

Assigning public health inspectors to factories in no way conflicts with the constitutional duties of the Public Service Commission. We have got to understand that the Public Service Commission in this country is a constitutional authority, and it is authorized to appoint, promote, transfer and generally discipline the Public Service. This Act in no way seeks to appoint, transfer, promote, discipline or do anything to the public health inspectors. A public health inspector gets his appointment from the Public Service Commission and he is assigned to the Ministry of Health, but the Public Service Commission has no authority in saying whether Inspector McClean should work in the northern district or Inspector Jones should work in the southern district. That is a matter which is dealt with at the administrative level, and the Ministry of Health is the authority which is empowered to administer that Act.

I do not want to hear later in the debate any of the non-legal arguments I heard in another place about interference with the duties of the Public Service Commission. This is a matter not of regulating the Public Service, but of regulating the quality of food which is being processed in Barbados. It is no more an interference with the Public Service Commission for the Ministry to assign public health inspectors to a food processing plant, than it is, as at present, to assign a public health inspector to check on the swimming pools at various hotels in Barbados to make sure that they are kept clean for people to swim in. If you can assign people to factories, you can assign them to districts, you can assign them to hotels to make sure that the swimming pools are kept clean and you can assign public health inspectors then to hotels to make sure the rooms meet the standards required by law. All of this is part of the administration of the Public Health Act. It has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with the conditions of service and the discipline of public officers as envisaged by the Constitution which provides for the Public Service Commission.

An impression has got out in Barbados that public health inspectors are not properly trained. I want to deal with that. I believe that the public health inspectorate is slightly understaffed. We have the same number of inspectors in Barbados in 1985 as we had in 1969, when the Central Government took over the services of the three Local Government Councils. Since then, we have had a lot more residences in Barbados, we have had a whole new tourist industry grown up in Barbados, and now we have the poultry farms and food processing plants. So it is obvious that something has to be done very soon about increasing the manpower in the inspectorate.

Nevertheless, the present inspectors which we have get all the training that they need to ensure that they are properly qualified to carry out the duties which are assigned to them. Over the past year, for example, we have sent one inspector to the USA to do vector control. We have sent another one to the USA to do poultry inspection. One is doing a one year's course in Jamaica in health management. Two are in Texas doing poultry inspection. Three went to Trinidad to do air and seaport supervision. Two went to California to do vector control. One went to Antigua to do community health. One did a three months' course at the Community College in meat and other foods. Four of them are doing advanced courses at the Barbados Community College, another three are doing the basic Public Health Inspectorate Course at the Barbados Community College and another three are doing two year courses at the Barbados Community College. So the Ministry is, in fact, constantly training and giving further training to public health inspectors to ensure that they are properly qualified to carry out the inspections which they have to do.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I do not believe that any reasonable person would take issue with the Government in its stated policy of trying to ensure that companies which are involved in the processing of food and food products ought to maintain the highest standards at the plant, and that we have the best quality product. Failing this, obviously so many health problems could arise that one would not want to begin to imagine. However, I would like to take issue with the way in which the Government is proposing to handle this vital matter.

It would seem to me that it would have been a much better approach to have regulations relating to food processing, the handling of food and those companies which have to do that, and in these regulations stipulate that these companies would not be able to operate unless they have on staff a food quality control officer. To me, that should be a basic minimum requirement that should be established from the very outset. I do not believe that any company which is in the business of making hot dogs and hamburgers, or the large poultry processing plants, ought to be able to operate and put food on the market for public consumption unless the quality control officer is in place in order to ensure that the public gets the very best.

Where does the Ministry of Health come in? Of course the Ministry of Health has a role to play because, in the final analysis, the Ministry of Health is responsible for ensuring that the standards which are set for health in this country are maintained. Therefore, I would see the role of a public health officer as one which would involve

visiting factories on a regular basis to ensure that these standards are maintained. Of course, there would be the usual penalties attached to the companies which do not measure up to the requirements which have been laid down.

Senator Trotman indicated that the number of public health inspectors, I believe this is the word he used, has not been increased since 1969. I do not think that in 1985 Senator Trotman should be making that point. I have heard him make that point already. If the Government recognized that this is a need, and since we are moving into that kind of manufacturing process, then we ought to be in a position to answer that particular need, and already enough people should have been trained in order to have the number of people available to deal with these problems. This points out very clearly the short-sightedness on the part of the Government, because we should not now be complaining about the lack of public health inspectors. If we are going to be promoting food processing as an aspect of our manufacturing diversification, then we have to have the tools available to ensure that this can take place, and it is short-sightedness on the part of the Government to be complaining in 1985 that we do not have enough people to deal with these things.

11.45 a.m.

Our whole system has to be geared to meet these demands. What is happening is that, on the one hand, you are proposing one kind of development — you want to diversify manufacturing, to get into food processing — but now that you have got plants here which are in that business, you find that you do not have people who can fill the role of quality control officers, and you do not have enough public health officers to meet this demand. I have to take issue with the Government on that particular approach, because I do not believe that the approach which Senator Trotman is advancing is the way to deal with this problem. In the final analysis we will still have to come back to the point of insisting that these companies have their own system to deal with these things, and the Ministry playing a supervisory role rather than having public health officers assigned in the way that they are now assigned and the way in which the amendment to the Health Services Act envisages that the assignment will be made.

As to the question of who is to do the assigning and whether the Minister is taking over the responsibility of the Public Service Commission or not, I think that is a moot point. Senator Trotman attempted to justify the wording of the amendment, which, as far as I can see, would empower the Minister of Health to assign public health inspectors to certain private businesses on a full time basis, on such terms and conditions as the Minister prescribes, and I am a little worried about the way in which the Government proposes to deal with this problem.

I used to think that the personnel management in the Public Service was the function, in the first instance, of the Public Service Commission, in that they appoint people to the various posts, and that the day-to-day assignment and delineation of duties was the responsibility of the head of various departments or Ministries. I am not aware that, from an administrative point of view, a Minister is head of his Ministry. I was under the impression that a Minister ought to concern himself mainly with setting up policy guidelines. And what is the policy that we are talking about? The policy we are talking about is that there is a need for public health inspectors to be assigned to oversee the food processing plants to make sure that quality food comes out on the market. That is a policy decision, nobody has a quarrel with that, and I am sure that is the Minister's responsibility, because, in the final analysis, if food comes out on the market which turns out to be poisonous, the Minister has to take the blame. So he has to say that the position of the Government is that we want to make sure that there is proper food coming on the market. That is the extent of his role. Then it would seem to me, and this is what I thought used to obtain, that the actual assignment would be done by the Chief Medical Officer, in this instance, who would be head of the Health Department, who would have the responsibility to assign the various public health officers to the various areas.

I get a little worried, because Senator Trotman in his introduction mentioned, by way of examples, names. I do not believe he was talking about the names of any specific public health inspectors, but what worries me is that the impression I am getting is that Senator Trotman, in his capacity as Minister of Health, would see it as his responsibility to assign Mr. Yearwood to BARPAC or Mr. Williams to Hanschell and Inniss. This is a very serious thing. And Senator Trotman gave examples of how he sees this whole assignment business functioning. I do not believe that that is the Minister's responsibility, and this is where I would have a departure from the Government on this particular matter. It is a very serious departure.

Sometime ago, we debated in here, I think it was earlier in the session, the Factories Act. Under the Factories Act, I am speaking from memory — but I believe that I have a fairly clear understanding about the Factories Act — labour officers have to visit various factories from time to time. There are some factories that they have to visit at least once a year, some factories they should be visiting every six months and some they have to visit every two years; it is set out in the Act. The Act does not say that the Minister of Labour will assign factory inspectors to perform this function. Neither does it give the Minister of Health, under the Factories Act, the right to assign public health inspectors or the medical people to the various tasks which are involved in the administration of the Factories Act. Under that Act, you

will find that the Chief Medical Officer is responsible for carrying out the various arrangements under the Act. You will find that in the Ministry of Labour the Chief Labour Officer is responsible for doing the assignments, not the Minister of Labour. If there is a factory to be visited, the Minister does not say that Mr. Griffith will go and visit "X" factory or "Y" factory. The Chief Labour Officer does that. What we are seeing now, it seems to me from the interpretation which could easily be given to this, and certainly the way in which this Administration functions, is that the Minister will hand pick individuals, and he, himself will, do the assigning. It has happened over and over again, and this is a very dangerous development in the Public Service.

I believe that there must be a way out of this. I know that Senator Trotman in his reply will refer me to Section 7A (3) of this amendment on page 2, where it says:

"The Minister may by instrument in writing delegate the designation and assignment for the purpose of subsection 1 to the Chief Medical Officer or such other public officer as he determines."

11.55 a.m.

I am very unhappy with that wording, because all the wording in this says that the Minister may designate. There is nothing to compel the Minister to designate to the Chief Public Health Officer of such other public health officer this particular function of assigning. That is what worries me in this particular arrangement.

I think that we have to recognise that more and more we are finding that when the Opposition charges about encroachment in the Public Service by the politicians, by the Ministers, where Ministers see it as their role and duty to administer on a day to day basis their Ministries and departments in the way that a Head of Department administers rather than just setting the broad policy guidelines and ensuring that those are carried out, we are reaching the thin edge of the wedge, and I am saying, before it is too late, let us pull back from that. I believe that there is too much encroachment in the day to day functioning of the Public Service by the Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party Administration. The evidence is coming to the fore on a daily basis, and it is not good for the Public Service. I believe that we are creating a Public Service which has now become so politicised that they are beginning to lose their sense of direction, because they are scared, they are afraid of the way in which they are pressurised and of the threats which are made to them in one way or another.

I think that this is another example of the way in which the Barbados Labour Party is seeking to establish its control over the Public Service, and I want to see the Public Service functioning in the way that we have been accustomed to seeing the Public Service function, that is, performing its duties without fear or favour. On this particular amendment, I am afraid, from the point of view of the way in which it is worded, that I will have to

abstain from voting for it. I am in agreement with the general purpose of it, that is, I agree that we ought to make sure that with people who are involved in food processing and anything which comes on stream for public consumption, we ought to have the highest standards and the best quality. I am in total agreement with that, but I do not agree with the way in which this Act will allow the Minister, or any Minister, to encroach on the responsibility of people who are charged with the responsibility for the day to day functioning of the Service and of particular departments, and therefore, as I said, I will have to abstain from supporting this amendment.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I support the amendment to the Act, and before saying anything I want to declare an interest, as I am a director of one of the food processing plants in Barbados.

I agree with Senator Greaves that we all want the highest health standards in Barbados, and therefore I have no objection whatsoever to the Ministry of Health demanding that there be a health officer present at all times at all the opening hours of the plants. However, one of the problems is that we do not have plants all of the same size. We have small, medium and maybe large, and I am wondering if the Ministry would give consideration in their charges that they do subsidise the charge which they make for officers to the smaller plants, because the Ministry has a set fee, and whether you have 50 per cent of the market or one per cent of the market, you pay the same fee for each officer. It happens in the distilleries and the rum bottling plants regulations, and I gather from the Minister that he is patterning this after that.

I would like to suggest that the Ministry of Health consider that in the case of any officer being placed at one of the very small plants, the charge be subsidised somewhat to accommodate the size of the market, because we have a growing number of these food processing plants. Four or five years ago we only had one, but I think we must now have about six in Barbados. It is a good way of providing employment and it is very worthwhile for Barbadians to get into these items. It saves on our foreign exchange and we have to welcome it. I would just like the Minister to look at that point about charges.

SENATOR G. G. READER: Mr. President, I have to declare an interest, because a member of my family is qualified fully in veterinary public health. He has expressed to me his worry about veterinary drugs being sold over the counter to farmers who then feed them to their livestock before selling them to these plants, without telling the people who are going to process them that these animals have been fed large quantities of antibiotics, which when processed and fed back to the people of Barbados create a situation where people who are allergic to those antibiotics may have an allergic reaction, or people who are needing antibiotics may build up such a terrific resistance over the years that they no longer respond to the antibiotics in times of health crisis.

I had a very horrible story from him once. While he was inspecting meat in a factory in New Zealand, some meat was rejected but he was told that it does not matter because it has been sold to the West Indies who are not fussy about what kind of meat they buy. It is the rest of the world they have to worry about.

He feels that one of the greatest harms that can be done can come from the fact that the poultry in Barbados is very high in antibiotic content. He feels the Government should really look into this and see that something be done to cut down the amount of drugs that are allowed to be put into poultry feed and sold to poultry farmers over the counter. This is not just a matter of people buying these drugs because they do not want to pay a vet. At one time there were only three or four vets in Barbados, but now there are a great many more of them and the services are available. He feels that it is unnecessary for people to be able to buy these drugs and feed them to their animals without real knowledge of what these drugs can do to their animals.

The Bill provides for the inspection of meat, and I, for one, would be very glad to know that the meat is properly inspected. Also as Chairman of the Child Care Board, I have the responsibility for serving about 6 000 meals a day to small children, and this is an important area.

12.05 p.m.

I agree with the Bill and I hope that the Ministry will take into consideration what I have said, which is not really to do with the Act but impinges on it.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Mr. President, in supporting this Bill, there is an observation I would like to bring to the Ministry of Health in relation to a situation which I feel can become very dangerous to the health of this country, that is, with the fish sellers along Cowell Street, in the area along what is known as Marshall Hall.

People are selling fish along that street, Sometimes I have seen some of the fish on the ground, and those of us who know the area know that on nights sewage tanks pass that way — and one little touch on one of those fishes is typhoid. We are talking about food and the health of the country and I hope that will be looked into. Even though it is a small matter apparently it can develop into a very national health matter

SENATOR THE HON. O'B TROTMAN: Mr. President, the points raised by Senators Reader and Jemmott are points of substance which we have to apply our minds to, especially the question of the "night soil" and the fish competing for the same space. That is being examined and I hope it will come to an end very soon.

Senator Seale raised a matter, I would suggest that he raised it with the Chamber of Commerce, have a proper examination done and a proposal made to the Ministry of Health about how we can raise the charges. There is also some merit in the concept of scaling the fees. We are having difficulty with that, but we prefer the

Chamber of Commerce to give us a proper submission and let us examine it.

We come now to non-contribution. The Constitution of Barbados provides for certain institutions. One is the Public Service Commission, another one is the Director of Public Prosecutions, and the same way the powers of the Public Service Commission are guaranteed by the Constitution, so are the powers and authorities of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Constitution, however, makes an exception in some instances and says exactly where the Director of Public Prosecutions must take his instructions from the Attorney General, who is, in fact, the Minister of Legal Affairs.

In the case of health, it is not written in the Constitution, but the Health Services Act, passed in 1969 — the date is important — made it quite clear, deliberately, that the health of the community is such an important matter that even though Section 11 of the Act says that the Chief Medical Officer shall carry out the duties of the Minister except in those cases where the Chief Medical Officer is given instructions, otherwise it is the reverse situation, the Act says in all sections the Minister has authority. Section 9 says:

"Except as the Minister may otherwise direct, the Chief Medical Officer shall discharge the functions conferred on the Minister under this Act, and every Medical Officer of Health, Public Health Nurse, Public Health Inspector or other public health officer shall discharge functions under this Act as directed by the Minister or the Chief Medical Officer."

That is described in the Act deliberately, because in the business of health, we are not discussing the question as to whether or not we are constructing a highway from Bridgetown to the airport or whether we are building a harbour at Oistins. We are dealing with people's lives, and decisions have to be made quickly, so we are not making any excuse for how the Act is written.

The Act was written under another Administration when Senator Greaves was not in this place and I do not believe he voted "no". I am not excusing myself on the Act. I am only saying he played one game and he is playing another game another time.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order: Senator Trotman is misleading the Chamber, because in 1969 I was not in Parliament. Therefore, ask him to withdraw the comment "he played one game one time and another game another time."

Mr. PRESIDENT: I missed the second part of what the honourable member said. I thought he said you were not in this Chamber. I am just trying to get it clear what he said. I heard him say you were not in this Chamber. He went on to say something which you are objecting to?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What is it again?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: "At one time he played one game and at another time he is playing another game."

Those are offensive remarks and I am asking the member to withdraw them.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Implying that in another place you said something else?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Would you want to pursue that or withdraw it?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I never said the Senator was in another place at another time. I said he was not in this place.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If he takes objection to that and you did not mean it that way, take it back.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Greaves in 1969 was not opposed to the amendment of the Act.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: He was not aware of it? He was out of the island?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not let us pursue this any further.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Greaves was not opposed to the Act then. That is what I am saying. Senator Greaves was not opposed to the Act in 1969.

Asides

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I never said in the other place.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Why continue this?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I am rising again on a point of order. I would request you to get the shorthand reporter's report so that we can see what Senator Trotman said, because I am insisting that the remarks should be withdrawn.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not have to go to the Hansard Report. If there was an implication of something that Senator Greaves said in the other place when he was not in the other place, I think you should withdraw it.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, I want to make my position clear. Senator Greaves is now opposed to the Health Services Act conferring the power of the administration of the Act in Sections 3 and 4 on the Minister and not on the Permanent Secretary. If Senator Greaves is prepared to say that in 1969 when the Act was drawn up he was opposed to it, then I would withdraw it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is not the issue.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: That is the point I am dealing with. If he was opposed to it then, I am sorry about that. If he gave any support to it, then he cannot oppose it now. That is all I am saying.

Mr. PRESIDENT: He was not in the Legislature. Withdraw any implication that he was in the Legislature. Do not carry on this disorder. If there is any implication in your remarks about Senator Greaves saying something like that in the Other Place, I want you to withdraw it.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I want to make it clear. He was not in the other place.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Will you withdraw the implication which was made?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The implication would not be worse because I did not say he was in the Other Place. How can I withdraw what I did not say? I really do not want to offend Senator Greaves, but I do not want to unsay what I did not say, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Take back any implication that was said.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: If there was an implication that can be withdrawn but I cannot unsay what I did not say. I did not say he was in the Other Place.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Withdraw the implication and let us get on with the people's business.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: How can I withdraw it if I did not say it, Sir? I want to get the position clear. Mr. President, I want to be as co-operative as I can be with you. I know that we like to protect the rights of the minority, but the majority has rights, too. I want my rights as well.

12.15 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us have a little order, please. Senator Trotman, I am not going to continue asking you this. If it was an implication of that sort, please withdraw it and let us get on with the business.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, any implication is withdrawn.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us get on with something else now.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The original Act was passed in 1969 as 1969-39. It was amended in 1969 again as 1969-45. In 1972, it was amended and carried to the Other Place. He was then a Member of the Other Place. I want to know if he objected then. It was amended again in 1972 as 1972-23, and he was then a Member of the Other Place. He did not object then either. It was amended again in 1973 as 1973-20. He was in the Other Place and did not object. It was amended in 1974 and he was a Member of the Other Place, and he did not object. He was again a Member in 1975 when it was amended as 1975-49, and he did not object. He did not object to the Act then and now he wants to object. He supported the Act at least five times on the floor of the other Chamber. He did not object on any of those five times when the Act was open for debate. One does not debate only the amendments in place, otherwise Senator Reader would not be in place. When an Act is called, the entire Act can be debated. That is accepted parliamentary practice. He did not object to any clause in the Health Services Act on those five occasions in the Other Place, but now he comes in here

objecting. He has a change of conscience now. If you want to vote against it, vote against it. That is your right. I am not asking for your vote. When one counts heads, we do not count your vote.

It is absolute foolishness for anyone to interpret the Health Services Act and the Regulations to the Health Services Act of Barbados into how the Ministry of Health shall divide the health districts of this country and the assignment of public health officers as a breach of the Constitution as it refers to the Public Service Commission, and the fact that you are mimicking a lawyer does not make it sensible. They have got good lawyers and they have got bad lawyers. It is nonsense. The other points are points of substance which we can take. About interference with the Public Service, what interference with what Public Service?

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to, Senator Greaves voting against.

On the 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, 2, and 3 were called and passed.

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

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

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 7 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Health Service Board Act, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The National Health Service Board Act makes provision for the disbursement of the funds collected under the Health Service Levy, and it would suggest from that Act that the funds so collected can be used only for the purpose of paying doctors. In fact, that is what seemed to have caused great confusion between my Ministry and the doctors. That is not the intention. The Health Service Levy is to be used to finance the GP component of the National Health Service as well as to finance the other services which are considered ancillary to the GP service, because we could not tax the people of Barbados to pay for the drugs, tax them separately to keep the hospital going, tax them separately for X-ray and labora-

tory services, and then impose a levy on them to pay the doctors. That is what the doctors thought we intended. In fact, throughout their conflict with the Ministry, their only point always has been that if we paid them the levy, they could deliver the health service, because the doctors of Barbados believe, genuinely, unfortunately so, that what we should do is take the people's levy, the \$20 million we collect, hand it over to the doctors and all will be well. We have no intention of doing any such thing. That is what all the conflict in Barbados over the last few weeks is about. They must understand, strike or no strike, there is no way we are going to hand over the people's money to the doctors of Barbados. Let that be recorded.

12.25 p.m.

The amending Bill seeks to establish provisions for the Minister to decide which ancillary health services can be charged to the Act, because the number of services to be charged will depend, of course, on the funds available. It is intended that the laboratory services should be charged to the levy, because if an old woman goes to the doctor, there is no point saying she can see the doctor free but she cannot have a blood test because she is too poor. That would make nonsense of the examination, I am sure you would agree, Sir. Or that she cannot have her hand X-rayed because she cannot afford the fee. Therefore, we intend to have the Act so carefully worded that the Health Service Board itself can pay for the ancillary services which the people who are to benefit from the scheme should get. So much for the Act.

Over the last two weeks, we have heard how the Government has by-passed BAMP with the National Health Service. We have heard how we are trying to enslave the doctors of Barbados. We have heard how we want to bring them under the political directorate. We have heard all sorts of things. The doctors have never once said that what we are quarrelling about is money. They do not like to talk about money, because they get a lot of money. But I want to talk about money today. We are going to talk about dollars.

Between 1983 and March, 1985, the Ministry of Health met eighteen times with the doctors to talk about how much money we are going to pay them to deliver the GP service to Barbados. I want to make it clear that whereas BAMP masquerades as the representative of all doctors in Barbados, BAMP is a collection of specialists in the hospital who have no interest in the GPs, who would like themselves to muscle in on the GP practice. What we are quarrelling about is how much the specialists at the hospital would wish to rob the taxpayers of. That is what we are talking about!

We met with them eighteen times in two years, three times under my chairmanship. On the last time,

on March 22, when I met with the doctors, the Chairman of BAMP, Dr. Hoyos, said to me that the only problem they had was the problem of pensions, which I told him we could not agree to, and the question as to how much we would pay for the After-hour Service. Those were two points on which I could not move, and I told him that, in fact, I had gone beyond the limit which the Government had agreed it could go to. I had in fact raised the After-hours Allowance prior to getting Cabinet come to terms on it. But the doctors now say they did not agree with that.

In addition to that, on the issue of terms of service, which they say represent slavery, officers in the Ministry met with them on July 26, August 2, 1984; August 20, 1984 February 14, 1985; February 28, 1985 and March 19, 1985 to discuss the terms of service. Now they say that they have been by-passed! But they have been by-passed because the consultants never intended that the GP service should start unless they had a big cut in the deal of the Health Levy.

We told them on March 22, that we would pay them to operate the Over Sixty-five Scheme. There are 27 000 people who are over sixty-five in Barbados, we are talking of just approximately ten per cent of our population. We told them that for ten per cent of their practice, because that is what it represents, they would get \$11 000 per annum as capitation fee, \$11 250 to get the figures accurately, an After-hours Emergency Service Allowance of \$5 400 and a Group Practice Allowance of \$2 800, because they said they want to operate in groups, that it is better to operate the service in groups, if you are doing after-hour service. Everything we are talking about is what they put to us, not what we put to them. If we had our way, there would be no Board. The Ministry sees absolutely no need for a National Health Service Board in Barbados. The existence of the Board is an attempt by the Ministry to accommodate the doctors of Barbados.

(Aside: They asked for it!)

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: They asked for it and they got it. What more do they want.

Going back to the fees, they want a continuing education allowance, \$432. This is for the over sixty-fives. They want a start-up fee of \$2 250. These are people who already have practices who are already operating, but they still want a start up fee of \$2 250. We said give them the money. These are not new boys coming from college, these are people who have premises but they still want a start-up fee. We said pay them. What more do they want?

They said they want seniority allowances going as high up as \$2 260 per annum, making a total package

of \$25 780 to the doctors. In addition to that, we told the doctors who are already occupying premises and paying rent for the premises for their entire clientele that we would pay them 22.5 per cent of the rent they have to pay. That has worked out at an average of \$2 700 a year. We are going to pay them rent for their own places because most of them own their own places. They already have telephones, they already use water, but they said they want \$12 116 for utilities. They are not taking on anything new. Telephone rates will not go up because doctors are taking part in the National Health Service Scheme.

They already employ record clerks or nurses and have to pay them 100 per cent of their salaries. They said they want us to pay 22.5 per cent of the cost of these people and they estimate that at \$8 820 a year. We are paying them now to pay the people whom they already employ.

All professions in Barbados pay registration fees. Whether you are an architect, an engineer, an accountant, you pay the appropriate registration fee. The clients do not pay any part of that; the clients pay for the services and the professional pays his fees. The doctors tell us that if we want them to take part in the National Health Service, if we want to guarantee them a salary for taking care of the old people, we have to pay them a percentage of the Registration Fee. Absolute madness. But we said we would pay them the \$750, making \$50 166.

Barbados is not the only place in the world where doctors work in a National Health Service. Britain also has people who work in a National Health Service. We are talking about paying \$50 166 to doctors in Barbados, \$25 000 in terms of their allowances and salaries and the rest in terms of reimbursable expenses. At November last year, the average net remuneration of a GP in the National Health Service in Britain, not for the old people alone, for all ages, was £22 070, calculated then at Bds\$52 825. So we are paying them \$25 000 for ten per cent of the population and Britain, a country in which wages are at least three times higher than Barbados, pays theirs \$52 000 for the entire population.

12. 35 p.m.

But they say that they want more, and it is the "more" we are quarrelling about. It is not any fancy words about slavery, it is a money-robbing business. We are going to pay them \$24 000 in allowances for ten per cent of the population. In Britain, they get £10 830 as of November last year, or \$25 922 after conversion for expenses. So we are almost paying in Barbados the same amount of allowances, reimbursement expenses, for ten per cent of the population that Britain is paying for 100 per cent of their population. That shows you the

kind of vagabonds we are dealing with in the medical profession.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: It is not the GPs. The GPs are willing to go along, but the poor GPs are frightened for their leaders. The GPs do not want to get into any conflict with their leaders, so they are keeping quiet and hoping that the whole thing blows over, and that they will be able to join the scheme. If not for this, the GPs would have never had it so good, but they are frightened for the big, bad consultants.

I want to compare what we have offered for the final phase of the National Health Service with what people earn in Britain. Our total pay packet would come to about \$104 000 in Barbados by the final phase, compared, as I said, with the \$52 000 which is paid in Britain. We are going to pay them twice as much as their counterparts in Britain. But they say that they want more. We cannot pay more.

The doctors try to frighten people in Barbados that the Government is about to embark on serving them inferior medicine by bringing in foreign doctors. Suddenly, foreign doctors mean inferior medicine. At present today, at the QEH, we employ 78 Barbadians and 59 non-Barbadians. So how is it that suddenly non-Barbadians mean inferior medicine? These are people who they approve and work alongside in the hospital. I want to know if these 59 are included among those people who are saying do not bring more foreigners to Barbados. In the public health services, the non-Q.E.H. services, there are 30 other doctors in Barbados who are paid from the Consolidated Fund. I think 23 of them are non-Barbadians. They come from India, England, Grenada, Jamaica, Guyana, all kinds of places, but, suddenly now, we are hearing, "no more foreign doctors."

The only statement about bringing doctors in Barbados from the Ministry of Health is what I said. I said that there are 25 Barbadian doctors overseas who want to come home. But if we are now in a position where non-Barbadian doctors in Barbados are telling us that our brothers, sisters and children overseas cannot come back to Barbados and practice, we are in a bad way. Could you imagine that? Non-Barbadians have now taken over the medical profession and they say that no Barbadians can come, they are in charge here. If you check the leadership of BAMP, you will see that the secretary is a non-Barbadian, the President is a non-Barbadian, the PRO is non-Barbadian, the Assistant Secretary is non-Barbadian. All of them are non-Barbadians and they are the ones who are talking about not bringing Barbadians to Barbados!

The doctors would have people in Barbados believe that they are somehow tied with a rope to a patient for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. That is foolishness! The terms and conditions which have been circulated for the general information of the Senate will show that the intention is that the doctor must be responsible for them, but you do not walk around with your patient in your hip-pocket. What it means is that if you are not going to be available, you have got to arrange with your colleagues to take care of your patients, and that is exactly what happens now. If a doctor is going to take a month off in Britain, he tells his patients that he is going away, go next door to another doctor. That is a normal professional arrangement with doctors and lawyers. Lawyers do not abandon their clients. They tell them they are going away for a year, but their colleagues will take care of business. That is normal professional business, but suddenly it is a problem.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I understand that the correct term is that "you hold paper" for the other fellow.

The After-hour Service and how much you pay for it is a big thing with BAMP. Would you believe that BAMP is now saying to us having agreed generally with the principle that the service should exist, and having made it clear that it is not a burden to people, that they want to have an After-hour Service. You pay them to work 8 a.m. — 4 p.m., and after that you are not to take sick, because they are gone, unless the National Health Service Board can pay them a sessional fee to take care of people between 4 p.m. and 8 a.m. They are only asking for just under \$1 million, they are not unreasonable people! You pay them the fees which I read out earlier to work from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., they say that they are unavailable for after-hour service, but they will be available if you pay them almost \$1 million a year to come back and work in panels at night. That will be nothing more than highway robbery, and we will be no part of that! One million to work at night, that is what they are asking for collectively! As I say, the problem is not with the G.Ps. The G.Ps out there are ready to work and are telephoning the Director of the Health Service to know how to get around the business, but we have these consultants who want to hold up the business in their own interest. 12.45 p.m.

Salaries in Britain are set by a Review Body. I have taken extracts of the Review Body of doctors and dentists under the chairmanship of Sir Robert Clarke to show the salaries of doctors in hospitals in Britain. One will find that the consultants in Barbados are doing as well as their fellow consultants in the best hospital boards in London, but they say they want to double their salaries. They are trying to get Head of Department

allowances, they want to get tax free gratuities. Everybody else in Barbados pays taxes. The doctors say not them, they are no part of the tax system in this country, because they are to work on contract and when the two years are up, they are not to pay tax on their gratuity. That is not on, and they know it is not on.

They are saying to us we must give them a Continuing Education Allowance. They do not want much, they want a basic salary of \$62 000 per annum, \$62 225. They want a Seniority Allowance ranging from \$8 024 to \$14 652. They want an After-hours Emergency Service Allowance of \$300 per session of 16 hours. They want a Continuing Education Allowance, non-taxable of course, of \$4 000 per annum, and the consultants — you would not believe it — who work in the hospital and therefore have no rent to pay, because you do not rent hospital space, say they want \$1 750 per month as a rent allowance. I do not know what they are renting. They want a Head of Department allowance of \$600 per month.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON O'B. TROTMAN: He cannot talk about BWU salaries anywhere, do you want him to get locked up?

As I say, they want their gratuities tax free. That is not on. That would be more than is paid anywhere else and we cannot be any part of that. It would guarantee the total collapse of the Treasury within two years. That is what the doctors are asking for. It has nothing to do with any slave conditions. The slave conditions are that they want some freedom with some money. The political control which they object to can be bought off with some more allowances. This is a money game we are into, and then they say they want pensions too.

They say they want their independence as professional individuals. They were not going to work for the Government, so we set up the Board. They said they are not going to work for the Board either, because they want to be individual contractors. In other words, they will not be employees of the Board, they want contracts for service. They do not want any contracts of service, they want contracts for service, so they had no connections with the Board. They provide a service, we pay them. We employ a staff, that is our problem. Then they tell us no, having got their independence, then they will get contracts for service, when they retire, we will pay pensions!

It does not work that way. If you have a contract of service and you are working for somebody every two years or every five years, at the end of the contract you get your gratuity. But if you are a private individual contracting your service to the person, the person does

not have anything to do with you and your pension problems, you have to make your own private arrangements on a month by month basis like lawyers, like accountants, like architects for your retirement. You cannot have it both ways, but they say they want their independence on one hand, and they want the pensions on the other hand. It cannot work that way.

Do you think the doctors are finished with this? The doctors then tell us they must have the right to employ their own staff, own clerk, own nurse, because they are independent contractors, but if for any reason they have got to be severed, the Government must pay the severance. The thing sounds like a comic movie. The whole problem, what is confusing the doctors is that they see in front of them the \$20 million of the Health Service Levy, but they are not getting their hands on that. That belongs to all of us, to get our X-rays done, to get our lab tests done, it does not belong to the doctors.

They have worked out a scheme, very, very good, to show you how they can provide a service, all you have to do is to provide them the \$20 million that is collected in the levy. Then somebody says he can deliver the health service in 14 days. I can deliver it overnight, all I have to do is to agree to pay the \$20 million to the doctors. I would guarantee that if we said we would give the \$20 million to the medical profession in Barbados by 1 o'clock, that by 6 o'clock all the doctors in Barbados would sign up for the Health Service. That is all they want, so it is not hard to work out, it will not take two weeks to work out, it can be done in six hours. All I have to do is to agree to hand the \$20 million over to the doctors, and I tell you, before you get dinner tonight, Sir, all the doctors in Barbados would sign up. Everybody would sign up.

It is a money quarrel. That is what we are quarrelling about with the doctors. We have no other quarrel with the doctors than one of straight-forward dollars and cents, and if the doctors in Barbados think that the Government is going to stand by and let them rob the poor and the elderly, they are wrong. It will not happen. The Health Levy is collected to ensure that the people of Barbados have a proper Health Service, not to make doctors rich.

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

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: I certainly did not intend to speak on this Bill at all, because the public information which is available on the merits or demerits of the opposing sides have confused me, and in fact the more I hear about the confrontation between the doctors and the Ministry, the doctors and the Administration, the more confused I am. This suggests to me, especially after hearing Senator Trotman's impassioned speech, that

perhaps there is a time for calmer and more considerate patient consideration.
12.55 p.m.

The confrontation between the doctors and the Administration whatever happens is going to harm neither the doctors nor the Administration, but a large number of people who are ill. It would seem to me that in the interest of that enormous constituency, because that is what it is, that of Barbadians, we ought as reasonable and sensible men and women to sit down again and look at this once more. It is not enough to say we met eighteen times — we ought to meet eighteen hundred times if it is necessary.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: The last time I happened to have the privilege of bringing to the attention of this Chamber the problems associated with the impasse between the doctors and the Government, the Honourable Minister got up and said, "Senator Hall spoke." That is the extent of what he thought about it. I can easily tell you what I said and we will see then who was right and who was wrong. The Minister has a way of listening but he does not hear, and therefore to get up and say that someone spoke, I regard that today as a situation where, perhaps, it would have to become a spoke in a wheel.

I agree with Senator Wickham who said that if you have met for eighteen times, this is such a serious situation that you have to be prepared to meet for eighteen hundred times. That is sensible. You have to. Negotiations, after all, are described as a hassle of give and take; not Dr. Hassel a hassle of give and take. That is what you have to do in negotiations.

I understand the Minister's position when he said that he has given his all and he cannot give anymore. I, at the negotiation table, have been in that position many times. I believe that if you can come into the Honourable Senate and try to explain to the honourable Senators exactly what the position is, I can only expect that you have put your case eloquently to the doctors. I do not believe, however, that to come in here and call them vagabonds is the thing you should do.

The ex-Prime Minister said sometime last year that, doctors or no doctors, the National Health Service will go on. I said at that time that that was not the thing to do, the thing to do is to negotiate. That has been my position when the Democratic Labour Party was in power and it is my position now that you should exhaust all available means at the negotiating table.

Barbadians are sensible people. If the case is put fairly and squarely before them, they are able to choose and they will tell Government or the doctors whom they think is right or wrong. I think that is exactly what you have to do. You just cannot look at it from

a position of talking about foreigners coming in here and that it is not the GPs. It is not true at all to say it is not the GPs. There are many GPs out there who are concerned, like all Barbadians. It is not true to say, therefore, that it is a few specialists. It does not seem right to me. It seems to me that there is a confrontation and the Government is honour bound to go back to the negotiating table, as Senator Wickham said, and let the people of this country understand what your position is.

The last time there was an attempt to debate this in 1984, you can well recall, Sir, that the Minister came in here and when we were ready to debate this issue, read out a long, long rambling statement. I do not think he understood it too well himself. He did not read it well because it appeared as if he had just seen it. I am sorry he is not here, but it does not matter, you can tell him. We could not debate it, then he walked around and laughed and pushed up his chest and figured "I tricked you." That was nearly a year ago. How long can you go on doing this? It is political foolishness. I do not believe in that, and all Senators who have a vestige of love in their hearts for this country must think about health the same way, like Senator Wickham thought today. We cannot go on with this nonsense.

I am talking as a concerned Barbadian. It is not a political football. The doctors are not, to my mind, influenced in their views because of political patronage. It seems to me that the Bs, Cs and Ds, are all unanimous in the view that there is not participation, so it is not like how you have it sometimes in this country where there is a line of demarcation and those that are Ds take a view without even any due concern of the true facts and those that are Bs do the same thing. I do not see it so. When it comes to the health of this nation, I think that we all have to view it as concerned citizens and not because of partisan allegiances, and I do feel that the time has come when we have to put a stop to this nonsense and not call people names that you would not dare call them outside of these hallowed walls.

I read in the papers this morning that there are three outstanding areas of concern. The Minister has said that it is a matter of money, \$20 million. It is quite possible. When I draw from my industrial relations expertise — Senator Williams will concur with that, I do not stand to any correction on that — I can conclude that the three outstanding areas, because the Minister has said it is all money, have cost factors. It is obvious that they have cost factors.

The Minister has put his case here, but I have been trying for a long time to mention a few of the areas as I saw them, as we looked at the situation developing, and nobody seemed to have given them any consideration. I remember standing here and saying that I

wondered what would be the situation of the female doctors working at night. I was not thinking in terms of a million dollars for working nights. No one had replied to that.

1.05 p.m.

I mentioned when we were thinking in terms of the Board that I did not wish it to become a political board. I looked at the composition of the board and I did not like it and I said so, and it was strange. I did not like the idea of putting up three names to get one. I think I alluded to the fact that the late Prime Minister had said that the Chamber of Commerce had put up ignorant people. I know whom he was referring to, not that I agree, but the point is that this is what Parliament does. It is an avenue where you can attack people innocently or otherwise.

I was very concerned that the Board should comprise the type of people which would give it an opportunity to do its work properly. I did not wish, as I said then, for it to be in the same vein as the Transport Board, I mentioned that, and housing, where I had seen the Minister dismiss people. Even since then I think the past Minister of Energy will tell you that he fired the Board. He might be right, it might be right or wrong, I do not know, but I am saying it gives the Minister the right to fire the Board. If he feels the Board should go, then the Board should go. I have not gone into the pros and cons of it, because I was not in the island at the time, and I feel that Barbadians have accepted that. I do not wish this Board to be so constituted that the Minister can fire people at his whims and fancy.

I also remember saying that some of the doctors with whom I had talked – and I must confess that I have never talked to any of the experts or the foreigners that the Minister alluded to, I talked to ordinary GPs and ordinary folk, doctors who have been in the field for many years – were worried that when they went on vacation or if they fell ill, they were expected to pay. That was the impression they got and that is the impression they gave me. I was worried about that, and I felt that the Minister in his reply would have got up and said something about it. He did not.

I mentioned the St. George Medical School. I said I did not like it at all. I said I did not like the cadavers right here, and do you know that that was disdainfully swept aside? One would have thought that I had committed some crime for saying so, but I felt at the time that there would come a day when our entire reputation might be tarnished, because either people know or they do not know, but the point is that what a man feels himself is a fact is indeed a fact. That was the principle I was operating on. If the whole world feels we are idiots in Barbados, you will find that we would hardly be able to

convince them otherwise. Bad publicity and association could get us that type of reputation.

It really upset me, having said all that, to be told that I just spoke. It upsets me a year later to see in the *Caribbean Contact*, dated July 1985, an article which confirmed my view that we could easily get bad publicity out of our association. This could be made a document of the House, and I will read it. This is an article which said that the University of the West Indies Medical Alumni Association, whose President is Mr. R. J. B. Massay, recently acquired evidence that the University of Miami School of Medicine has, because of recent legislative proposals of the State of Florida, adopted a policy which lumps the UWI with the medical schools in Grenada, Dominica and the Dominican Republic, so that no medical student from the University College of the West Indies will be accepted at the Miami School of Medicine for their electives. The credibility of the UWI is therefore.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. I am not too clear what the connection is.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: The connection, Sir, is the next line. I was only requiring that you listen.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Tie it in for me.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, one more second and I would have tied it in: "The credibility of the UWI is therefore being questioned and its reputation downgraded." It went on to say that the Medical Alumni Association has now alerted all of the Caribbean Ministers of Health of the threat to the reputation of the UWI Medical Faculty and to the deleterious effect of the presence of off-shore.....

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: I still do not see the connection with what we are saying in the amendment.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: What I am saying is that last year I stood up in this Honourable Chamber and I said that I was very concerned about the presence of the medical school in this island because I felt that we would get some adverse publicity at some time. I feared that. All I am seeking to say is that this article tends, in my view, to confirm what I felt at that time might happen.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, but you still have to talk in relation to the Bill that is before us and the arrangements between BAMP and the Ministry. On another occasion I will let you enlarge on that one.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I thought we were speaking about health services.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, not in that sense.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I will listen to you and be guided by you. I will not be bad behaved.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have always appreciated that.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: like that Minister over there. You must have heard about him, and I am sure you are not going to tolerate any of his bad behaviour today.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us try and get on with it.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: The situation with the doctors and the Government is one that if this apparent impasse continues to ride the wave it is riding now, nothing good could come out of it. It is no good raving and ranting and saying that we are not going to do this and we are not going to do that and calling people all sorts of names that you would not call them outside, because that does not tend to sort of put your opponents in the position where you can negotiate properly with them. After all, anyone with a modicum of common sense, anyone who knows anything at all about negotiations, will tell you that the object of negotiation at this time is to bridge the negotiable gap. I do not believe that we can think in terms of 'do not worry with the doctors.' That is not what we should be doing.

In that same speech I recall that I asked the Minister if there was any truth in the rumour that they were going to get doctors from Korea and the Philippines. I do not question their competence, I never do, but what I do say is, and I am sure the impression I conveyed was, that there would be a language barrier, and oftentimes there are language barriers which necessitate the nurses having to intervene on behalf of the patient. That is why I asked that question. The Minister did not see it fit then to answer whether or not the rumours that were going around the place at the time were true, that they were going to get doctors from Korea and the Philippines, and I do hope he will be able now to tell us something about that. He has said that there are Barbadians and West Indians who are willing to come back home and work in the service. I would assume that the Barbadians and the West Indians will speak the same language as us, and, if that is true, I would think that that would alleviate the problem.
1.15 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: If I said so, he cannot say, "if it is true." He is saying that I am lying to Parliament.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: No. I am not saying that, I would not say that you are lying. I would say that.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: But that is the point. If I say so on the floor of the Senate, he cannot then say, "if it is true."

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not sure that has any substance. That is a conditional sentence.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, oh dear, do you expect him to know about conditional things? This Minister got up and called the doctors vagabonds this morning. That is not true. Vagabonds what? What doctors are vagabonds? That is not true. He got up in here and said the doctors are vagabonds. It is on that that I base my argument, 'if it is true.' It is conditional, of course.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do let us get on with it. Do not let us fight one another. Continue.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I feel that the situation is one in which all Barbadians should join hand in hand and try to see exactly what we can do to alleviate the problems that beset us today. It is indeed an ugly scene when this sort of thing happens, and I believe that enough has not been done, or whatever has been done has been done badly. I hope that the powers that be will stop making these stupid statements and get on with the job of negotiating.

The Health Service is nearly a decade now. It is nearly a decade that the Health Service was talked about. It has been bogged down with paper work and all this sort of thing. A paralysis of analysis is what we have actually seen all the time. So I know that the Government is anxious. With an impending election, I am sure you want to get it off the ground. All right, get it off the ground, but do not come in here and call people vagabonds and give people the impression that you have a few crooks out there who are holding you up, and that the average doctor is not really interested in it. I am not really sure how true that is. That is the way I said that.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I explained myself already, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. You are on a point of what?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: He is misrepresenting what I said.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please. Just a minute. Let me run this Chamber, please. What is the point of order?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The Senator said that I said that the average doctor is doing something. I made the point every time that the GPs are supporting the scheme. It is therefore unfair to represent that I said that the average doctors are against the scheme.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I made it clear I was separating the GPs from the Consultants.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. Please sit. Senator Hall.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Honourable Minister said that he differentiated between consultants and GPs. I think you yourself made that point earlier on.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Of course, Sir. I did not say that about the Minister. The Minister listens but he does not hear. I said that at the beginning. That is ample manifestation of my statement. He listens and has some puffs and raves and rants, but he does not hear, nor does he understand, and it is a simple matter.

I said that the Minister is calling the hierarchy in the medical profession vagabonds and he had said that the GPs were willing to work. All of us here understand what he said. I was making the point that I have to say, "if it is true," because he has made a big statement in here that the consultants are vagabonds, and I do not think that is true. That is how I based my argument. I want the Minister to listen, instead of jumping up in here and getting on badly to address certain little things.

It is passing strange that any little thing that some Senators get up and mention, you would find that the Minister gets up and says it is of substance. Fish down there, yes, substance. Senator Reader's cousin says the importers get up here and import contaminated meat, they do not care what sort of meat it is; that is a good point made, you have to look into that. But if you come here and you make a critical and a constructive analysis of a situation, people not only interfere with you while you talk, not only consistently jump up to try to break your trend of thought, not only behave badly during your speech, but they get involved in all sorts of things. I think that something has to be done about that.

Instead of doing all of that, you could look at your Drug Service seminars — I went into Queen's Park the other day to watch Empire versus Spartan, a traditional cricket match of some repute. While I was sitting there, some young girls came along and said: "Would you like to come down to the seminar down in the Steel Shed? We are having a seminar down there." After a slack period in the game's proceedings, I ventured to go down there. Of course, the Minister did not wait until the end, he was not there, and there were only five or six people there, all employees of that particular department.

I would like to counsel him. When Mohammed cannot come to the mountain, send the mountain to

Mohammed. In this situation, you need to take this sort of seminar and counselling to the people. That is what community centres are there for. You can go right into them and educate the people. Illuminate the dark corners of their minds on the Drug Service. Let them know what it is all about. He could really address himself to points like that instead of jumping up and wondering what I have said.

The point, therefore, is that under this Bill, I can make a constructive criticism. I can say that in order to educate people in the country, you could go to them, and not go into the Steel Shed where you know you would get three or four people.

I do not wish to see a collapse of the Treasury. The Minister said that if you take the \$20 million and give it all to the doctors, we would see a collapse of the Treasury. As a right-thinking Barbadian, I do not wish to see that, whether the doctors ask for \$20 million or not. I do not want to see the collapse of the Treasury at all. It is a very debatable matter, but we do not want to see that. We want you to continue negotiating with the doctors. If you have only got three outstanding issues, I think you would have covered a lot of ground, because, judging from what the Minister said today, it is obvious that there have been long and protracted negotiations. It is obvious that a lot of thought would have gone into the issues on both sides, and I feel that all Barbadians would like to see this impasse somehow corrected by the doctors and, indeed, the Government. They want to see both sides making a last and determined effort to make right all the things that have gone wrong.

We say so as concerned Barbadians. We are not saying so because we want to get up on this side and oppose the Government and its National Health Service. If we want to oppose that, we will say why we want to oppose it. It is a matter of national interest, and when I get up and asked the Minister to look at the situation seriously, in the interest of all Barbadians, and he is going to get on with some behaviour that is not befitting this place, I really feel that that is the last straw. Like any other Barbadian and like Senator Wickham, I would encourage, would make a plea, an impassioned plea, with the Minister to forget his arrogance. Forget that, recognize that the people's work has to be done, and as a servant of the people go in there and play each ball on its merit. Go in there and negotiate. I am sure he has more negotiating expertise than the people in BAMP.

I take issue with the fact that BAMP is a few experts. The Minister said that. I do not believe so. In every endeavour you would get high-flyers, and if you have more vocal people in the negotiations and they happen to be experts, that happens around every negotiating table. I feel that if you take the attitude that the experts are

vagabonds, and if BAMP is the expert, this situation will never really be resolved.

1.25 p.m.

In conclusion — I say this with all seriousness — I think the time has come when, in the public interest, the Minister has got to go out there and re-negotiate this whole thing and put his cards on the table. Having exhausted all areas, then he will be in a position to come in here and tell us what is the situation and not come in at one time and read a statement and then not even listen to what we are saying when it comes from this side.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think that other honourable members would like to speak and the time is getting closer to half past one. I think it is probably better to suspend at this stage and come back after lunch. I believe that honourable members will have to go over to the Park and it will take a little more time.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do you want to say something now? Do you wish to speak for five minutes? All right Senator Jones.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I was very impressed by what Senator Wickham said because I think that really is what the matter is all about. I would like to suggest that the Minister of Health and the people in BAMP do not think of themselves — that the Minister does not think about himself as Minister of Health and the BAMP people do not think of themselves as doctors who have to carry out this thing — but try to think of the people whom they are serving.

As Senator Wickham said, there are quite a lot of people over 65 who have been waiting for a long time to see this National Health Service actually working. As a matter of fact, I think that the Barbados Labour Party in both of their manifestoes mentioned that they would be working towards this free medical service, especially beginning with the over sixty-fives. I would like them to keep that in view. Do not go into the meeting trying to score any point. Try to think of what you are doing to help those people over 65 who really need that help.

I read somewhere where the Minister is alleged to have said that as far as BAMP was concerned, he was finished talking with them. I do not see how any Government can implement a scheme where doctors have got to be the main people in it and then say that you are not going with talk to them. If there is no communication, you are not going to get anywhere — the impasse just remains an impasse. There must be communication. I agree with Senator Wickham that if you have to meet 1800 times you will meet, because what you are trying to do is to get something that is going to be helping a large number of people, something that will redound to the credit

of this whole island, will redound to the credit of both the Government and BAMP.

I think we have to desist from using certain appellations when we are dealing with each other, because if you rub a man's back up, you cannot expect him then to have charity towards you. I think you have to withhold the kind of remarks that you would perhaps use from person to person. At least in an Honourable House like this you should not be using those terms at all.

I would like to feel that the Minister is big enough to admit that he made a *faux pas* when he referred to the consultants as vagabonds. I think that is a *faux pas*, and I think he should never say a thing like that. If we want the measure to succeed there must be a certain amount of give and take on both sides. But whatever happens, I think they should meet, and meet as often as it takes to make this medical scheme a success for this island of Barbados.

SUSPENSION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting will be suspended until 2.30 p.m.
1.35 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I am going to be somewhat brief on the matter before this Chamber, which is a Bill which seeks to amend the National Health Service Board Act, 1984–22. My remarks will be in the context of this National Health Service which has been proposed since 1976.

I do not believe that one could discuss the present impasse between the Government and the doctors of this country as represented by the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners without reference to the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which in 1976 promised to the people of this country a free National Health Service. Of course, never did one suspect that the free National Health Service as promised by the Barbados Labour Party would lead to a situation in 1981, after the Barbados Labour Party won a second term, and in an emergency budget where the taxpayers would be faced with a Health Levy. All this was coming immediately after a campaign in which the slogan was, 'we never had it so good.' Elections were in June, and by September of that same year, 1981, the country was presented with this emergency budget, and one of the measures in that budget was the imposition of a Health Levy.

Senator Trotman today indicated that the Health Levy amounts to some \$20 million per year. That is the

nature of the freeness which people in this country were promised. A free medical health service, but we are paying \$20 million per year through a Health Levy! The seriousness about this whole problem results from the fact that, so far, the Government has not been able to live up to its promise, and certainly all indications suggest that they will not be able to live up to their promise. In the first instance, we will not have this free health service. We already have a health service, and from what I can see, what will eventually turn out will be that we will have, supposedly, some improvements to the service.

The Government is aiming to provide the service for the over sixty-fives and, as I understand it, at a later point to the under fives, or at least very young children, and some other services. The fact of the matter is that it is very clear that this whole free National Health Service, in my view, was nothing but a fraudulent promise on the part of the Barbados Labour Party. It began in a fraudulent manner, it was a fraudulent promise — I make no apologies for that — because they knew that a free National Health Service was beyond the scope and the capacity of this country to undertake, and they never told people that this free National Health Service would have had to be supported by additional tax. Prior to that we were paying, and we still are paying, our taxes. We have not had any reduction in consumption taxes, we have not had any reduction in income taxes. In short, far from having reductions, we have been having increases in both direct and indirect taxes, and on top of that we have had to pay this Health Levy since September, 1981.

What has happened is that lots of money have been collected under false pretences from the taxpayers of this country and no service has been delivered. All that we have been getting from the Government, and from the Minister in particular, is a lot of talk. Each time that anything with the National Health Service has come up, we have been hearing promises about the start of the Health Service. It has to be postponed for one reason or another, it will start at a particular time, and we have only been getting very expensive talk and no kind of action.

We reach a situation where there is an impasse between the doctors and the Government, an impasse between the Ministry and the doctors. The impasse has arisen because there are, I suppose, certain positions which have been taken by both sides, and it does not seem as if there is a way immediately out of the situation. But negotiations having reached the kind of delicate stage at which they have reached will only come to a successful resolution if the parties concerned are prepared to continue discussions, or reopen discussions, and you may very well be surprised that sometimes what appears to be an impossibility can, with the passage of a little time and with the cooling of tempers, easily be resolved. But when the Minister, at the full height of his pomp

and arrogance, can without any apologies refer to doctors, and then he indicated specialists, as vagabonds, how then can you expect people to sit down around a negotiating table and talk to him? To denigrate people with whom he has to speak in the way that he has denigrated those people certainly will not make for any good feelings.
2.55 p.m.

It is incumbent on the Government to ensure that there is some attempt made to get the situation back on an even keel but Senator Trotman's attitude does not favour that kind of approach. Senator Trotman accuses the doctors of wanting the Government to hand over the levy of \$20 million a year to them so as to get the Health Service going. I have not been party to the negotiations, I do not know about any of the details, but I would take that kind of statement with a pinch of salt. I do not believe that.

Senator Trotman said that the specialists at the hospital would want to rob the taxpayers. He called the specialists vagabonds and he has called them robbers, I am using his words. When Senator Trotman gets up and makes those kinds of statements, how does he expect that people will sit down and talk with him? How does he expect to get the Service through?

I believe that we have also heard from other speakers here. I am not one to, as it were, speak after a number of Senators, because I have my point of view about a number of things, but already Senator Wickham, Senator Jones and my illustrious colleague, Senator Hall, have urged the Government to reconsider its position and to try to get back to the negotiating table with the doctors. I also want to appeal to the Government that it does not do the country any good to have the chief spokesman for the Government in the area of health, in the name of the Minister of Health, abusing members of the medical profession in the way that he has abused them today and adopting the kind of arrogant and pig-headed approach that he has adopted in these negotiations.

I would like to think that there is room for getting this matter settled. I know there is room for getting this matter settled. I believe that the doctors are willing to sit down and discuss this matter in a rational way. I believe that if the Government changes its stance and its approach, we can get some movement in this direction. I certainly add my appeal to those appeals of honourable Senators who have already indicated how they feel about this particular matter.

As has been pointed out, health is very important to each and every one of us. We would like to ensure that we have the very best health services in this country. We would like to think that we are able to attract and retain some of the best specialists and general practitioners and

all of the people who are involved in the delivery of health services in this country. But that will not be the case if we have a Government and a Minister who behave in the kind of way that they are, at present, behaving in. You know what can very well happen as a result of this kind of approach. You may very well find that people may decide to leave the country.

If you are talking about delivery of proper health services, you are not going to get people giving of their best if they are treated in the manner that the Government is seeking to treat the doctors, to bludgeon them, to bulldoze them. I think the time really is for negotiations and trying to get this matter over and deliver a proper service, because that is really what, supposedly, the Board relating to the National Health Service is all about. I am really concerned, and certainly the Democratic Labour Party, about the impasse which has been reached, concerned about the fact that the doctors will be driven to a point where they are threatening industrial action and to a point where the Prime Minister has threatened that those people in the Public Service who take industrial action will be taken to the Public Service Commission.

That is a matter which the doctors need not get too worried about, because I am sure that they are just empty words, words attempting to drive fear in their hearts. I do not believe he is serious about that. In any event, I know BAMP has been registered as a trade union, and under the laws of Barbados, a trade union can take whatever industrial action they want to take, obviously, within reason. So the threat about taking them to the Public Service Commission if they take industrial action is merely an attempt, I suspect, to frighten some weaker souls within the group.

I believe, like everybody else, as I said, we would want to ensure that there is no deterioration in our health services. Certainly the Democratic Labour Party stands committed to ensuring that we have the best standards of health in this country. We would want to see it continue to improve. There are a number of improvements which we would want to see which we have already suggested, and there is one which you will be hearing about later on, but most importantly, at the present moment, there are problems and we would want to see a smooth resolution to these problems.

I want to support the call which has been made previously for the Government to find a way of getting back to the table and sitting down and trying to get whatever problems exist ironed out.
3.05 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I was reluctant to get into this debate because I thought the Minister did make some very salient points, but to sit here and listen to the contribution made by Senator Greaves on this issue makes me wonder what this country

is coming to in terms of integrity and honesty of opinion. We have heard the usual diatribe about what is free and what is not free, and I have to keep making the point in here that the party which Senator Greaves represents and is the chief spokesman for in this Chamber ran the Government of this country for fifteen years.

We have been hearing about the boast of free secondary education and free school meals. Yet, Senator Greaves can forget all that to bring a criticism about the concept of freeness as it pertains to the Barbadian society. In 1963, the Government revenue from the secondary schools was \$72 000 a year and they gave up that for political mileage. Today, what is the budget for the Ministry of Education? Just think of that and then you will appreciate in context what freeness really is. So Senator Greaves is in no position to criticise the concept of a free National Health Service, or in a position to criticise anything when it comes to Government policy.

Sometimes we ought to be forced in this Chamber to bring documentary proof for some of the allegations we make. We have heard something about increases in indirect taxes and direct taxes in Barbados. That is a total and absolute untruth. There is no increase in indirect taxation in Barbados. I will deal with that in an appropriate Bill.

What is really bothersome to me is for the Senator to get up and say it is time for negotiations, that we ought to sit down and negotiate and renegotiate, but can still make the judgment that the Government must change its stance. And he is supposed to be an experienced trade union leader! The Government must change its stance, but it is time for negotiations: two incompatible positions! Say what you mean, that you are against the Government and finish with that. You cannot come with any conciliatory statements, because you are in no position to make any. The Government must change its stance, but negotiate! How can you do both? Your position is that the Government is wrong in this matter, but I want Senator Greaves as an experienced negotiator to tell me where else on earth you can find people on contract asking for full pension rights when they are getting a gratuity? That is what the doctors are asking for.

I was a contract officer for the Government for four years. They gave me a gratuity and I had to pay taxes on it; fifty per cent of the gratuity was taxable. But because they are doctors we hear that they must have 100 per cent tax free gratuities and you must make them pensionable, and you as an experienced negotiator working in the public interest would get up and support that kind of position. We have not heard one word in criticism of any of the positions placed by the doctors, not one word from Senator Greaves, and he is supposed to be an experienced union negotiator.

Look what the doctors are asking for. I have gone through this and I certainly would never want to support

some of these proposals. Gratuity paid to consultants employed on a contractual basis should be tax free. Everybody else pays 50 per cent of the gratuity in taxes, but the doctors must get all tax free. There is not a word from the goodly Senator on this matter, but the Government must change its stance. There are many concessions that the Government has made.

Fifty per cent of their professional registration is met by the Government. Ask the lawyers out there who pays for theirs, ask the other professions who pays for theirs. But the doctors must come in a service and the taxpayers of this country must pay 50 per cent for them because they are doctors. That is essentially what you are being asked to do.

They are on a contractual basis and after three years you put them in the Government Service. Yet they say they do not want to be in the Government Service. But they are asking for that in this. They do not want to be in the Government Service, but after three years you must put them in the Government Service. These are totally impossible negotiating positions. We are supposed to pay the rent for them; they want us to pay severance to people that they employ; all kinds of impossible conditions, and we get in here and hear people talking about the Government must change its stance.

The Government has given all that it can possible give in this regard, but because the Government does not change its stance, we hear of a threat of withdrawal of services. Of course, that will be supported by the Barbados Workers Union and other unions, because whenever it comes to the question of withdrawal of services, the country must be held up to ransom. If you do not pay out of the Treasury, hold up the country to ransom. That is the position of the Barbados Workers Union as enunciated by its chief spokesman in the Senate. We must be held up to this.

I believe that there has been a lot of talk on both sides. That is my personal view. I must support the Government on its position, not because I am a Government Minister. I must support it because clearly there is a political element involved in this whole thing, and the doctors must understand that they cannot tell the Government or the Prime Minister who must be the Minister of Health. They must understand that they must separate their jealousies within the association, those consultants who are quarrelling because the general practitioners will get over \$100 000 a year. That is what they have to deal with, the intramural bickering that they have among themselves.

I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that gone are the days when people must believe that because you are called, "Doctor," people must cringe and cower. They must understand that they have a service to perform

and the Government is prepared to pay them commensurate with the laws of Barbados. If they want to be contract officers, they cannot be civil servants too in the context of people who are permanently employed in the Civil Service. They have to make up their minds what they want.

Rather than try to help them to make up their minds, all these experienced trade unionists we have around the place will take the Government to task. We must change our stance but the doctors have nothing to concede. We must be prepared to incur the wrath of all the other contract officers and give the doctors a tax free gratuity and 100 per cent of their gratuity; we must be prepared to treat them as contract officers and give them a gratuity, and at the same time treat them as civil servants and give them a pension. That is what must be highlighted, that this is what they are asking for, and nobody who was speaking against the Government is prepared to point out that that was an irreconcilable position. That is why the Prime Minister has said you cannot have your cake and eat it, and the doctors must understand that like anybody else. They have a service to perform, the Government has gone as far as possible in trying to ensure that this service gets off the ground, but now we keep hearing that nothing has been given. I keep wondering why it is that there cannot be some penalty imposed on people who misrepresent the facts all the time like some politicians do.

We have a Drug Service here. People over 65 do not pay for drugs; those under six do not pay for drugs; hypertensives and diabetics do not pay for drugs, and drugs for hypertensives and diabetics are very expensive. Still we hear they do not get anything. That is because it behoves the chief Opposition spokesman to come in here and rave and rant and froth at the mouth. And tomorrow the headlines carry it, and that makes news in Barbados, an enlightened country! I say a day of reckoning must come, because you have to get out there and stand up and show the people what you are worth.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Wickham and Senator Jones would have us believe that talk, talk and talk will eventually come to some acceptable solution. The total position is that we have talked, we have made all the concessions which I have gone through in my earlier submission, and except we want to really take the taxpayers' Health Levy and give it to the doctors, there is nothing else Government can offer. That is the position we have come to, and we are not prepared to do that.

3.15 p.m.

The position at this stage is that the doctors have made it clear that they will strike in the Hospital, if the Health Service Board does not agree to pay the other doctors what they want. It is not that the GPs who are

the possible contractors of the Board will go on strike, because the National Health Service Board has no part with the hospital doctors. So the GPs are not saying they would go on strike if the Board does not offer them a good contract, although that would be a funny position, because if you do not work for a man, I do not know how you could strike against him. They are talking about striking against their patients.

This is why you have to constantly make the difference between the hospital doctors and the general practice people in Barbados. The hospital doctors, who have no contract with the Board, are not being offered contract with the Board, but they are going to go on strike if the Board does not offer the Health Levy to the general practitioners. That makes you wonder why. I will tell you why. Because somebody made a serious mistake two years ago and said that they would not conclude the salaries for the general practitioners in Barbados until they also concluded talks on salaries for the hospital doctors, and that you would have one great package. BAMP understood clearly what it was doing. The effect of that was that BAMP would get the \$180 000 per annum for the general practice people and then the consultants, who always say that they must get more than the general practice men, because they are on top of the ladder, would have to get a slightly different pay from the \$180 000. That is what the strike is about.

What we come down to is not a conflict between the doctors and the Ministry of Health. It is a conflict between the doctors and the poor. It is a conflict between the doctors and the elderly. It is between the doctors and the undersixes. I am going to join the under sixes, the over sixty-fives and the poor against the doctors. The doctors can understand that. The poor have never lost yet. They have nothing to lose but their poverty. Tell the doctors that.

Everybody who speaks says, as my colleague said, that the Government must change. In all matters of negotiations in this country, the Government is always wrong. It is not that BAMP has to make any concessions, they have a responsibility to their patients. The Government must give the doctors what they want because the doctors are doctors. My closing message to the doctors is that I am siding with the poor. I am siding with the over sixty-fives and the under sixes against the doctors.

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

On the 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 5 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment.

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

BORROWING OF THE SUM OF US \$25 000 000 FROM
A CONSORTIUM OF BANKS FOR THE PURPOSE
OF ASSISTING IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE 1983-88 DEVELOPMENT
PLAN

Order No. 9 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of US \$25 000 000 from a Consortium of Banks, for which the participating County Bank of London will act as agent, for the purpose of assisting in the implementation of the 1983-88 Development Plan.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: The Government's Five Year Development Plan was published last year and copies were made available to all Honourable Members in this Chamber. It was a pity that in neither this Honourable Chamber nor the Other Place, the Plan had not been debated, because we have heard some suggestions that when aspects of the Plan are being implemented, it is for political gains only.

The Plan covers the period from 1983-88. It calls for financing of, I think, some \$700 million over the Plan period for capital development projects.

In this exercise in the Resolution before this Honourable Chamber, the Government proposes to float a syndicated loan not exceeding US \$25 000 000 on the London Capital market. The loan will be provided by a syndicate of banks lead by the County Bank Limited, a subsidiary of National Westminster Bank of England. It is expected that the syndicate will include Canadians, French, Japanese, U.S. and U.K. banks and the loan will be raised under the Special Loans Act, Cap. 105. It will be for a period of seven years with a four year grace period on repayment of the principal. Under this special Act, the Government is authorized to borrow \$375 million, and the total amount outstanding of loans borrowed under the Act currently as of March 31, 1985 was \$175 981 430.
3.25 p.m.

As I said before, the loan will be used to support the Government's development programme. This programme, as has been said several times, will include the Northern Access Road to the cement plant which now has to be built, fishing harbours in Bridgetown, Speightstown, and Tent Bay, and a few other projects which we have coming on stream this year.

It is not the first time we have borrowed floating loans on this market. This is the third one, the first one was in 1977. But the ready acceptance of the Government's approach to the market to borrow money, contrary to a view which has been expressed in this Chamber, is an indication that this country is a credit-worthy country. The fact that one bank can lend this size and that the lead bank gets a consortium of international banks to support the loan for Barbados is a strong indication of how we are respected. We only heard recently how Barbados' image abroad has been tarnished, but the fact that there is such eagerness to lend Barbados money in the international market, to me, would not support the view that we have heard in this Chamber on several occasions.

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

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On the last occasion when we had a Resolution seeking to give Government permission to raise loans, I suggested then that it would help us if we would get a projected schedule of debt servicing so that we can have some kind of picture as to how the debt servicing requirements are building up because of the accumulation of loans. Quite evidently the Government will have to have this information to engage in reasonable planning, and I see no reason why Parliament, and this Chamber in particular, should not have the benefit of information in this area.

Quite evidently, the reasons for this loan also relate to financing the Government deficit. It has been indicated that it is for financing projects in the Development Plan, but those projects fall within the Budget, and you have a Government deficit which has the finance and quite evidently this exercise is part of that effort. It would have helped us if we had an up-to-date statement as to the arrangements which have now been put in place or whatever the projected deficit is.

I support the Resolution. I support it especially because I am aware of the substantial need for foreign financing of the Government deficit in the present circumstances. The reason why the need for foreign financing is so great is tied in large measure to the problems we have with the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility, and as we have heard recently, that problem has not yet been solved. If it had been solved, we would not have had a substantial requirement for

foreign lending, and the country still needs to solve that. Foreign lending is not entirely a substitute for solving that problem and it is going to confront us in a serious way somewhere down the line. One hundred and twenty million dollars is not an amount of money that we can just turn our back on and say that we can press ahead without recourse to that again, so we need to get some kind of solution to that problem.

It seems to me that the present negotiations on the part of the Government, presumably in the Ministry of Finance and the Central Bank, have come to the end of their line in trying to persuade people to do something to alleviate the situation in the interest of Barbados. Government should give some consideration to designating some special negotiator to negotiate some kind of settlement on behalf of the Government. There are people in this country who are not in the Ministry of Finance, or the Central Bank, or the public service, who have negotiating skills and knowledge in this area, who I am certain can do no worse than what has happened so far and have a good shot at doing a lot better. One area we could draw from is the university.

For a negotiator to be successful, however, he must have a proper appreciation of all that is involved in the situation. I rather suspect that part of the reason why we have not met with any greater success is that the officials within the Government have espoused the view that Barbados benefitted during the period that the CMCF was in existence, that Barbados benefitted from the CMCF, and if this view is accepted by Trinidad and the other people, they might regard our problem with the CMCF as just cancelling out a little bit of the benefit which we derived from the CMCF.

We must come to the realization and put it across to the others that Barbados has not benefitted in one job from the CMCF. The level of trading which took place during the period of the functioning of the CMCF involving Barbados and other countries could have and would have taken place under bi-lateral arrangements. The fact that we were able to export to Trinidad in that period was not related to the presence of the CMCF, it was related to the buoyancy of the Trinidad economy during that period of time. The CMCF was just an arrangement to multilateralize settlement rather than have it on a bilateral basis. It was a convenience largely for central bankers, not something which permeated down in terms of specific benefit to the people. We have not benefitted, specifically because of the same CMCF, and, indeed, we have been injured. Because what has happened now is that the sequestration of this \$120 million has transformed what would normally be healthy trade relationships with Trinidad into a situation where the country is no better off than if all the furniture manufacturers and garment manufacturers had made these clothes and carried them three miles off Barbados and threw them

into the sea. That is exactly the situation as it relates to Barbados now if we do not get this thing settled. They could have manufactured all these things, get the money from the Central Bank, and threw them out into the sea. So we have not benefitted, it would have served us better to manufacture the thing and ship it around the country.

The country that has benefitted from the Multilateral Clearing Facility is Trinidad. The way they have benefitted is that the multilateralization of settlement enabled them to get money to net out their position in the region. Instead of having to hold bilateral debt with Guyana for all the oil that they were selling to Guyana that Guyana could not pay for, they were able to net off their debt to Barbados within the CMCF situation – and they have benefitted. It is Trinidad who has made clear, unequivocal gains because of the CMCF, and the sooner we try to get that across to them and we stop believing that, for some kind of strange political reasons, we have to tell the people that we did not make a grand *faux pas* and what we did at that time was a benefit to Barbados, the better. The people in Trinidad listen when you try to tell us those kind of things, and they say, 'If that is what they believe, that is all right. We will throw it back in their face in negotiations. You benefitted when you had this thing, so what now? You are free not to export all this stuff when you knew that Guyana could not pay.' That is the first point.

The next point is that the Central Bank of Trinidad is the agent for the CMCF. The agent must have some kind of responsibility. They were made the agent because they had the capacity to make up any deficiencies that should emerge. They had enough reserves that they could honour any obligations. It was not because they can do accounting or arithmetic better than anybody else, but because the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago could pay the debtor countries which default. That is the only good reason for making them agent, therefore, we have to get it across to them that, as agent, they have some responsibilities in the matter to pay Barbados and then do what they will to get the money out of Guyana.

The third point that we have to get across to Trinidad and Tobago is that the \$120 million, although it is a lifeline to Barbados, is trivial to Trinidad and Tobago, and they can do it without jeopardizing in any way their situation, because of the difference in size of the two economies.

3.35 p.m.

I am saying that that would have the essence of any kind of negotiating position, but it would be rather more complicated than that, we would probably have to get into all the details of all the trading and so on and resort to skilled argument and so on and other levels of persuasion to get across the point. Essentially I am saying that it is quite evident that if the same

actors on the scene just meet again a next time they will rehash what they rehashed many times before next time around, and we will get maybe a few more mealy mouthed promises but no follow through, and if Barbados is to make any headway they should start by appointing a special negotiator to deal with the matter on their behalf.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I know that we are seeking to raise U.S. \$25 million on the foreign market. I wonder if Senator Griffith would do us the honour of informing this Honourable Chamber the extent of our total National Debt now. I believe that it is about \$1.4 billion, according to what I am told, and I am wondering if he could give us some indication of that.

I know that we are going to hear it is nothing to worry about, it is well within our capacity to repay. I have already in the past expressed my concern about our galloping National Debt, and raised certain questions about the ability of the country to repay, particularly as the outlook of our economic situation does not look as promising as one would hope, and certainly our ability to repay must depend on our capacity to produce and earn foreign exchange.

I hope that the Government has taken this into consideration that there are a number of loans and debts which we have had which may very well be coming on stream now for repayment. I think the Orion Bank loan which was negotiated some years ago is due for settlement this year, I believe, or partial settlement. The thing is that it gets me a little worried, and I think my position is generally known on the National Debt and the rate at which it has been rising. Certainly this is another indication that we are going in this direction and I would just like to add a word of caution to the Government in this particular exercise.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, I am really impressed with the civility of the last speaker. I was just here waiting. It is an appropriate question to be asked, and I have the figures here for the Honourable Senator.

The public debt, according to the Central Bank, as of 31st March was \$1.145 billion, and it is made up as follows:

the external portion of the debt, and this is public guaranteed debt also, is	\$528.9 million
international lending institutions	165 million
foreign governments	41.8 million

Euro market loans	91.3 million
bonds	80 million

other	23.8 million
-------	--------------

To repeat, that is the Central Government external debt totalling \$402.2 million, and the public guaranteed debt \$126.7 million, with a total of \$528.9 million on the external portion of the debt. The domestic portion of the debt is \$616.9 million. That should satisfy Senator Greaves' question.

I want to respond to one or two points made by Senator McClean. On the question of the creation of a special negotiator, I wonder if he recognises that by making that suggestion it also is a demonstration of a lack of confidence in somebody else, not necessarily the Government. I would not want words to be put in my mouth, but I would say not necessarily the Government.

To create a special negotiator, to my mind, would not solve the problem we are having within CARICOM, especially the CMCF. I attended the CARICOM Finance Ministers meeting last week and this matter did get a lot of public airing, and it was thrashed out within the CARICOM Finance Ministers Conference. There are indications that countries that are debtors to the CMCF would like to settle their obligations. Jamaica is a debtor and Jamaica has indicated that it is prepared to pay whatever outstanding debt it has, U.S. \$2.4 million. Guyana, the major debtor to the CMCF, has indicated that they would like to find some way of settling their financial obligations. It is commonly known now that Guyana is not in a position to settle any of its outstanding obligations where foreign exchange is concerned, because of the shortage of foreign exchange in the country, but the proposals, that have been advanced show an indication which would suggest to me that there is a great desire to resolve the impasse.

The proposal made by Guyana two years ago, which was accepted at a CARICOM Heads of Government Conference, that Guyana's surplus sugar should be sold within CARICOM at a CARICOM agreed price, and where the proceeds from the sale of that net surplus sugar would not go back to Guyana, but would be charged against its obligation under the CMCF, seemed to be a very noble proposition on the part of the Government of Guyana. That was never taken up, and the major reason that it was never taken up was because the price of sugar in Guyana was higher than the world market price, and the countries in CARICOM that are sugar importing countries were not prepared to buy sugar at a price that was three times higher, when it was calculated, than the world market price for sugar. Indeed, Guyana was faced with the competition of countries external to the Caribbean area that were dumping sugar in CARICOM

markets to the great disadvantage not only to Guyana but to the countries that are accredited countries within the CARICOM Multilateral Clearing Facility.

I detected some movement at the last CMCF meeting last week, because it was determined that Guyana's surplus sugar could be sold at a negotiated price on a bilateral basis within the CARICOM which would bring the price, I suppose, very much closer to what the world market prices are for sugar. This is a step in the right direction, where a country like Guyana, which has been the major beneficiary, as Senator McClean quite rightly said, through its ability to procure oil through the CMCF, while Barbados could not, is prepared to take steps to resolve its debtor position.

I do not suppose that there is any need for us to look for a special negotiator, because I do not know what a special negotiator would find in the negotiations that could help solve the problem of Barbados. 3.45 p.m.

I have not heard going abroad from Government officials that we have benefitted from the CMCF and this might be considered a problem for us. What I have heard is that because of Barbados' facility at manufacturing, because we were the best manufacturers in the region, we came into the position we found ourselves in because our manufacturing goods were selling better in the CARICOM markets. This is different from saying you benefit under the CMCF. We were put in a disadvantaged position because our manufactured goods were doing better in the CARICOM markets.

I agree with the suggestion made by the Senator that the country which was supposed to be the manager of the Facility ought to share greater responsibility in the resolution of the difficulty. But, all in all, I think that some movement has been made in dealing with the problem as the Government of Guyana has said only within the last few days it is going to take them about five years to resolve the difficulty with the CMCF. And the countries in the CARICOM region, I suppose, are now of the view that there is a need to restart CMCF. It has to be restarted under certain conditions and certain rules and, indeed, there is a view that it should be started without Guyana and give Guyana a chance to recoup its own position before it gets back into the Facility.

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

GUARANTEE OF REPAYMENT OF \$8 000 000
BORROWED BY THE BARBADOS PORT
AUTHORITY FROM THE EUROPEAN
INVESTMENT BANK

Order No. 8 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of

Finance of the repayment of the sum of \$8 000 000 and interest thereon borrowed by the Barbados Port Authority from the European Investment Bank for the purchase of one Container Handling wide Gauge Gantry Crane.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: The Government is now guaranteeing a loan so this would go on to the figure I just gave as the public guarantee debt, and this is for a good reason.

At the Port, the Port Authority presently is experiencing a lot of difficulty in respect of a shortage of container handling equipment and they are taking steps, which have been approved by the Cabinet, to acquire a crane, a container handling wide gauge Gantry crane, and equipment, and the total cost of this equipment is some Bds \$16 million.

The European Investment Bank has indicated it is prepared to approve a request for a loan of ECUs 5.6 million, which is about Bds \$8 million to the Barbados Port Authority. The \$8 million will only represent 50 per cent of the cost. The interest on the loan is payable at 6.55 per cent on the outstanding balance of the loan. One of the conditions for the loan is that the Government guarantee the repayment.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. President, I support the Resolution. I support the idea of the Port becoming more modern. We have a very efficient Port in Barbados that we should be proud about. However, some problems are creeping in. Some of the Port charges have now gone a little too high, and I hope that the Government would take a good look at this, because I think we are losing a lot of our transshipment business as a result of the charges.

It is no use having a most efficient Port and nothing to do, therefore, I would urge that great consideration be given to this, because the Port could bring a lot of revenue into Barbados. But if we go and try to pay back these loans a little too quickly and charge too much dues, we may end up by not getting any money at all.

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

TAX ON QUARRIABLE MINERALS ACT, 1985

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of the sale of minerals mined in a quarry.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: This Bill before us had its genesis in the Budgetary Proposals laid in Parliament by the late Prime Minister on April 17,

1984. Certain charges at the time were in respect of mining operations in Barbados. For example, it was proposed that a licence fee of \$10 000 be charged to operate a sand quarry, a tax of \$2.50 on every cubic metre of sand sold from the quarry, an annual licence fee of \$10 000 to operate a stone quarry and, with effect from July 1, 1984, a tax of \$1.00 for every tonne of clay which is delivered to trucks which drive on the highways of Barbados.

At the time, it was proposed that these taxes be paid to the Accountant General not later than the 15th day following the month of collection. A lot of water has passed under the bridge since then. Indeed, this measure should have been brought as an enabling legislation before the end of the financial year, but the Government has been looking at bringing a total new Quarries Bill which would incorporate a number of the proposals that were made. In the meantime, while this was being debated within different Ministries, the Ministry of Legal Affairs, the Ministry of Labour, we had the death of the Prime Minister and a new Bill was drawn after several amendments were made. The Bill before this Honourable Chamber is now a Bill called a Bill to enact the Tax on Quarriable Minerals Act, 1985, and a few changes have been made.

Some major provisions to this new Bill are that, instead of the Accountant General being the recipient of any levies, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is made responsible for the administration of the Act and for the assessment, collection and recovery of the tax under the Act. It also provides for the submission of returns by the operators of quarries to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and the payment of appropriate taxes must be made by the 15th day of the month following the month in which the returns are made. So this has moved from just an ordinary piece of enabling legislation as support of a budgetary proposal, now to three pieces of legislation: a Tax on Quarriable Minerals Act, 1985, and its two Orders, the Quarries (Fees) Order, 1985 and the Quarriable Minerals Tax Order, 1985 and we propose that the date now, instead of being 1st June, 1984, for the legislation to become effective will be 1st June, 1985. 3.55 p.m.

During the time that the Budget was presented last year and up to the end of the financial year, the Government had projected that we would have had about \$150 000 in revenue from the imposition. But because of the fact that the legislation was not ready and was not enforceable, there was only some \$11 750 collected, and it is very small in comparison with the estimates. Also, under Section 5 of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, these sums will have to be refunded.

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

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I would like to thank the Minister for explaining the Bill. I have no great quarrel after listening to him, except to say that only recently I happened to go to a quarry, and I was amazed to see about thirty men just milling around in the morning wondering if they were going to get a job, and as I looked around within a radius of two miles of that very quarry, I noticed massive road programmes and canals and what-have-you around the place. I can see that there will be no harm in this Bill but I am only asking that the work be spread around. Let it go around a little bit so that everybody can live. The Ministers are laughing. They know quite well of whom I speak.

I am not joking. I feel really badly when big men, men with families, in this year of Our Lord 1985 have to be in this cap-in-hand situation, with nothing to do, and with the inevitable answer: "Well, Harry is taking two loads of sand down the road, so maybe tomorrow!" I do not believe in that. I do not know if this is Government policy or if this is ministerial responsibility, but whoever is responsible, I am not really criticising, I am just asking you to do this for the benefit of those workers in the very constituency. They did not come from Bawdens or Czechoslovakia; they come from within a radius of two miles, and they are not working. They could put up a sign at the entrance saying "No Vacancies. No Work."

Seriously, I think that is wrong, and I am just asking the authorities that be to have some sort of Christian understanding in this matter. Let us spread the cake. I think, if I am not mistaken, that was a slogan used here the other day. Let us spread it and let those people who have been working for many years in this enterprise get something to do. As I look around the place, I see many tractors rusted. They have seen their day, not because of activity but because of inactivity.

I am making this plea on behalf of the workers, some of whom are my friends — I have to declare an interest — people with families and with children at school and things like that. It is not that there is not a lot of work. There is a massive amount of work around the place. Looking around I see a lot of roads being built, and with the big one coming soon, I am hopeful. I have told the people that people cannot be so insensitive to their plight and I do believe that with the big one coming soon, they will get some work. Let it be a reality. I am asking the Minister responsible or those responsible to take heed and observe the plight of these workers who in the last year or two have seen little job. I hope that this plea will not fall on deaf ears; and seeing it is not in the Ministry of Health, I can rest assured that someone will look at it.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Sir, Senator Hall amused me. Sir, his party is against the building of the new

highway from the airport to St. Barnabas and down into Cave Hill. I believe that would give a lot of work to those fellows that he sees idling, because if you take the work from the people that are working and give it to the ones that are idling, the people that are working are going to be idle. So it sounds to me like there is not enough work to go around, and that we need the new road so as to get the work to go around. I believe that somehow Senator Hall has got himself mixed up a bit, but as he intends or hopes to represent the constituency near where I work, I am pleased to hear how he is working for them.

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

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Bill be taken in groups of five clauses and then the Schedule.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

Clauses 6 to 10 were called and passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 were called and passed.

4.05 p.m.

Clauses 16 to 20 inclusive were called and passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 2 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, Cap. 114.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, the Government has been looking at the District Auctioneers Bill, and the Cabinet has approved,

after recommendations from the Registrar and others, some amendments to the District Auctioneers (Amendment) Act, 1984 so that certain penalties for certain offences should be increased.

For non compliance of Section 8 of the Act, the penalty now is \$100. For the unlawful removal of goods or chattels which have been distrained or levied on before the same have been sold by the auctioneer, \$250. For obstruction of an auctioneer, baliff or an execution officer, an amount not exceeding \$100 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding 12 months. For non compliance with the auctioneer, \$100. For mutilating, defacing or removing certain notices of sale, \$250. Under Section 24 a term of imprisonment is created under this Section.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, 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 4 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WAVELL AVENUE, BLACK ROCK, FOR PROVIDING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, Black Rock, for providing recreational facilities.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. President, through this Resolution, Government is seeking to acquire three parcels of land at Belfield, Black Rock, St. Michael. The three parcels of land total some 5 325.9 square metres or 1.3 acres. This land has been utilized for the provision of recreational facilities. The relevant notices for the required land acquisition under Cap. 228 have already been published in the Official Gazette and the daily Press.

The total amount of land comprises some 787.8 square metres formerly owned by Dan Springer, some 2 460.4 square metres owned by Ellman Clarke and another 2 077.7 square metres owned by Clarice Chisholm.

The land has already been utilized by Government for the development of combined recreational facilities. A sporting and community complex in the Belfield area has already been built. The development is known as the Belfield Park and it comprises a playing field, a pavilion cum community centre, a hard court suitable for a variety of games, including tennis, netball, volleyball and basketball and an area for children to play.
4.15 p.m.

The Belfield area is an extremely densely populated area, and it has been utilized over the years by the people for competitive sports like cricket and football. The Member of Parliament for St. Michael West Central has been very instrumental in getting this sporting complex built. As a matter of fact, it was one of his dreams, and I dare say that the people in the area are extremely happy. I trust and hope that at sometime the people will be the recipient of something similar or something which comes particularly close. It is an extremely impressive complex and I believe that all credit should be given to the representative of the area. I know he built it at a time when money was tight. I think it redounds to the credit of the representative, and I am certain that, for instance, Senator Hall is extremely happy to see the kind of facilities that we are talking about. I dare say that he would have loved if his party had seen it fit during its days to build something comparable.

The development which has taken place will be now offering improved sporting and recreational facilities for children as well as for adults. The four houses which were located on the area that was needed to extend the field have already been resited in the nearby Wavell Avenue, Black Rock area, finalized and the owners duly compensated.

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

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Mr. President, I listened with rapt attention to Senator Williams as he proceeded to tell us who took the responsibility for these amenities here in Black Rock. As a young boy, I spent many hours playing on a smaller version of this same field, and indeed all of the surrounding areas that you can play cricket and football in the Eagle Hall/Bank Hall/Black Rock area. I think there are a few of us in this Honourable Chamber who can say the same thing.

He said that I would be rather pleased about these facilities in Black Rock, and I must concur. I am pleased

for two reasons. I am not pleased because they are simply there and it is long overdue or anything like that. I am pleased because as a member of the National Sports Council for many years, not a Minister for a few months, it can be safely said that I engineered the thought that recreational facilities must be put in areas where they are compatible with all round developmental processes.

If you look at the area, you will note that youngsters in Spooners Hill, Bush Hall and Long Gap, play their games at Waterford. Then there is the Grazettes playing field, which has been there for many years, and there are tennis courts there and cricket and football facilities. There is also an area in the Farm, and a very small parcel of land in Deacons where some of the most enjoyable and hectic games in Barbados are played. So I am rather cognizant of the needs of the youngsters in the area and, like Senator Williams said, I am rather happy to see that they have got the sporting facilities they deserve.

I know that Black Rock is the cradle of sport in Barbados. You name the sport and Black Rock has produced the sportsmen. That is factual, and therefore I think it is only right that the people of Black Rock should have the type of facilities that they deserve.

The Senator said that money was tight at the time. I know only too well how tight it was. Indeed, in the Other place the Minister was criticized for using 75 per cent of the vote for that thing. I am not in that, I am not criticizing him for that. As I said, I noticed that the instigator and all of that sort of thing is the Minister, but I am saying that, through my work in the Sports Council, I have made doubly sure that the youngsters would get some sort of facility. I did not have the power to vote or to have the money voted in Parliament at the ministerial level or in Cabinet for the realization of my dreams, but the people in this area will now be able to do the thing that I advocated — they will now be able to play the games on a zonal basis.

Sport is not something that you can just come and throw a facility at people, not like the monstrosity they have up there in Cave Hill about which Senator Griffith is a little upset about — if he had to plan it, perhaps it would be planned differently. You have to look at sport differently. You have to think in terms of the youngsters in the area having some measure of responsibility. You cannot just give them a pavilion and say that is the end of it. I feel that you have to monitor the situation and to make sure that they have taken up the challenge that has been thrown to them, I am thinking of the upkeep and the maintenance, things like keeping the place properly. Do you know the amount of vandalism that you get in these areas? Sometimes people just believe that you build buildings for them to tear them down.

I am fully *au fait* with the fact that there is a lady who is there during the day. I also know there is a watchman at night and indeed one on the weekends. I live in that area and I know only too well what goes on. But what has me unhappy is the fact that at night, no action is on there, Sir, none whatsoever. That sort of engages youngsters to congregate, not to debate or play games, but perhaps to gamble and things like that.

When I was on the National Sports Council, those were the days when these ideas were born and executed too. Those were those golden days. When I was on the National Sports Council, the then Chairman, Mr. David Simmons, and I had very long discussions on this, and in the Five Year Development Plan you will find it there where we felt that the people of the area, that is those people in the youth groups and things like that, should be made responsible for the utilization of these facilities. I say so because I feel that unless you get the support of the people in the respective areas, then all falls down. I hope that it will be monitored so that you are able to make sure that the facilities are utilized fully. I really mean it when I say that they are not used at night. I would like to think that there could be some adult classes. I would like to think that there could be some debating committees. I would like to think that the people of the area would believe that the facilities are theirs and as a consequence they should use them to the best of their ability and to the fullest. I feel that if this is done, then we can all say that this is a dream we have had that has been realised.

4.25 p.m.

The Senator talked of the hard courts where you could play tennis, and no doubt volley ball and those relevant games. The only criticism of that is that the tennis courts bear no relation to the pavilion. Indeed, the pavilion faces the cricket and football field and you cannot watch tennis, volley ball or any game in the area of this land you are acquiring now.

Aside.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: No, no, I did not plan that. I said that on purpose. I knew that Senator Griffith would say that I helped plan it. No, much to the contrary. They kicked me out before I could plan it for them. I wanted to tell them that when you are planning multi-purpose facilities you do it in such a way that everyone benefits and no sport becomes a minor sport. In this way you will find that the tennis, the volley ball and netball would not feel that they are minor sports.

I think we should encourage games like netball because I really feel that it is wrong when you have to get a coach from New Zealand, as I saw in this morning's

newspaper, to coach the girls in Barbados to find that there are only 28 girls in Barbados playing First Division netball in 1985. It is a shame, a disgrace. I believe that if these facilities are used properly throughout the island, if we are able to take the youngsters and coach them from early, so that they will not lose interest as soon as they are out of school, then I feel that, overall, Barbados will once again reach the type of standard in a game like netball where we have at least come fifth in a world championship.

I feel that these measures are rather important, so here is a call for sport on a zonal basis where the people from Eden Lodge could have friendly combat with people from Belfield, and indeed from Deacons, the Farm and surrounding areas.

Aside.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: And Eckstein Village, as Senator Seale alluded to. I really mean this. It is only when we get it at that level that we can see for sure that we are advancing in the area of sport. If we do not do that, we will always be in the doldrums in perhaps everything except cricket – and even today I cannot think we can boast that we are anywhere near the top of the ladder in West Indian cricket, not any more. We need to have a serious look at the utilisation of these facilities.

I cannot be sadder as I speak to you than to say that night after night these new brand facilities, impeccable as they are, according to Senator Williams, are under-utilised. They are not utilised after sundown, and I say that is a burning shame. Let us get the young people in there, let us get them to be debating, let us get the adults in there for adult classes and let it be a community effort, so to speak. I think that if that is done, then all and sundry can say we have a facility of which we are duly proud. If it is not done, you will find that these wonderful buildings will be in a dire state of repair in a year or two, because nothing can really run down sporting buildings like inactivity or like having vandalism being the order of the day.

I feel that is not too much to ask. I am not saying that the Minister or the Ministry can have these facilities put there and then he has to go out there day after day, I am saying let us set up some committee. I know, it is not that I do not know, I know everything that is played there. There is cricket, soft ball, I know about Perth, I know about Western Australia and even the boys from over the road in Ashdeane. Senator Williams looks up, and so he should. Those boys come over and utilise these facilities. It is a good thing, but what I am saying is let them come together and be responsible for the facilities. That is what we need to do. If we do not do that, you will find that with most of the facilities around Barbados, people believe that once you

have actually set them up and you have them there where you can play a game of cricket or football, then it is not their responsibility whatsoever as far as the upkeep is concerned.

The people who use these facilities must understand that it is their responsibility. As a resident of the area, only yesterday I wrote a letter asking them to allow me to show some films – I did not mention the fact that it is never open – on football and cricket, nothing political, the good old days.

Aside.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: No, pornography would be in St. Philip South where you would be the architect, Senator Linton. We are talking about the advancement of young people.

Sir, he came all the way from over there. He is not in the Opposition, what is he doing here? He has come over here and is heckling me all the time. My only desire is to make a contribution and sit down, as you know, and he is heckling me, reading my book without permission. All those things he is doing.

I want to conclude by seriously making the point that as far as recreational facilities go, they are very dear to my heart. They transcend political barriers as far as I am concerned. I need decent facilities for my children and grandchildren to play in. I recognise that when you are born poor you need to have those outlets, I understand that very well. I am happy, as Senator Williams said, that we have these facilities. I am not going to go tongue in cheek about it, but I am happy that I, Wesley Winfield Hall, did have an input into it; a great one, too. I feel that if the Ministry takes to heart the few things I have said today, not only in relation to this facility, but the one in Sion Hill, the one at Dover, the one at Bagatelle, the one in St. Peter, all over this country, you will find that the people would come to the realisation that the amount of money that was spent in putting them there was not meant just to be an election gimmick or anything like that, it was meant for the advancement of the people of this country. If that is true, then it behoves them to pay a little attention and look after them.

I hope the Ministry will find it very fitting to allow me to go into that pavilion and to show the films. I am no footballer, but I think that football is a great game. The only thing I have seen happen in that Belfield pavilion so far at night has been a dance by the Belfield Football Club and a meeting by the St. Michael West Central Branch of the Barbados Labour Party. I do not want it only to be used for those particular situations, I want it to be utilised by all the constituents in St. Michael West Central and the neighbouring areas. It is not

particularly just for St. Michael West Central, I dare say, and I think that once you play on a home and away basis, you will find that the opponents, although they may come from three or four miles away, are utilising it just the same.

I am indeed happy that we have actually come to the end of this long saga. The courts are there, the pavilion is ready, they have been open a long time, and I am glad that we have so far tied the knot which brings to the end all negotiations pertaining to the facilities in Black Rock.

SENATOR G. G. READER: Mr. President, I am sorry to have to assure Senator Hall that all the negotiations are not yet at an end. Senator Williams said that when the facilities were built money was very tight. It was not only tight for the Ministry building the building, it was also tight for the Child Care, and all the water taken to build that facility was taken from the Nightengale Home Day Care Centre, and the money for that water has never been paid. The children had to suffer for that, and I do not think that is right or fair.
4.35 p.m.

I was assured at the time that the Sports Council and the Child Care Board were under the same Ministry

and it was like coming out of the same stable and we did not have to worry. But nothing has ever been done about it and that is not fair. I would like to see this matter rectified by those who can do something about it and try to help us out, because I am sure there are other people that would be glad to see the Child Care Board have a little bit of money to spend here and there.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, that brings us to the end of Government Business for the day. We will have to postpone the two Resolutions on the Order Paper until next week.

I beg to move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday, July 17, at 11 o'clock in the morning.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, July 17, 1985 at 11 o'clock in the morning was put to the Senate and agreed to.
4.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH 861

Report on the Registration Office and
Supreme Court Registry for the year 1983.

Report on the Fire Service for the year 1984.

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH 861

Motion re items on Order Paper.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH. 861

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act,
Cap. 44.

A Bill to amend the National Health Service
Board Act, 1984-22.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 861

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2)
ACT, 1985. 862

Senator Trotman, 862, 866; Senator Greaves,
863; Senator Seale, 865; Senator Reader, 865;
Senator Jemmott, 866.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE BOARD
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985. 868

Senator Trotman, 868, 879; Senator Wickham,
871; Senator Hall, 872; Senator Jones, 876;
Senator Greaves, 876; Senator Griffith, 878.

BORROWING OF US \$25 MILLION RE IMPL-
EMENTATION OF 1983-88 DEVELOP-
MENT PLAN 880

Senator Griffith, 880, 882; Senator McClean,
881; Senator Greaves, 882.

GUARANTEE OF \$8 MILLION BORROWED
BY BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY
FROM EUROPEAN INVESTMENT BANK. 883

Senator Griffith, 884; Senator Seale, 884.

TAX ON QUARRIABLE MINERALS ACT,
1985. 884

Senator Griffith, 884; Senator Hall, 885;
Senator Seale, 885.

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1985. 885

Senator Griffith, 885.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
WAVELL AVENUE, BLACK ROCK, ST.
MICHAEL FOR RECREATIONAL FACI-
LITIES 886

Senator Williams, 886; Senator Hall, 886;
Senator Reader, 889.

SUSPENSION. 876

ADJOURNMENT 889

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

CATO, His Honour Sir Arnott

GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.

GREAVES, E. E.

HALL, W. W.

JEMMOTT, C. E.

JONES, Canon I. McK.

MCCLEAN, A. W. A.

READER, Mrs. G. G.

SEALE, C. D.

TROTMAN, Hon. O'B.

WICKHAM, His Honour J. C. W.

WILLIAMS, J. E. D.