

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, July 29, 1987

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, July 29, 1987, at 11.15 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator F. L. Walcott, O. B.E., (President)
His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President)
Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate)
Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State, for the Civil Service)
Senator A. Morrison, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)
Senator N. W. Boxill
Senator D. A. Comissiong
Senator V. C. Fraser
Senator G. L. Eastmond
Senator A. J. N. Phillips
Senator T. A. Prescod
Senator L. R. Tull, Q.C.
Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.
Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.
Senator C. A. Blackman, Q.C.
Senator P. Y. Forde; and
Senator J. S. Goddard

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Guarantee granted under the Exempt Insurance Act Cap. 308 A, Section 32 to the ECS Reinsurance Company, INC.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ended 30th April, 1987 and 31st May, 1987.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1987.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, under this item, I am asking permission to move the suspension of Standing Orders 45 (1) and (2) in order for the Bills on the Order Paper to be read a first time and dealt with at this sitting.

Mr. PRESIDENT: There being no objection to the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders 45 (1) and (2), those Standing Orders are suspended.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (LEAVE PASSAGES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 1 was called – to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am asking leave so that my colleague, the Minister of State for the Civil Service, could take care of this.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Resolution deals with the (Leave Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1987 which was made on July 3. The Order seeks to amend the (Leave Passages) Order, 1966 to make

the necessary adjustments to salaries for persons qualifying and entitled to leave passages.

It is customary that after every salaries revision an Order be made. In this case, salaries were revised with effect from April, 1986 and April 1987, and to retain the passages entitlement at an equivalent salary point, it was necessary for the Order to be made so that persons who wish to travel outside the Caribbean with effect from April, 1986 would only qualify if they are in receipt of a salary of \$24 780 or over, and with effect from April, 1987 the qualifying salary is \$25 320 per annum. For persons taking entitlement inside the Caribbean with effect from April, 1986, the qualifying salary is \$20 508 per annum, and with effect from April, 1987 the qualifying salary would be \$20 976 per annum.

I beg to move, Mr. President, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ITINERANT SALESMEN (LICENSING) ACT, 1987

Order No. 2 was called – to move the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision for the licensing of itinerant salesmen.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, this is a Bill consequential on the Budgetary Statement which was made in April by the Minister of Finance in the Other Place. It will be remembered that he said, as is the case in all CARICOM countries, that non-national salesmen promoting the sale of extra-regional goods in Barbados will, as from that day, be required to pay an annual licence fee of \$750 000. The legislation, as honourable Senators will see, provides for the licence fee to be collected by the Accountant-General.

11.25 a.m.

The Ministry has been examining the possibility of having the fee collected at the point of entry by either the Comptroller of Customs or the Chief Immigration Officer. So towards this and, the provision is being made at Clause 4 of the Bill for the Minister of Finance to designate a public officer other than the Accountant General to perform the duties of issuing the appropriate licences under the legislation.

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

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, as a matter of correction, I believe the Minister, in moving the introduction to the Bill, quoted a figure of \$750 000.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am sorry. I do apologise. It is \$750.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. President; I have some sympathy for the aims of the Bill which I believe are to ensure that non-residents coming to Barbados from abroad dealing in non-CARICOM, manufactured goods should make some contribution to the public treasury either by direct taxation or licence fees. What I find difficult is how such persons are going to be identified. In other words, Sir, if an itinerant salesman comes in here with suitcases, that poses no problem. But how will such a person be differentiated from, say, someone coming to the island as a tourist and offering goods that his company manufactures outside of the CARICOM region when he has no samples but he has catalogues or brochures? That person can do business just like the itinerant salesman with the samples. I find it difficult to see how the Bill provides for the identification for one as opposed to the other. I should also mention that today, with advances in communication technology, an extra-regional manufacturer can offer goods to local companies or businesses by means of cable, telex, telefax and overseas telephone calls.

So my problem, Sir, is not with the general objectives of the Bill. I understand them perfectly. As I said earlier, I am sympathetic to the objectives. It is a question of identifying those persons who would qualify to be deemed to be itinerant salesmen for the purposes of the Act and then how this would be administered. Maybe the Minister might be able to give an explanation.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I think the honourable Senator has raised a very interesting problem. My only answer can be that this is one of the cases where when you are applying a law, you have to rely on the judgment, clear-sightedness and experience of perhaps your Immigration authorities. I am sure it is possible for doubtful cases to slip through the net from time to time. But if someone claiming to be an itinerant salesman comes under the notice of the Immigration authorities at the point of entry more frequently than he should making the same claims, I expect that at that point some query is bound to be raised and his *bona fides* examined perhaps on the third or fourth occasion more closely and with the greatest scrutiny than perhaps on the first or second.

The concerns raised by the honourable Senator are genuine ones, but I think that perhaps this is a case where we would have to allow the legislation to start working and monitor it.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put to the Senate and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

Clauses 1 – 6 were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendments, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

11.35 a.m.

REVISED SALARIES OF PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am asking leave, Sir, for this item to be taken charge of by my colleague.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Leave is asked for the Honourable Minister to take charge of the Resolution. There is no objection, so leave is granted.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Resolution stems from the recently agreed revision of salaries for persons working in the Civil Service. Consequent upon the agreement which was reached by Government with the several trade unions representing public officers for an increase in their rates of pay, that is, salaries and wages, with effect from April 1986 and a further increase from April 1987, it is proposed that the salaries of the personal staff attached to the Prime Minister receive similar revision.

The numbers set out in this Resolution reflect the increases at the same percentage rates as those which were applied to public officers, and since it is customary for those revisions to be done, I now move that this Resolution be passed.

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

BARBADOS TOURISM INVESTMENT CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg leave, Sir, that this be taken charge of by my colleague.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Leave is asked for the Honourable Minister for the Public Service to take charge of the Bill. Leave is granted.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Bill seeks to amend the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation Act, Cap. 332A.

Section 6 of the existing Act authorises the corporation to have share capital of some \$20 million divided into 200 000 shares of one dollar each. This Bill seeks to revise that authorised share capital and upgrade it to \$100 million comprised of one million shares of \$100 each. In addition, the amount of Government's initial paid up capital has now been increased from \$12.5 million to some \$36 million.

The existing Bill appears to have certain deficiencies relating to the borrowing powers of the corporation and in terms of the Investment Corporation's responsibilities for substantial properties such as the Hilton Hotel and the Heywoods Holiday Village. It was found that the board's authority was circumscribed because of its inability to go to the commercial banking system to borrow money to facilitate certain improvements at the present time at the Barbados Hilton Hotel.

What the amendment now seeks to do is to give the Tourism Investment Corporation borrowing powers, subject to the approval of the Minister responsible for Finance, and also to give them authority to open and to maintain accounts at such banks in Barbados as the corporation may from time to time think fit.

The Bill also seeks to provide a limit on the debt-equity ratio of the Investment Corporation.

This measure, Mr. President, is seen as providing the opportunity for the Tourism Investment Corporation to operate more efficiently in terms of its management of hotel properties on the island.

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

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, the Tourism Investment Corporation has overall responsibility for the Hilton and the Heywoods hotels. The Government last year articulated as its policy that it was going to sell the Hilton Hotel and Heywoods. I have heard unofficially that that policy is now changed, but I do not believe that there has been any Government official statement to that effect.

Mr. President, while Nero fiddled, Rome burned, because plans were made over a year ago, before a change in Government, for major remedial work to be done on the Hilton Hotel, and indeed for extension work to be done at Heywoods Hotel. I believe they were going to build additional suites at Heywoods, and these plans had reached a fairly advanced stage. But with the policy of the new Government last year that they were into the act of privatisation and they were going to get rid of these hotels, maybe for that reason the work to be done on those two hotels was put off. I suspect so, Sir.

As I said, I have heard unofficially that there is a change in policy. Certainly no official statement has been vouchsafed to this Chamber to that effect. But if one accepts

that what one hears in the highways and byways is true, then it seems to me now that the provision for the increased borrowing powers of the Tourism Investment Corporation is to do something that could have been done before. I have no quarrel with that, Sir, because the Hilton Hotel is in very bad shape, it is leaking and it needs a lot of work being done on it. The point I want to underscore is that when Government's spend their time making one step forward and one backward and doing what is now known as U-turns, that is, dramatic changes in direction, these things have a financial cost, and we are being asked to pay this year a higher cost for the extension of Heywoods Hotel and for the remedial work at the Hilton Hotel because the Government seemed to have had some difficulty in getting its act together.

Inherent in that, Sir, is the thesis that I have often put out, that Governments should be reluctant to make major changes in policy too early in an administration. I know that promises are made and that promises must be kept, but it takes a little while before a Government settles down and gets itself well briefed and *au fait* with what is happening before it makes reasoned and often intelligent decisions. Perhaps if the Government had not operated the way it did, with this reckless haste in spouting a lot of what I like to call neo-conservative slogans, but had taken their time and perhaps studied what they found, we would have been saved, not the embarrassment because the Government is not easily embarrassed, Sir, but certainly we would have been saved the expense that we could have if we had continued what was then in train and started the work a year earlier.

11.45 a.m.

In respect of the Tourism Investment Corporation, this corporation was removed from the aegis of the Minister of Tourism and placed under the Public Investment Unit or State Enterprises Unit a year ago. Again, I am not sure, considering the new changes made in ministerial responsibility a month or so ago, whether the Tourism Investment Corporation remains now under the aegis of the Minister for State Enterprises or if it has been returned to the Ministry of Tourism.

If it has not, well, that is it, but if it has, it again demonstrates the good sense in approaching a number of these very important matters, particularly when they involve the spending of money, *festina lente* making haste slowly, because one hears on the political grapevine all sorts of reasons why the Tourism Investment Corporation was removed from the general responsibility of the Minister of Tourism. I will not use these Chambers to spread any further the kind of rumours you hear, but, again, I make the point that the policy of building statutory boards, corporations and ministerial responsibilities around individual persons rather than around a coherent policy is one that is usually pregnant with difficulty, and again I would caution the Government, for what it is worth, that they should go a little

bit more slowly in making these radical departures, which are not absolutely necessary at the time or absolutely critical to the programme of the Government.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, my question on this Bill relates to the Government's paid-up capital, which has been increased from \$12.6 million to \$36 million. Is this being done by way of a re-appraisal of the evaluation of the properties which are vested in the corporation, or is it going to amount to a natural injection of cash into the corporation? In other words, is Government providing the corporation with the wherewithal to do some of the things that I understand are envisaged or is it just really a paper write-up in the books on account of the evaluation of Heywoods and the Hilton Hotel?

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, concerning the paid-up capital, it has always been abundantly evident to persons who understand the vesting of properties in corporations or any other businesses that the actual value of the properties should be reflected in the share capital. This was not so when Heywoods was originally vested because of the limitation in the amount of the share capital. What is happening now is that 60 per cent shareholding in the BTIC, which represented Government's case input into the construction of the hotel, is being converted into share capital.

The Government, as you may have well been aware, when Heywoods was in existence for more than its first year, found it necessary to meet the interest charges payable on the loans for the construction and they are not being treated as share capital so that in any event Government has since the construction of Heywoods put additional monies into the Heywoods Project and until such time as Heywoods is able to meet its own interest charges on the loans, Government will be forced to do that.

With regard to the questions about Government's privatisation and divestment it was my understanding when the subject of the Tourism Investment Corporation was translated from the Ministry of Tourism to the State Enterprises Unit of the Prime Minister's office, this was done as a result of thorough scrutiny of a study done by the same State Enterprises Unit commencing some time in 1985 when all of the Statutory Boards were examined and they were categorized some to be the sort of enterprises which required state direction rather than individual subject portfolio direction and the late Prime Minister when he made certain comments about his unwillingness to pursue the privatisation path and he did mention something like this, he directed that the subjects relating to the Heywoods Holiday Village Project and the Hilton Hotel as well as Barbados Feeds and Mills become the direct day-to-day responsibility of the State Enterprises Unit which reported to him on a day-to-day basis. This was the mechanism by which he intended to ensure that Government at a central point would maximize on the direction of these agencies.

Now, the fact that the subject has gone back to the Tourism portfolio could well be understood to mean that a new Prime Minister considers that the subject matter should deal with it rather than him having direct day-to-day involvement, but, the State Enterprises Unit still retains its responsibility for continuing monitoring of the financial and accounting activities of all of these corporations and a representative of the State Enterprises Unit is now a member of the board in order to ensure that this relationship continues.

I believe that if I were on the Other Side I would have made similar strictures to the members on the Other Side with regard to the new turns and I understand that that is what Opposition is for and, indeed, anybody who has individual personal concerns but all Governments from time to time have to make "U" turns. It is the "U" turns which recognize, which are evidence of the fact that they have not just taken a stance and are unwilling to reflect upon it and, if necessary, change course when the situation demands that there be change.

With those remarks, Mr. President, I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

11.55 a.m.

Clauses 1 - 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

FINAL APPROPRIATION (1986-87) ACT, 1987

Order No. 5 was called - to move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the financial year ended March 31, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am asking leave for this to be taken charge of by my colleague.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Constitution of Barbados provides that, in respect of supplementary expenditure voted on by the House of

Assembly in pursuance of subsection 4 of section 109 of the Constitution, the Minister of Finance may at any time before the end of the financial year introduce into the House of Assembly a supplementary Appropriation Bill containing under the appropriate heads the aggregate sums voted during the year, and as soon as possible after the end of the financial year introduce into the House of Assembly a Final Appropriation Bill containing any such sums which have not been included in the Appropriation Bill.

In respect of the financial year which ended on March 31, 1987, sums totalling an amount of \$69 273 676 were voted by the House of Assembly to supplement the Appropriation Bill. These have been certified by the Accountant General as having been issued on the basis of warrants issued by the Minister and issued out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I have a few observations to make in respect of the Heads for which approval is being sought, since at the time the money was being spent out concurrence was not sought.

With respect to Head 28, which refers to the Ministry of Legal Affairs and also Head 75, General Improvement to the Prison, I would like to know when the Senate may expect to receive a copy of the report of the Commission of Enquiry into the death of Michael Agard. More than seven months have passed since this report was handed in, and I understand that certain Public Service actions have taken place with respect to one or two of the prison officers, one of whom perhaps has gone into retirement - he has received his pension and he may even have left the country - and that disciplinary proceedings are being pursued against members of the Royal Barbados Police Force, but yet, Sir, this Parliament has not yet seen evidence of the report.

In respect, Sir of Head 84, which deals with the Ministry of Transport and Works, there seems to be a woeful lack of co-ordination on the part of people in that Ministry in respect of carrying out road works in and around Bridgetown, and around Barbados generally. Last year, before the election, when the former Administration was in a hurry to make sure that all the roads that ought to have been done a long while before were done before the elections, roads all around St. Michael were blocked up. Station Hill was blocked up the same time that Black Rock was blocked up, and people spent inordinate amounts of time trying to duck from one road to the other to find that road also blocked.

That has not changed with the change of Government, because civil servants are a law unto themselves. You block up the Swing Bridge and at the same time you close off the

roundabout at Collymore Rock and Martindale's Road, and at the height of midday workmen can be seen marking the road in white with the road blocked in Bay Street crossing the old Eye Hospital.

I would like to make an appeal that there must be more co-ordination between the Ministry of Transport in its road works and the Police, sometimes to give directions, because you go from one direction to the other and find that that road is also blocked. I think it is a ridiculous state of affairs. I read in the Press recently that the Minister had some critical remarks to make of the staff in his own department, but it seems to fall on deaf ears.

Imagine what is going to happen with the bridge now closed, and closed for four months. God knows what is going to happen when the schools re-open. It is bad enough now that people are on vacation, but when the schools re-open in September, it is going to be worse. At least one would expect them to put a policeman at the foot of the National Insurance Building to send traffic over the Bridge and so stop people having to drive around the Empire Building and come up Independence Square to feed into one line of traffic. Better ought to be done.

I do not understand why we need to close the bridge for three months to put up an arch. Modern technology is available, Sir, and I would have thought that the arch could be manufactured and assembled over a short period of time. You would only have to close it for the short period that is necessary, not for four months. I would hazard a guess that if this matter was put out to private contract, it would not take four months and it would be done more expeditiously with more regard to the uses of the bridge. The Minister talks about the matter of economy. Can you imagine the cost to the country of the gas consumed in people driving around inordinately just to get to work? Really, better has to be done.

The only other point that I want to say for the record is that I will vote against the Bill as a matter of principle, in that I want to register a protest, which I think I have communicated to this Chamber before, that the Chamber is not permitted any debate on Resolutions of this kind. I think that really to ask us after the event to approve expenditure that has already taken place is really a travesty of Parliament.

12.05 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I can assure the Senator who just spoke that his concerns about the diversion of traffic, especially at the Chamberlain Bridge and the new roundabout at the Martindale's/River Road/Collymore Rock junction is of tremendous concern to a lot of us, except that what I am hoping is that they get ahead with that work on the stretch coming down River Road within the next four or five days, which I believe is

possible, rather than holding up for too long a time. At least that will save the wear and tear which several of us who use that junction would have been encountering over the last month with all the dilly-dallying and stupidity of the Ministry of Transport and Works staff. It is high time that they have some pride in themselves.

Over and above that, I will certainly undertake to ask questions about the necessity for closing off the Chamberlain Bridge to construct the arch, when, in fact, to the laymen anyhow, it seems an absolute hindrance to attempt that and something not necessary at all. I do not recall when the last arch was constructed whether there was any closure of the bridge, but I doubt whether there was any closure of the bridge. It was prefab, of wood and other materials rather than stone, but even so, the correct way is to precast the things and then carry them and join them. The Hilton was constructed with a lot of precast things, and that was 21 years ago, so I do not see what is the point of all the stupidity on the bridge.

I will certainly convey to the appropriate authority the concern expressed about the failure or the delay to provide us with the report on the enquiry at the prisons relating to the death of the late Mr. Agard.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time, it being a money Bill.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was passed.

EMPLOYMENT LEVY ACT, 1987

Order No. 6 was called – to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the imposition and collection of a levy on income to be known as employment levy.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am also asking leave for this to be taken care of by my colleague.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Leave is being asked for the Honourable Minister of the Public Service to take charge of this Bill. There being no objection, leave is granted.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the Minister of Finance presented his Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals in the Other Place on April 7, 1987 he announced:

"As a temporary measure, a new Employment Levy will be introduced. This Employment Levy will be used to finance specific programmes relating to new job opportunities. Effective from May 2, employers and employees will each pay 0.5 per cent of insurable earnings. This is expected to yield \$9.2 million."

The matter was examined and the Director of National Insurance pointed out that deductions for National Insurance and other levies are collected on the basis of a week beginning on a Monday. The nearest Monday to May 2 was May 4 and it was felt that the levies could be introduced on that date. However, when the matter was further examined and it was realised that the levies would apply also to self-employed persons, it was discovered that the effective date could not be May 4, hence, June 1, 1987 was selected as the date on which the levies would apply to self-employed business persons.

Cabinet agreed that the proposed levies would apply to self-employed persons effective June 1, but that the others would take effect as announced by the Minister of Finance from a date in May, varied to May 4 to comply with the accounting weakness of the National Insurance Department.

There has been much discussion, Mr. President, relating to the Budget, and the most that I can say at this stage is that I believe that the Minister's emphasis that it is a temporary measure bears a lot of weight and should be given that sort of consideration. This is a temporary measure as a means of yielding revenue of some \$9.2 million.

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

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I express the view again that this type of measure is regressive legislation, and since there has been a fairly consistent policy in recent years of moving away from regressive legislation to progressive legislation in relation to taxation, I would have thought that since this move was afoot that you would continue it. But this is just another example of what I mean by Government's U-turns, much to the embarrassment of its fans.

The previous Administration introduced levies, and they were bitterly criticised by the then Opposition, the present Government. There were some fairly absolute statements that if that Opposition became the Government, they would abolish the levies. It has been enshrined in their election manifesto, and it has been put on record in Hansard in the Other Place. Despite that, what we are seeing is not the reduction or abolition in any of the levies, but an increase in levies and the introduction of a new levy. That cannot be fair. You cannot be fair when you are dealing with people to treat them in that kind of contemptuous way.

But levies are made respectable now. They are good company. They can come into your living room these days.

In the old days, they were relegated to the backyard by this Government. But now they have pride of place in the living room.

I do not want to be very long today, Sir, because these points have been made *ad nauseum* and we will continue to make them *ad nauseum*, because the Government must never be allowed to forget that there is a very wide gulf between its promise and its performance. They must hear about these things.

In introducing this, the Minister quite rightly said that the Minister of Finance in his Budgetary Proposals said that the measure was temporary. My question is, how temporary is temporary? I have been around in this business for more than a day, and I know that one of the easiest ways to put off criticism is to talk about something being temporary. I know a woman who got a temporary accommodation in the mid-1950s, when they had Hurricane Janet. They gave her temporary accommodation and she is still occupying that accommodation today. So I am interested in knowing from the Government how temporary is temporary. What are they talking about?
12.15 p.m.

One of the things that lawyers learn very early is that the law must be certain. People must not be left in any doubt. I think it is sloppy really to come and tell us that this is a temporary measure without the slightest projection even in the *res gestae*. Even in the *res gestae* you do not tell us.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I did Latin. I did most things. Do not fault my versatility.

(Asides: I hear you!)

Laughter.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Not even in that, Sir, have we been given some general idea of what we are talking about. The Minister can say it is temporary. Is it for a year, that is temporary, or is it two years? To use the word "temporary" and leave it there is not good enough.

I was interested in what the Minister who introduced this said. That is the basis of my continuing the charge of sloppiness, because the Minister obviously, or the Government, since I am not supposed to talk about the Minister, came up with May 2, then May 4, and then they went to June 1, and then they mixed it up. They have a hybrid date now – one for self-employed people and one for people who are the employers of others. It is interesting that they should decide that the date for self-employed people for payment of this levy should come after the date for the people who are employers of others. I do not know if there is any special significance in that. I would have hoped and

thought that it might have been better to have it the other way around. But many men, many minds. The Government obviously knows what it is doing.

I am also interested in having some word from the Government, which is so critical to the understanding of what they are doing with this measure, to give us some correlation between jobs and payments. You just cannot ask people to pay \$8 million or whatever it is and do not at any time tell us what are your projections. I am a reasonable person, Mr. President, and I do not expect that the Government can know with exactness and precision how many jobs will accrue out of every million dollars collected, but they certainly should be in the position to give us a general idea of what it is they have in mind.

This business of an employment levy, also goes to the heart of the character of the Government. It really goes deep, because not many months ago, the Government brought a measure dealing with the Registration of Professions, Trade and Business Act, and there was the usual hoopla, a big song and dance, that the previous Administration was so insensitive to the position of the workers that they required a long list of categories of people to pay \$5 a year to get registered and to practice – some paid more, but the majority paid \$5 a year – and that it was an opportunity for us to sit down here and hear how wicked the Government was. How could you ask people to pay money to work? We heard about all of the nut sellers and the car washers and how could it be fair to ask these people to pay money to do a job, to carry out their calling or whatever it is? Now, without a whimper, as the old people used to say, the said very Government comes in here arising out of the Budgetary Proposals and slaps on an employment levy on those very people which is far greater in quantum. The amount of money that they will pay in this is not \$5 a year or \$10 a year. This is real money. So they come with all their piety early in the year and say \$5 shows that you are a wicked Government, and hallelujah, they say it is a wicked Government because we amended the Business, Trades and Professions Act to relieve them of \$5 or \$10 a year. But while that argument is being put even in this very Chamber, the Government was contemplating the imposition of an employment levy on the same hawkers, nut sellers, and coconut sellers, a whole range of people in this country who earn some money, and as I said, Mr. President, to take in an amount of money many, many times over what they used to pay in their registration fee.

I am one of the last persons, Mr. President, to get in here and say that the Government is not collecting enough revenue. I leave hypocrites to say that, and I do not mean hypocrites in here. I leave hypocrites to make the kind of facile statement that Government must not somehow raise revenue to run the country. What I am saying, therefore, is not that Government must not collect revenue, but Government must be consistent in its underlying philosophy in the collection of revenue. And this brings me back, as I

will *ad nauseam*, to state that a Government which in one year gives \$22 million in relief to the private sector, principally the big private sector companies, and comes the following year and ask the nut sellers, to use their terms, the Government's terms not mine, the coconut sellers and the hawkers, to pitch up money to make up for the \$22 million that they gave away last year, is a government – well, I had better not say. It is a government. It can do as it likes. But I am making the point not that you must not get revenue, but that there has to be some moral and philosophical basis for your policy, and equally important, it must be coherent policy. So the political neophytes on the other side should not stick their necks out and hold on to whatever the Government says at any time, as if it is holy writ, and find themselves out on a limb and being embarrassed within a month or two, because that is happening.

This Employment Levy, I think, is untimely and is a bad tax. I really think so, Sir. If they want to raise \$8 million, take back \$8 million of the concessions they gave in the private sector, because the private sector has not come up with the jobs that they were expected to deliver. They gave them \$22 million in concessions in the expectation that they will generate more employment. But when they do not, they have got something for nothing. And if you need \$8 million, Sir, do not ask the nut sellers to pay. Get back by budgetary proposals the \$8.5 million you are trying to collect from the private sector, because the private sector has not delivered on the jobs.

12.25 p.m.

One would have expected, Mr. President, that when the Government is pursuing these measures, they do it after a period of study and consultation. You do not gamble, Sir, this is not a lottery or a poker game. There should be consultation and study. What I am trying to say, Mr. President, is that if the Government is going to give concessions of a certain amount to any section of the community to achieve a particular aim, they must sit down and work it out that they can tell us that for every million dollars of concessions, the study and consultation point to the fact that we will have X number of jobs. Equally, with an employment levy such as this, we should also be told that if we are taking in \$8 million, our study and consultation tell us that we will get approximately X number of jobs.

I must reiterate, Sir, because I have a way of being misquoted, that I am not saying that the Government can know with precision exactly how many jobs you get, but it must have a general idea and it must be done on a scientific study, not some of the studies that you see in the Public Service where a lot of paper is written up with a lot of confusion. I am talking about a scientific study. That is my position in relation to this unemployment levy.

I want to reiterate two other points. First, we should be told how temporary is this thing, how long is it going to last, so we can gird ourselves for what is coming. The second thing I am saying is that the Unemployment Levy is misconceived. It is insensitive and it is unnecessary at this particular time.

I say further that if the Government wants more revenue – as indeed it must, because you do not get something for nothing – if you give away \$67 million, the needs and the wants of Barbados and its Public Service will not suddenly evaporate, so the money has to come from somewhere, and some will come from additional Corporation Tax, some will come from additional Stamp Duty, Consumption Tax and so on – but it is obvious that those particular measures – Corporation Tax, Stamp Duty, Consumption Tax and the like – have not brought in enough to make up the shortfall of what was conceded last year, and to impose on the workers, including the workers who can least afford to pay, this additional burden, to my mind, Mr. President, is the indication of the unfeeling and callous nature of this present Administration.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I do not always rise to speak on matters, which, quite frankly, are a bit too technical for my particular understanding, but what I have to say, does not come within that range. I wish to respond to the remarks which, quite frankly, are political, and I feel more at home here, which have just been addressed to this Senate by the Senator who has just sat down.

From the time this Session has started, whenever we have been discussing a financial measure, no matter what its intrinsic merits, the Senator and his colleague have started down on the doom and gloom path. If I remember rightly – and I do not want to misinform the Senate – from what they have been telling us since early June last year, or whenever it was, there are very few months left now before the country falls into ruin. Of the 18 months which they gave us, or gave the country, we must now perhaps have only about five or so months left, so I do not think we have done too badly.

The main point I want to address is that if you are a political party in Opposition and you are challenging a Government on fundamental economic and fiscal policy, at some time or other you are bound to say that if you get back the Government, you are going to undo what has been done. I wish to throw out this challenge now to the Barbados Labour Party, and I want to do it in the clearest possible terms. It is about a dozen times now we have heard in this Senate, or perhaps more, that we have done the wrongest possible thing in the fiscal arrangements which we have introduced since we took the Government, and that in those arrangements, we have given back large sums of money to the private sector and that this, by implication and inference,

is the worst thing a Government could ever do. So what I am asking the Senator and his colleagues to tell us simply is this, and to make a positive declaration of principle to the people of this island so that the battle can be more clearly, if not more fairly, joined – are you saying that if there is a change of Government within the next four years, or whenever, and you are returned to power, you are going to dismantle all of the fiscal arrangements which we set in train in consequence of pledges which we gave to the electorate before? You have to say this at some point or other, you cannot just dodge around this question. If what we have given, you are going to take away, then there is a sensible political argument which you can come out with, and the people of the country will know when they go to vote next time, or even know before they go to vote next time, what they may expect from the Barbados Labour Party. This is what you have to face. It is all right to get in here and make this point.

If we come to complete the arrangements, as he says, if we come for a loan which is an extension of, in some cases, policies they have already inaugurated and which we are carrying through, we hear that we are borrowing merely because we have given away too much money. No matter what the particular issue is, they always seize some chance to tell us that we have given away too much. Well, the issue is a clear one, as far as I can see. Any political party in Opposition which thinks that a Government in office has given away too much, has a duty to say to the people long before voting time comes, if you put us back, we are going to snatch back everything that they have given to you. If we can hear this, then the debate can be lifted to the practical level of what you may expect next time. We do not need – we may not even have, I hope not – another by-election to test this particular argument out. I think it has been well-tested in recent weeks. I mean there may have been special circumstances there, but the arguments which we heard in here have been carried there and I do not know the extent to which they have been listened to. I do not think we need to have an occasion of a by-election to test that ground out again, but certainly a responsible party, as the Barbados Labour Party claims to be, has a positive duty to inform the people of this country as to what it will do if it asks for, and receives, mandate to govern again. It must say that it will dismantle those fiscal reforms which the Democratic Labour Party has set in train, or it must say it will keep them. If you are going to say you are going to keep them, then we have to change the context of this argument. You can still tell us we are doing wrong, but you cannot tell us we are doing wrong for leaving money in people's pockets. I think, therefore, that we have to shift the ground of this argument.

12.35 p.m.

It is very possible that when we bring a Resolution here, you can draw our attention to some criticisms which are valid, and it is our duty to listen to you to make sure that

we understand the criticisms and not only pay attention to them, but possibly, make whatever reforms are necessary in the particular matters. That is the duty of an Opposition, and Governments should listen to Opposition parties. There should never be any arrogance at all, but if you are only telling us that you are going to undo what we have done, do not only tell us here, but shout it from the housetops so that all of us, if we are alive in 1991 and we are going to mark our Xs, must know we are going to vote either for those who want us to retain some of our money or we are going to vote for the snatchers. If you want to be cast in the role of money snatchers from the citizens in this country, that is all right with me, but we must know what we are going to argue about.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the Senate go into Committee on that Bill.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: There is no Committee.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: It has been certified. I apologise for misleading the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BORROWING OF US\$4 MILLION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON- STRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, this Resolution seeks the approval of the Senate to borrow the equivalent of US\$4 million from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the purpose of assisting in financing an agricultural project in order to bring about an appropriate balance between sugar and non-sugar crops, and also to increase the production of, and income from, non-sugar crops, as the Government is seeking to have the agricultural sector more diversified.

The loan is repayable in instalments twice annually, as the Addendum says, on each May 15 and November 15 commencing November 15, 1990 through November 15, 2001 - \$165 000 - and on May 15, 2002 - \$205 000. Interest is payable on the principal amount of the loan withdrawn and outstanding from time to time at a rate per annum above the cost of qualified borrowings for the last semester ("semester" means the first six months or the second six months of a calendar year) ending prior to the commencement of such Interest Period.

Sir, to give Senators a brief background to the purpose of this Resolution, some time in 1982, the last Government entered into a loan agreement with the IBRD, which is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for the provision of technical assistance amounting at that time to \$2.7 million for the purpose of financing an agricultural diversification project. That project was implemented over a three year period and it formed part of a broader project which also included an energy component.

The objective of the agricultural component at that time was to review the agricultural institutions and to identify and promote the development of the agricultural sector. At that time an agreement was drawn up with the Agricultural Development International Ltd. for the supply of certain consultancy services for the implementation of that project. That spanned some 730 man months of consulting services, mainly in the areas of extension, agronomy, irrigation technology, marketing and forest production.

When we reviewed that project over the period 1982 - 1985, we found that there were certain successes that were gained. We were able to resuscitate the cotton industry. We were also able to expand the local onion industry, such that planting can now be effected over an eight month period instead of the normal five months previously. We were also able to realise higher yields for vegetables and peanut production on the part of certain farmers, and they were able to come up with the adoption of more efficient feeding systems for livestock farmers.

The Government at that time felt that in spite of the achievements which were gained as a result of that project, there was still a lot more to be done before the main agricultural development programme could be said to have been successfully implemented. They figured that the agricultural diversification programme would have to be implemented over not only a short term, but medium and long term periods to realise the full gains of a full agricultural diversification programme. So it was decided some two years before we got into power that they would explore the possibility of a second loan to assist in the implementation of another agricultural diversification programme.

As a result of the decision taken by the previous Government, we had various missions come to Barbados to evaluate and also negotiate with the Barbados Government a second loan to improve the development of the agricultural sector. Cabinet, some time just before we got into power on May 22, 1986, considered proposals for the Government to negotiate a second loan with the IBRD for the promotion of a second agricultural development project. As a matter of fact, the Cabinet at that time concluded that the offer of the IBRD to negotiate a loan estimated at \$US5.97 million, with a foreign exchange component of \$US4 million and a local cost component of \$US1.97 million as detailed at that time, should be accepted.

12.45 p.m.

They had also agreed to certain components – the formulation of a new agricultural development strategy, technical assistance for agricultural diversification as one of the planks, provision of training for Ministry personnel mainly in the form of short term overseas attachments, vehicles, machinery, equipment and materials required for modern mechanised agriculture, to identify and make recommendations on potential investment enterprises, organisational models and policies necessary to effect the establishing and the running of relevant agro-industries and a component for the agro-industry credit sector. So the Cabinet at that time agreed that the objectives of the project would be to provide a sound basis for defining an agricultural strategy that is technically feasible, financially and economically sound and appropriately balanced between the sugar and non-sugar sectors. The policy also sought to increase the production of an income from non-sugar agriculture, that is, to boost the income that would be received by small farmers.

There were certain conditions and terms demanded on the same loan, that the loan should be advanced to the Government of Barbados for 15 years with a three-year grace period at the standard variant interest rate, procurement procedures acceptable to the bank to be followed, and all the other conditions which are attached to these loans by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

When we came into office, Sir, the present Minister of Agriculture had a look at the formulation of this project and the matter was deferred until he could have a more indepth look at the particular proposals that were put up. We have been able to vary these proposals somewhat, especially with respect to the input of the consultancy services. We felt we had sufficient people in the local area who could also help in the implementation of this plan, so we were able to cut out some of these consultancy services which were embedded in that plan, but which would not have interfered with the amount of money of the loan which we were asking for. We just did a little cutting here and there.

The Cabinet was able to look at the project on July 24, 1986, and after the comprehensive review, it was felt that the project could be redesigned not only in the manner which I started to allude to not too long ago, in that we would maximise the use of local available expertise, but that we would provide greater flexibility with respect to the supply of consultancy services, that we would strengthen the training component and that we would increase the agro-industrial credit component. The policy of the Ministry now, Sir, is to move more towards agro-based industries to push our local consumption of food and to handle our local fruit production in such a way that it becomes more acceptable to our consumers and so be able to save some foreign exchange in the amount of jams and jellies which we now import from outside.

A part of the plan was for there to be an agricultural census financed by our own local needs – we do not need the loan to do that – and we decided that the component for consultancy services would be reduced from 104 man months to 49 man months, and that we would have an allocation of \$100 000 to facilitate export market promotion.

As a result of those little adjustments by the Ministry of Agriculture, the Cabinet approved a broad-based strategy at that time including four planks: that we would approve the revised agricultural development project, that we would approve the proposal that the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries co-ordinate the agricultural sector study which was done as a result of part of this loan agreement; they approved the loan agreement between the Government of Barbados and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for \$US4 million to finance the foreign exchange component of the Agricultural Development project estimated to cost \$US5.97 million, having a local cost component of \$1.97 million; and Cabinet agreed to authorise the Ambassador to the United States of America to sign the loan agreement on behalf of the Government following its approval with the board of the bank.

It is the result of 3 and 4, Sir, the loan and the signing of that agreement, that we are now asking the Senate further to approve. The loan agreement was signed on March 12, 1987. We are now having a further loan to give a bigger impetus to our agro-based industries, to deal with certain matters to bring about more agricultural diversification, and to have technical assistance in dealing with certain crops, vegetable production, farm economics and management, a bigger boost to cotton production, flower production, mechanised farming, irrigation, marketing and agro-industries. We are hoping to make a meaningful attempt once more at putting more emphasis on these areas of production to have a better diversified agricultural programme to balance our sugar production in this day.

12.55 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Is it the will of Senators that we should break or continue?

Mr. PRESIDENT: How many more items do you have?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Nothing more.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Go through.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR:

Yes. This is the last.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is a waste of time.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR:

Yes, all right.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I will not be very long because I do not want to detain Senators – it is getting close to lunch time – but there are a few points I have to make, Sir.

No amount of words from the Government can deter me from making the point repeatedly that the Government is deviating in major areas from its stated policy. This particular measure, Sir, the loan for another \$8 million, throws the National Debt in the vicinity of a \$290 million increase since this Government came to power. Against the background of repeated statements both as the last Opposition and as the new Government that the amount of foreign borrowing would be not only curtailed, Sir, but discontinued, it does not fit well in the mouth of the Government to come now and try to wriggle out of these things by trying to give a lot of inane lectures to the Opposition as to how it should conduct its own business.

I was a little bit curious to hear the “mix bag” exponent telling a responsible Opposition that it must not be critical of the Government’s policy, particularly when the Government’s policy is one of breaking faith with the people. But I have learned also, Sir, that nobody takes you on, if what you say does not sting. If I were making a lot of useless statements, they would have passed and nobody would have said anything. I am honoured that the Leader of the Senate, who does not normally get into debates on financial matters, was sufficiently moved by the strength, potency and effectiveness of my statements that he had to get up and give a lame excuse and lecture to the Opposition.

We hear about telling the people what you would do. We would do a whole lot of things differently. It is not fair to say that the Opposition ever gets up here and talks about not leaving money in people’s pockets. What the quarrel is about is a misallocation of the coppers for certain sections of the community.

The Central Bank Report, Sir – I have a copy here in my hand – the last one, the Economic Review, June 1987, gives some very interesting information. It says, among other things, that non-sugar agriculture has declined. I will get back to that. It says that the lowest crop since 1949 was the most recent one – the lowest

since 1949 – 83 432 tonnes, 25 per cent less production than in 1986.

If at the same sugar production was flagging non-sugar production was up, then we could understand the correlation between the two that this Bill is seeking to address. I have no quarrel with it, I must say. I slip that in early before I get quarrelled with after. I have no difficulty at all in supporting a measure that has as its object the further enhancement of non-sugar agriculture in this country. It is a policy that was pursued by the Barbados Labour Party as a Government, it is a policy that this Government is giving some lip service to. The truth of the matter is that the facts show that there has been a decline in non-sugar agriculture since the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, and at the same time there was a massive decline in sugar production in this country. There has been a concomitant drop in agricultural exports, and therefore, all this talk I am hearing about foreign earnings and so on is relevant in this regard, because we have been, over the last number of years, increasing non-sugar agricultural production and exporting more and more all the time.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Who started to export onions? Who started to export tomatoes? Who started to export tamdew melons? Who started to export sweet potatoes? Who exported yams? This is the kind of thing that developed in non-sugar agriculture during the period 1976–1986. There has been nothing comparable to it before or after.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am getting heckled.

What has gone up in production in agriculture is the production of milk. The Pine Hill Dairy has recorded significant profit and has been named by the experts in these areas as the blue chip company, the company that did extremely well in the circumstances, and the Chairman of that Board was dismissed for his success. The production of milk increased by 14.9 per cent in the period under review, the first quarter, over the same period last year, and it has done so at a time when the plant had been streamlined, the management structure had been set in place, things were beginning to work and profits were coming in.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill, you are not addressing the Chair. Order.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: It was during that time when these things had been done and the results were being shown

that the architect of that success was very unceremoniously dismissed.

Agriculture is very dear to my heart. I live in an agricultural community, with tenants all around me on agricultural tenancies. What I have seen is that for the first time in many years – “many” meaning in excess of 11 years, I am not going any further than that, – at the end of the crop this year agricultural workers were sent home. We hear all about a five day week that was negotiated by the Barbados Workers Union some years ago. That policy has now fallen in obedience. Agricultural workers sent home. Massive lay-offs! Agricultural workers now, instead of working the five days a week that has been guaranteed by law, are working one day a week, two days a week, and if they get three days a week, it means that they and the boss get on real, real good. That is the situation all across the country.

But it goes a lot further than that. What has also happened is that one of the companies, the beneficiaries of the Government largesse that the Leader of the Senate does not want me to talk about – Barbados Shipping and Trading is the beneficiary of this massive largesse by the reduction of the Corporation Tax last year – has been responsible for the sending home of a number of people from Bulkeley Plantation in St. George. And not only have these people been sent home after working for Bulkeley for many years, but they tried to shift some of them to other employers. The Severance Payment Act requires that when one employer goes out of business, he cannot transfer his employees like chattel to another employer. The people are entitled to severance payment, but they are having difficulty with that. 1.05 p.m.

I want, Mr. President, since I have undertaken not to talk too long because of the hour,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I was just going to remind you that you were spreading it out a little wide.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am going to pull in the kite, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I will pull in the kite, Sir.

The arrangement for a loan from the World Bank for \$4 million for this particular project is one, as I said, with which I have no quarrel. I must commend the honourable Senator who introduced this. At least when Senator Morrison introduces a Bill in here, he gives you all the information and you know what he is talking about. Unlike others who get up and treat us to a light one minute, telling us basically what is in the Bill already in its Objects and Reasons, he gives us a lot of information.

One of the things he said that caught my ears was the part about consultancy. The Barbados Government is into

getting all kinds of studies. I say the Barbados Government, I am not saying the DLP Government. They get all kinds of studies done, and the Ministry of Agriculture, in particular, has more studies than they have the space to put them up. Studies come one after the other, and quite often before they begin to address the recommendations in one study, they commission another study. Well, if that is the way they are doing it, Sir, I will not deal with that at this particular moment.

The point that I want to make in relation to consultancy is that in Barbados we have the persons who can advise the Government on every aspect of agriculture. This business of running off and borrowing money, or borrowing money from foreign sources – both Governments, I am not critical now – and allowing those agencies to twist our arms into finding jobs for the high-paid international civil servants who come down here and rake up all the reports they find down here, hold two or three meetings with people in Ministries and then go back to their hotel and copy 90 per cent of our own officers' reports and include 10 per cent of what they pick out of our heads and for that we pay them large fees, I think that has got to end. It could end now. Maybe it could not end before, because before you used to need these people's money, you had to borrow it. But in this new dispensation, they say that they do not need to borrow any money, so they can tell the people to go and jump in the careenage.

I am hoping that the figure I hear from Senator Morrison shows a reduction in the consultancy fees, and I applaud the Government for that. But I am going further in saying that the Government should insist on using the experts that we have in Barbados to provide the advice that is necessary in carrying out these new programmes.

It is also important that I make the point that the delivery of the services, – I do not mean the constancy service, the implementation or whatever programme, should be in line with much of these consultancies. What I mean to say is that you cannot be the consultants when we get the money to give you some work at the beginning and then disappear and leave us to carry out the project, and when the project runs into certain difficulties and you need an additional bit of advice, those consultants have now gone to Senegal and you cannot get them to talk to about these problems. If you use local consultants, and by local I do not only mean Barbadian, I mean Caribbean consultants, that is not a problem that we will have to deal with.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, like the Senator who has just sat, I shall be brief. Meeting after meeting of this Senate, on matters relating to money, whether it be a loan or a levy, the Government is subjected to serious attacks by the Opposition Senators. It appears to

me that we on this side seem to be giving the impression that our backs are broad and so we can take the lashes which they give to us meeting after meeting. Obviously, Sir, they keep a little tab of our borrowings and they are able to tell us each time the position of our external borrowings. But, Sir, I was a little surprised that in spite of comprehensive explanation given by the honourable Senator who presented the Resolution, we were still attacked for the borrowing, although the presenter pointed out very clearly and very definitely the reasons for the borrowings.

It is my considered opinion that when the citizens of a country are satisfied with the explanations given to them by a Government, whether it be in the case of borrowing or in the case of introducing a new levy, the citizens are happy. The citizens of this country, in the by-election just completed in St. John, have shown the Barbados Labour Party that they are on the wrong path if they intend to continue on that path which they have been taking as far as the criticism of Government is concerned, because the citizens have entirely rejected them and have told them in no uncertain words that they must look for something new. In other words, Sir, they are not taking the arguments put over by the spokesmen for the Barbados Labour Party.

There is need, Sir, irrespective of what the Senator who just sat said, for a Government to look at the problems of the country as they present themselves and make decisions which best suit the particular situation. I can see very clearly two very pressing needs in this country now, and I am imploring the Government to look at them very carefully with the view of introducing a further levy, because I feel that in these two areas that I am going to talk on, there is a serious need for the Government to concentrate its efforts in relieving persons of a burden, in some instances, and to provide some facilities in the other area, for which the country has a pressing need.

I refer, Sir, and I think I have spoken on this before in this Honourable Chamber, to the situation relating to the absence of insurance on timber houses. I feel that the Government of this country has a duty to the citizens of this country to make sure that there is some instrument in place, so that when there is a fire which occurs to a person who is not in a position either to carry insurance or who is ignorant of the importance of insurance, that there should be some instrument.....

1.15 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not want you to develop that point too much, Senator, because that will be outside the scope of the Resolution. You can do it in passing, but you cannot develop that, because this Resolution has nothing to do with that. I do not think you can deal with that matter as being germane to this Resolution, so I think you will have to come back a little bit.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: I accept your ruling, Sir, and shall do as you have said. However, Sir, I believe

that you may permit me to make reference in passing to the need of such insurance for such persons.

Furthermore, Sir, if I may, with your permission, I can see a pressing need for the development of sporting facilities as part of the development of the youth of this country. Again, Sir, I am saying this in passing.

Laughter.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Phillips, you cannot pass so many blockades, you have to stop. You have these passes in football or in bridge, but I do not know if you can have them in the debate. I think you will have to get to the subject.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: You are not showing kindness today, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am kind but I have to be reasonable.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: I sense the lunch hour is here, Sir, so I appreciate that. I will just finally say that I support the Resolution.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, I rise to admonish the Senator off the opposite side, Senator Tull.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Admonish?

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is not necessary here. Speak without admonition.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: This is no ammunition, this is to admonish, to tell him not to get up with this kind of thing. Do not worry with these fancy things with me. I am talking about to admonish, I am not talking about any ammunition. This is fire coming from this side now, this is the ammunition.

The Senator, repeatedly, every time there is a money Bill, gets up and makes the same statement, and he says he will continue to make it. If he continues to make the same statement, I am going to continue admonishing him not to make that statement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill, just a minute. If I make a ruling on something and you say that to me, you will be breaking the rules of the House. I just want to warn you. You cannot say, if I tell you admonition is not for a member to say to another, you are going to get up and do it. You have to be controlled by the Chair. You cannot say you are going to do it. You can't! If the Chair informs you,

you can't do it, you can't do it. If not, the Chair will have to take steps.

Go ahead.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Well, I will say chastise him then.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not carrying on an argument with you, I am not having a debate with you, I am only saying how the matters have to be weighed and what language you are to use.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You cannot tell me what to do in here.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Again, Senator Boxill, these things cannot go across the Chamber like that. That kind of behaviour is not becoming of the Senate.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Can I make my speech now, Mr. President?

Mr. PRESIDENT: You can, but I would like you to contain yourself and remember where you are.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: The member used two remarks which I am going to take him up on. Let me tell him that during the reign of the Barbados Labour Party from 1976 - 1986 they took something like \$6.5 billion in taxation from the people of this community. He keeps saying that we gave back this largesse to people of the society. I said before, and I am going to say it again, that we gave back the money that you took from them unfairly. It was money that was not needed. We have not seen what you have done with it up to this present moment. Far from taking that money from the people, you put us into a debt of \$94 million for a non-profitable, unnecessary road. I said before, and I am saying again, these people who got back this money that he is killing about, that worries him so much, are Barbadians. They are not Germans, Italians, Chinese or Yugoslavians, they are Barbadians who are getting back what is theirs.

(*Aside:* SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yugoslavs, not Yugoslavians).

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yugoslavs, then. You can say what you like, but I know what I am saying. These are people who are getting back what you have taken from them unfairly, and as Senator Tudor said before, if you feel this way about it, say if you ever get back in power, which I do not think will happen in my life time or yours, and I am prepared to live fairly long.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us get to the Resolution.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am dealing with the Resolution, but I am here to make points against what the honourable member has said that are not exactly correct.

Mr. PRESIDENT: And I am here to guide the debate.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: And I am here for your guidance, yes.

The Senator went on to mention that the milk plant was the only operation that was making a profit, and that we unceremoniously dismissed the chairman. If he did not say that, he said words to that effect. That is how I understand what he has said. He knows as well as I do that one of the reasons why the milk plant started to make money was because the former Chairman was not allowed to cut down on the staff. He was not allowed to do a lot of things, the chairman he is talking about who was unceremoniously dismissed. That is how they made the profits.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill, do you really think that that is germane to the Resolution or answering those points? Or are you going to make a substantive point to the matter? Are you just dealing with points he made? Who was the chairman is not germane to what we are dealing with, we are dealing with a Resolution dealing with a loan and what was said. Let us get down to that.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, the honourable member mentioned this in passing and therefore.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, deal with it in passing.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am dealing with it in passing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, do not spend the whole evening on that.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You stopped me before I could continue. I am not spending the evening on it, but I am going to mention it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think you are too long on matters that are not in the Resolution. I cannot stop a member from making a speech, but you cannot answer everything and make it germane to what you are replying to in the debate. 1.25 p.m.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But, Mr. President, tomorrow morning when you look into the newspapers, you will see that Senator Tull said that the former chairman of the milk plant was making this amount of money and the Democratic Labour Party unceremoniously dismissed the man and that is the reason why it was not making any more

money. This is politics. This is a house of politics and I am a politician.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is the Senate.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: The Senate is a part of Parliament, Mr. President, and I am a politician.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am asking you to debate it in Parliament, not in the newspapers. This is Parliament, you are not outside in the newspapers now.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: And I am debating it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am saying that you cannot bring what the newspapers write as an argument. I am nothing to do with what the newspapers write tomorrow. It is something...

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Maybe, Sir, you do not mind what the newspapers say, but I...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Hansard is a document. If you are speaking...

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Everybody does not read Hansard, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill our reports are in Hansard, so do not refer me to the newspaper. We have reporters in here to take the debate, so would you confine yourself to what I have ruled on. If you do not, I will have to draw your attention to the rules of the debate more specifically.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: It would seem to me that certain members can make certain statements and get away with them...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not bring that inference to me. That is an inference on the Chair, and I will ask you to withdraw those remarks immediately.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: What remarks am I to withdraw?

Mr. PRESIDENT: The last remarks you made. Withdraw them immediately, that certain members can make remarks and get away with them. Do not make those remarks. It is insulting to the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I think you should know well enough, Mr. President, that I have no disrespect for you or the Chair.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But you made certain remarks that will go down, and I am asking you to withdraw those remarks. Do not argue with me.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All right, you want me to withdraw them, I withdraw them.

Mr. PRESIDENT: And proceed with the debate without arguing with the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But, Mr. President, I am not arguing with the Chair.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You continue to argue with the Chair. Proceed with the debate without arguing with the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: The member went on to say something about the experts. I am supporting him on that point, that it is time that when we are getting a loan from these people, we do not allow them to push in the idea of sending their experts down here. I know they come down here and get what our experts have to say, go back to their hotel and then come up with the same thing that we have been saying all the time. He is on good ground with that. I can support him on that.

I cannot support him when he gets up and talks about the largesse that was given back and calling firms that did so well by this great largesse that we gave back. I do not think it is fair that every meeting we are dealing with a money Bill here for the honourable member to be using this lame duck excuse as against the mismanagement that we had to put to with for 10 years when they were in power, I am, therefore, asking the honourable member to desist from constantly using these unnecessary, unwarranted and uncalled for points when debating money Resolutions in here, because if he does this, I have no alternative than to get up and remind him about what they did to this community, as I have mentioned before. They got us into debt that up to this day we cannot pay, and we also have to remind him that when we were in power we did such things as the East Coast Road, the Financial Building and the university with the money from inside this community without having to go to any of these places to get money to put this country into the debt that we were in, and that we will never get out in his lifetime or my lifetime.

I thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Ward.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, I will not be long. I do not want to delay the people from their lunch.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Ward had risen on the last occasion, Senator Fraser.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: I rise, Sir, to support this Resolution, but I was a little bit at a loss when I looked at the Resolution on financing the agricultural development project I really thought that it might be a specific project

that we were borrowing this Bds.\$8 million or US\$4 million to finance. However, Sir, the continuation of the diversification is a very necessary and desirable thing.

Statements were made about the fall in production of sugar and non-sugar agriculture last year. This island has very limited areas of irrigation and the majority of the land in this country has to depend upon the rainfall that we get for either the rise or fall in production. The last crop that we had was one of the driest periods in memory that the island had had up to the middle of May, really from December up to the end of May, and that was contributory to the fall in the production of sugar. We estimated output to be around 90 000 tonnes, and it would have been had it not been dry from early December up to the end of the crop.

Similarly, non-sugar agriculture – as I said, the majority of land is not irrigated – is dependent on rainfall. A large portion of our export produce was yams, and the yams for the last two years were affected by a disease. The estate on which I live planted two fields of yams and never reaped one at all. The disease completely wiped them out. That is some explanation for the fall in the production of sugar and non-sugar.

There was also a statement about agriculturists not employing people at the end of the crop. Agriculturists would be irresponsible if they were to employ people without knowing how they could pay them. The Barbados National Bank, which finances the majority of the estates, told the sugar estates that until their loan applications could be processed there would be no funds available, and only an irresponsible employer would employ people without knowing how he was going to pay those people at the end of a week. That is why the workers were not employed at that time. But I know that most of the estates are now employing people for the full days if the people will come to work, but some of them have got into the habit that four days will do and they do not come on the fifth day.
1.35 p.m.

Agriculture is not a steady line of employment like keeping a store or anything like that. You have your peaks where you can employ more people than are available. It is a seasonal thing. You have the flats when you are wasting money when you employ, because there is no productive employment. I know it would be political dynamite to ask anybody to remove the guaranteed employment thing, but it is something that is extremely difficult to ask people in agriculture to carry out, especially with agriculture in the financial straits that it is in today.

I am very pleased, and every agriculturist would be very pleased, to know the efforts that Government is making to find crops that we can produce, and hopefully produce at least on a break even point. At the moment, Sir, I do not know if it has reached the consumers yet, but there are gluts of various vegetables on the market because most of the

plantations, when the rains came in mid-May, went and planted, and we have had good rains after that, and the vegetables that were planted at that time are now coming on the market in large quantities, and the prices of these vegetables should fall. In fact, I know of one estate that harvested 1 000 pounds of string beans on Monday. The manager of that estate was in the markets at the night trying to dispose of this 1 000 pounds of string beans, and he was only successful in getting rid of 300 pounds of that produce. He gave me some as a gift, and I thanked him very much, but he lost a customer, because where I would have gone to the supermarket or my wife and bought some string beans, she never had to, because he gave them to me. That is the position that we find ourselves in.

You have said, Sir, that we do not go by newspapers, but I would like to refer to an article that was in the *Advocate* this morning by Mr. Cumberbatch about an experimental food processing plant. That is something that I would really like to see come into the island, and let us find outlets, providing these people can pay a price that would at least cover the cost of production.

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, in supporting the Resolution, I first should like to say that we in the Caribbean basically have agricultural economies, I hardly think that anybody would disagree with that, but the problem has been in the past that we have been producers of the primary product and therefore attitudes to any new products take some time to change. People have been accustomed to other people abroad marketing their crops for them such as sugar and cocoa, and these markets were well organised. You can well see that if a person has been doing something for a long time they gain the expertise in that particular area.

I should like to say that vigorous attempts were made by this present Government when it was in office in the past to diversify agriculture. Indeed, there was a food processing unit or food promotion unit, and this was set up by the Agricultural Development Corporation to assist business people, to stimulate and facilitate agriculture, then to pass on the technology to the business people, and to assist them in every way possible by allowing the technocrats to continue with them until they had passed the teething stages. Sometime after 1976, under that particular regime, that food promotion unit was demolished.

Do you remember the product instant yam? Many markets had been explored and they were very favourable, and by now if instant yam had been continued, I am sure we would have earned significant revenue in this country. But some people were not as far sighted as they ought to be.

In that area were developed many projects, such as carrot flakes for children which were used at the Nutrition Centre, and it would have saved our importing things like

corn flakes. It was tried and tested by many experts not only in Barbados but throughout the region, places like CARIRI, and these products were found to be very successful. They would have stopped us from importing a whole range of baby food, because you were mixing yam with fish and dehydrating it and all that.

You would have noticed that the equipment in the factory has all disappeared, but people the world over are asking what has become of the instant yam in Barbados. It was employing at the time some 64 women and about four or five men, so it meant that those people went on to the unemployment market. Also, with respect to the question of layoffs on plantations, we noticed that at the Government's agro-economic station people were just told to go home. They have not returned yet. Agricultural training came to a standstill, and therefore there were no scholarships offered for further training to help people to help themselves, thus resulting in a number of consultants being imported into this country and drawing fat sums of money and strengthening their purse. Naturally, if that is the case, no training, no experimental food processing unit to continue to develop crops that could replace some of the nonsense items that we are importing into this country, obviously you will have a rise in your imports, and the import bill in this entire region and in Barbados is really ridiculous and scandalous, to say the least.

1.45 p.m.

There has to be a changing of attitudes of people to agriculture. We are committed to a regional food and nutrition strategy. We are committed to agricultural diversification. We are committed to the development of new and indigenous crops for export to earn foreign exchange.

I am happy to see that included in this Resolution is some money for marketing, because people have misunderstood the marketing of agricultural crops. If you want to keep in line with the other countries that you are going to be competing with, people will have to be trained in the various techniques of packaging and grading to suit the export market. Already an export unit has been established, staff is in place now and some crops have been exported, the tamdew melon and even eddoes, which we will have to get back growing. People abroad are very interested in peppers and crops that can be simply grown for export, okras and breadfruits. These will provide employment for people and also will help farmers to become more interested in growing these crops.

We must all see this whole programme of agricultural diversification on a national basis. I do not think we must look at any narrow political basis. We must look at the fact that if we are not going to be able to at least reach as near self-sufficiency as possible, we have reached it in some of the poultry products and so on, we are going to be in a very sorry state. When you have to depend on somebody else to feed you, they can close off any time. So I am calling for

people to be more involved in something that is going to redound to the benefit of us, our children and our grandchildren. We have to look at all the indigenous raw material we have available, and not only for eating purposes, but for instance, the banana can be utilised in about ten different areas, and the coconut can be used in the handicraft industry, which would create further employment for people in agriculture.

I hope that we would have people being more nationalistic in this regard and that people would realise that every time we import more food, we have to look for foreign exchange to go out of this country. There are certain crops I do not think we would ever be self-sufficient in, we do not grow wheat in this country, but we are looking at the crops that we can grow and grow successfully. We are looking at putting the technology in place. This must not, I repeat, be taken as a partisan or sectoral issue. It must be taken as a national and regional issue, and it is the job of every citizen to get involved, or to encourage people to be involved, in this whole matter of food security.

With that, Mr. President, I should like again to say I am very happy with the Resolution, and I support it *in toto*.

Applause.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, I am grateful for the support of the Opposition with regards to the reducing of the consultants. I am glad that Senator Ward has been able to respond to other points made by Senator Tull in the way I would have responded as far as the decline in the area of non-sugar crops and also the reduction in the sugar quota for this year. Sugar production depends on rainfall. If you do not have any rainfall, we cannot produce sugar. If the recovery rate is low, then production would be low and tonnes per acre for sugar in the fields would be low. It does not matter how many acres you have in canes, it is the recovery per acre that counts, and if that is low, the production will be low. So those are very good points that were made by Senator Ward.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: Cane fires.)

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Those are supposed to be under control now.

I should also like to assure Senator Ward that this new thrust by the Government in the area of food technology will be maintained, that it is part of this complete package that we are now working on and that it would be further widened. As we go on, we will try to get a real base so that we can do some more experimenting on our local crops and solve some of our foreign exchange earnings in that respect.

We are giving agriculture a new boost, trying to decide how much sugar we should produce, and do it efficiently

and putting the accent on our diversification project, so that we will have a balanced approach to agricultural production in this country.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: That, Mr. President, concludes our business today. I must thank Senators for their attendance and their co-operation.

The Other Place, as you have noted, Sir, has disappeared, at least separated itself from its labours until, I believe, the first week in October. When they come back,

it would probably take them some time to get themselves in train to send work up to us. But I suppose that the safest thing to do is to have an adjournment *sine die*.

I therefore beg to move, Sir, that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

I wish Senators and yourself, Sir, a very pleasant respite.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.
1.55 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor. 550

The Guarantee granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A, Section 32 to the ECS Reinsurance Company, INC.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ended 30th April, 1987 and 31st May, 1987.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1987.

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor. 550

Suspension of Standing Orders 45(1) and (2).

PUBLIC BUSINESS

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (LEAVE PASSAGES)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1987 550

Senator Lewis, 550.

ITINERANT SALESMEN (LICENSING) ACT
1987. 551

Senator Tudor, 551; Senator Wickham, 551;
Senator Goddard, 551.

REVISED SALARIES OF PRIME MINISTER'S
PERSONAL STAFF 552

Senator Lewis, 552.

BARBADOS TOURISM INVESTMENT CORPORATION
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987 552

Senator Lewis, 552, 553; Senator Tull, 552;
Senator Blackman, 553.

FINAL APPROPRIATION (1986-87) ACT, 1987 . . . 554

Senator Lewis, 554, 555; Senator Blackman,
554.

EMPLOYMENT LEVY ACT, 1987 555

Senator Lewis, 555; Senator Tull, 556; Sena-
tor Tudor, 558.

BORROWING OF US \$4 MILLION FROM THE
INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECON-
STRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT 559

Senator Morrison, 559, 567; Senator Tull,
561; Senator Phillips, 562; Senator Boxill,
563; Senator Ward, 565; Senator Fraser, 566.

ADJOURNMENT 568

Senator Tudor, 568.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, C. A. *
BOXILL, N. W.
FRASER, V. C.
GODDARD, J. S.
LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.
MORRISON, A.
PHILLIPS, A. J. N.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James
WALCOTT, His Honour F.
WARD, L. A.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.