THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Monday, March 23, 1987.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Monday, March 23, 1987, at 11.10 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, Public Service);
Senator A. Morrison;
Senator F. G. Smith, Q.C.;
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 B. A. Miller;
Senator L. R. Tull, Q.C.;
Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.;
Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones;
Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.;
Senator C. A. Blackman, Q.C.;
Senator P. Y. Forde;
Senator J. S. Goddard;
Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey.

Prayers were led by Rev. Dr. Lionel Crawford.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is now in session.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. PRESIDENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform The Honourable The Senate that he will be absent from the country during the period 23rd March to 11th April, 1987, on a private visit to Swaziland and Britain.

Under the provisions of section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, the Chief Justice, The Honourable Mr. Denys Ambrose Williams, GCM, will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during His Excellency's absence.

HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
BARBADOS

19th March, 1987.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

SPEECHES RE DEATH OF MRS. ANTOINETTE CLARKE, AUNT OF SENATOR MILLER

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, Sir, by leave of the Senate, before we proceed to business, I want to deal with an unfortunate matter.

Members of the Senate would have heard, with great regret, of the passing of Mrs. Antoinette Clarke, the aunt of Senator Miller, the sister of a former Minister of this Government the then Honourable Freddie Miller, the mother of a former Member of this Chamber, Miss June Clarke, and other children, and I believe that Members of the Senate would like to express to Senator Miller their deep-felt condolences.

I have known Mrs. Clarke almost all my life. She was a very gentle and decent woman, very hard-working, very interested in her family, a tower of strength in times of difficulty and a rallying point in times of joy.

I would like to express my own personal sorrow and condolences at her passing and ask that the Senate note, and convey, as we can now, personally to Senator Miller, our regret and ask her if she would kindly convey to her cousins and other relatives the regret which we feel at the passing of Mrs. Clarke.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, I too, should like to join with the Honourable Leader of the Senate and pay tribute to this dear lady who has been called by her Creator to her eternal rest. I have known her for several years. I have not seen her recently, but I knew her when one of her daughters used to attend Queen's College, and there is another daughter who is a nurse, and they were my contemporaries, more or less. I have also had the occasion to meet one of her sons who is a legal colleague of mine, Mr. Bobby Clarke, and we have a very wonderful relationship.

In my days at Harrison College, I used to visit the home of Mrs. Clarke, and throughout that period I was treated with the utmost courtesy. I could not become a son-in-law at that time, because I was still young and at school, but over the years, a relationship, which I have always treasured, grew up.

I know she was the aunt of Senator Miller and I would like, without guilding the lily, to say that a great lady has passed – humble and hard working, and like my own parents, the mother of a vast number of children.

The fact that she has produced so many successful offsprings must be an indication of the dedication, hard work and sacrifice that she must have made to have raised them. As the Honourable Leader of the Senate has said, not only has she produced a former Senator and potential political candidate for this country, but a daughter who, in her own right, is a successful administrator and businesswoman, who I think earned for the family the great honour of being the first woman to be Head of the Chamber of Commerce, which is a great distinction. As I said, she has produced other successful offsprings as nurse, teacher, and so on.

I think that occasions like this show what the Senate is about. We have our rows and we have our quarrels but when death intervenes in the family of any Member, whatever their persuasion, I think it is time when we can show not only our profound and deepest sympathy and condolences, but to show that we are human beings who, one day, have got to answer to God for our own actions and deeds.

11.20 a.m.

Mr. President, I would just like to go on record as extending to all the family my personal sincere condolences and the condolences of this Senate on her recent passing.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no other Senator speaking, I would like to share with other members the sentiments that have been expressed to Senator Miller on the passing of her aunt. I am sure that I express the sentiments of the other Senators here today.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Report on Education in Barbados for the period 1st September, 1978 to 31st August, 1982.

Report of the Task Force Committee on Employment.

Organisation of American States (OAS) Report to the Government of Barbados on the Fifth Actuarial Review of the National Insurance Scheme.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Your Honour, under this Item you will have noticed that three Bills have been circulated. I wish it recorded that they may be deemed to be read a first time so that we can proceed with them later in this Senate's sitting.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that three Bills have been read a first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to move that Senator Lewis, the Minister of the Public Service, take charge of Order No. 1.

APPROPRIATION ACT 1987

Order No. 1 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of Barbados for the year ended 31st March, 1988.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill, it is apposite for us to recognise that the Democratic Labour Party, through its Minister of Finance, proposed on the assumption of office certain fiscal policies and a reform package aimed at economic recovery and improving the living standards for all citizens of Barbados.

According to a World Bank report entitled "Barbados Economic Memorandum – the DLP Proposals", these proposals were recognised as steps in the right direction for augmenting economic recovery, although the response of the economy to the initiatives will take some time to work through the system.

During last week, the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for fiscal year 1987–88 and the accompanying Appropriation Bill were passed by the House of Assembly. These Estimates anticipate Current Revenue of $698 071 077 and Current Expenditure amounting to $711 636 404; a shortfall on Current Account of $13 565 327.

Since the introduction of the Appropriation Bill in the House of Assembly, there have been various alterations done on the floor of the House, as notified to us in amendments numbered one to five, which have been circulated to this Senate.

The functional sources of revenue are taxes on income and profits of $168 million, taxes on property of $32 352 000, taxes on goods and services of $203.6 million, taxes on international trade of $123 million, other taxes of $90.9 million, non-tax revenues of $40.959 million, special receipts of $31.875 million and loans and advances of $7.384 million.

There is a projected decrease in revenues for 1987–88 when compared with the Estimates for 1986–87. On the other hand, Current Expenditures are projected to increase by 1.45% over the previous year's Estimates, and that does not include additional expenditure on increased salaries of $18.6 million and on pensions of $2.4 million.

Every legitimate effort will be made by the Government to restrain the spiralling annual recurrent expenditure patterns, and every Ministry and department will be subjected to scrutiny in the Government's effort to effect savings in expenditure.

The functional areas of Current Expenditure provide for $108.261 million on general Public Service, $19.665 million on Defence and Security, $151.367 on Education, $98.766 million on Health, $18.474 million on Housing and Community Amenities, $12.764 million on Community and Social Services, $58.440 million on Social Security and Welfare, $110.648 million on Economic Services and $132.25 million on Debt Servicing.

The provision for debt servicing includes interest on foreign and domestic loans and redemption of foreign and domestic loans. The Government has inherited a problem which forces it to find monies to meet repayment of substantial foreign currency loans and interest thereon over a four year period because of the bunching of debt. This year alone, a total in excess of $80 million will have to be found. The amounts are – Interest on Foreign Loans, $41.297 million, and Redemption of Foreign Loans, $40.203 million. As a result, the debt service has increased. It is estimated that 18.7% of current expenditure for 1987–88 will be on debt servicing. This should be compared with provision for foreign debt amortisation in 1986–87 of $25.8082 million.
11.30 a.m.

It is critical, therefore, that in the next fiscal year, Government continues its efforts to control current expenditure by increasing its effectiveness and improving the overall level of efficiency in the public sector. In particular, efforts will be made to achieve even higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness in the major revenue collecting agencies in order to reduce the incidence of tax evasion.

Another area of expenditure which must cause great concern is the substantial amount which has to be provided for non-financial public enterprises. This year the amount is approximately $92.550 million.

Some two years ago, in 1985, the former Administration, recognising potential problems which could surface in the operations of the several public enterprises which had sprung up over the last 15 years, invited Dr. George Reid, a Permanent Secretary, to undertake a study of the activities of those enterprises. Dr. Reid is no longer in the Public Service. He is on secondment to the Inter-American Development Bank.

In order to continue the work started by Dr. Reid in 1985, another competent public officer was invited to return from secondment to a statutory board to serve in the same capacity as Dr. Reid. The work done by Dr. Reid resulted in the establishment of a unit with responsibility for monitoring the activities of these public

enterprises which have been a drain on the country's finances, and that unit is placed within the office of the Prime Minister.

Attempts by newspaper editors, Mr. President, and some special correspondents, whoever they are, which suggest that the Unit of State Enterprises is part of the Ministry of the Public Service represent a down-right mischief. In addition, further untruthful reports about the Unit of State Enterprises will not cause the unit to defer examination of any potential infelicity or any improper activity which could surface during the management audits which they will undertake from time to time.

It may be that the special correspondents in the *Advocate,* the Cassandras, the Richie Barrows, and other numerous pen names have something to conceal. They are, apparently, ashamed to identify themselves, but they are not ashamed to repeat half-truths, or absolute untruths.

Mr. President, the Government's Capital Estimates for 1987–88 have been largely influenced by the ongoing works programme which it inherited, and for which contractual obligations exist. The programme involves some major projects and leaves little room for the introduction of new projects during this financial year. However, the areas which have been emphasised also reflect, to the extent possible, the Government's own sectorial priorities. These are the key sectors of the economy, such as agriculture, industry, tourism and other services.

Capital expenditure for the coming financial year is projected to total $176.5 million, to be spent on Economic Services, $117.207 million; Housing and Community Amenities, $19.622 million; Health, $16.03 million; Education, $13.5 million; General Public Services, $4.23 million; Community and Social Services, $3.4 million; Social Security and Welfare, $1.6 million; and Defence and Security, $0.9 million.

The capital programme of the Prime Minister's Office includes redecoration and minor repairs to the official residence at Ilaro Court. In addition, studies will be undertaken by the National Council for Science and Technology. Provision is also made under Prime Minister's Office for renovation and refurbishment of the Hilton Hotel, for renovation and extension of the conference facilities at Dover Convention Centre and for consultancy and retention fees for the Heywoods Holiday Village Project.

The continuing programme for upgrading of airport facilities attracts provision of $1.658 million. In addition to the monies provided in the Estimates, substantial assistance is being obtained from the Canadian Government through the Caribbean Airports Development Project. That provides technical assistance, personnel, equipment and training opportunities, intra and extra-regionally, for upgrading the facilities provided by the Civil Aviation Department.

The area of security is also receiving special attention, and the mobilisation of manpower and equipment necessary to counteract the narcotics trade and other smuggling is underway.

The role of the Customs and Immigration at the airport is receiving special attention because of the many deficiencies which have surfaced through the manner in which both the Immigration and the security services were manipulated during the past five years. The three Ministries, of Legal Affairs for Immigration, Finance for Customs and the International Transport Division of the Prime Minister's Office for Civil Aviation will, during the current coming year, implement appropriate measures to correct existing deficiencies.

Under the Ministry of Finance, statutory provision is made for contributions to International Development and Financing Institutions. In addition, an amount of $04. million for increasing the capital of the Barbados Development Bank is being provided. This will augment the bank's resources and will match the funds raised by that institution from various external funding sources.

The Government also continues to provide for Energy Conservation and Wind Energy Projects, and through loans obtained from external sources, programmes of the Barbados National Oil Co., the Housing Credit Fund and the Industrial Credit Fund will continue.
11.40 a.m.

Agriculture will this year benefit from substantial provision, of almost $25 million, for its programmes, which include continuation of crop research and extension services for developing potato, onion and peanut industries. Studies will be undertaken for the total agricultural sector, and in this respect the World Bank has recently approved a loan in the sum of $8 million to finance an agricultural development project whose objectives are to provide a sound basis for defining an agricultural strategy that is technically feasible, financially and economically sound, and appropriately balanced between sugar and non-sugar sectors. The project will consist of the formulation of an agricultural development strategy, technical assistance for agricultural diversification and for agro-industrial development.

In addition, a feasibility study is proposed to make use of Three Houses Spring for irrigation purposes. The National Fruit Orchard Programme will continue, as well as research and development of livestock and fisheries. Indeed, the Government will continue to provide funds for the provision of better fish landing facilities for the fishing industry, and to this end $11.3 million has been

provided for the continuation of works on the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour project. When this project is completed, the facilities there will be as good as, or even better than, those provided at Oistins.

The fish landing sites on the east coast are also included in the programme of improvement, and provision has been made to fund a feasibility study for the improvement of fish landing sites at Consett Bay and Skeete's Bay. It is hoped that financial assistance for the projects resulting from the study will be obtained from one or more of the international funding agencies.

In the area of Industry, Government recognises the manufacturing sector, especially manufacturing for export to extra-regional markets. This will be one of the key pillars of Barbados' future economic development and growth, Government will therefore have to assist this sector wherever possible, and will continue to channel funds to industry through the Central Bank-administered Industrial Credit Fund.

For the Ministry of Transport and Works, the programme of road improvement and construction, including the Airport to West Coast Road, phases one and two, will continue. The Inter-American Bank's resources are being used for this latter project, but in executing the Ministry's road programme, support funding is also recoverable for the other work programmes from the World Bank. Project planning and administrative staff which have responsibility for work on public buildings, the Treasury Building and National Insurance Building, have been provided for, and work will also continue on the access road to the cement plant as well as works on drainage and other road works to correct land slips in the Scotland area and the adjoining parishes.

Mr. President, under Education, the programmes for selective improvements to primary and secondary schools will continue through major repairs and extensions. The Inter-American Development Bank is a continuing source of funds for replacement of eight primary schools, and provision is made for construction of new secondary schools and for upgrading, furnishing and equipping of existing schools. Expanded accommodation is contemplated for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, along with repairs to the Barbados Community College.

Provision is further made for programmes to continue the Text-book Loan Scheme, which assists pupils of public secondary schools and assisted private secondary schools. The grant of assistance to secondary school children after the Eleven Plus examination for the purchase of school uniforms will also continue.

The Ministry of Education also has a World Bank Education Project Unit, and provision is made for the continuation of the work of that unit along with studies in human resources development and programmes for improved teacher training, manpower research and development units within the Ministry of Education.

Under the Ministry of Health, the major portion of capital provision will be for further development of polyclinics. The Glebe Polyclinic will shortly be opened, and there is work to be done on the polyclinic at Black Rock. Work is also continuing on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital extension. In addition to the furnishing and equipping of the Glebe Polyclinic, refurbishing of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will take place, as well as equipping of the new extension.

There will be some upgrading of the Geriatric Hospital in St. Michael and the Psychiatric Hospital in Black Rock.

The Sanitation Service Authority will be provided with some more vehicles, and the Pulverisation Plant will be provided with a welding room.

On the question of sewage, final designs and other necessaries for the proposed sewage system of the south coast will receive funds in excess of $1.5 million.

In the Ministry of Housing and Lands, work will continue on projects at Apes Hill, Checker Hall, Golden Mile, Maynards, Lammings, Husbands and Bonnetts, as well as the sites and services programmes which have been started. The plantation tenantries scheme and the urban improvement programmes will continue, as well as the Coastal Conservation Project, which is aimed at recovering several areas along the coast which are being denuded by the tides.

The most sizable activity of the Ministry of Housing will, however, be the Barbados-Venezuela Housing project, a project, aimed at construction of middle income housing. Stage 1 of the joint project between Inversiones of Venezuela and the Government of Barbados will commence. The manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party promised that a DLP government will ensure that housing is granted a priority claim on our financial resources, and this joint Venezuela/Barbados project is one step in that direction.

Mr. President, there have been allegations in a recent issue of the *Barbados Advocate* that a management audit was being carried out at the Barbados External Communications. In the days of the last World War, there was an infamous German Minister of Propaganda. The name of Goebbels springs to mind. It is abundantly evident that from the *Advocate* of Saturday, March 21 and that of Tuesday, March 17, where the editorial and the presentation by a special correspondence are so identical, one cannot help conclude they were written by one and

the same person. The mischief carried out in the editorial was repeated, although the full facts were known to the chief executive of the newspaper. Apparently, the editorial staff cannot be controlled or prevented from repeating untruthful statements.

Mr. President, a perfectly harmless circular issued in February 1987 addressed to Accounting Officers and General Managers of statutory boards by the Permanent Secretary who has responsibility for the activities of the Unit of State Enterprises was maliciously reported in the *Advocate* editorial as emanating from the Ministry of the Public Works. That monstrous and disparaging untruth was drawn to the *Advocate's* attention, with a request that the apparent error be admitted in an appropriate place. Maybe the Managing Director, to whose attention it was drawn, no longer subscribes to the four-way pledge of Rotary of which he is a standard bearer, or control of the newspaper and its editorial lie elsewhere.
11.50 a.m.

Further evidence, Mr. President....

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Further evidence, Mr. President,...

Mr. PRESIDENT: This debate is going to be a long debate, and I do not wish to have to warn members that, in their seats, they cannot preside over the meeting when I am sitting here.

Laughter

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Further evidence, Mr. President, of the downright irresponsibility of the newspaper lies in the suggestion made that, in the Other Place, Government avoided discussion on certain Heads of Expenditure, when it is well-known that Government backbenchers in the House of Assembly would have had a field day debating the past operations of Health, or Housing, or Transport and Works or the non-export successes of the Export Promotion Corporation.

The circular to which I referred earlier was made available to the *Advocate* by me, so that they cannot escape any knowledge of the fact that what they printed was altogether untrue.

Mr. President, let me proceed, however, with positive matters and relegate those others to the place where they belong. The Democratic Labour Party produced a manifesto, to which the electorate responded. This manifesto assisted the public in deciding upon the party which would assume office after General Elections in May 1986, and in that manifesto, a promise was made relating to the Ministry of the Public Service. The promise was that:

> "The efficiency with which a DLP's policy agenda is implemented will in large measure depend on the efficiency of the Public Service. In turn, the efficiency of the Public Service will depend *inter alia* on administrative systems, the competence and morale of public servants, role perception and ministerial direction."

(Aside: SENATOR B. A. MILLER: You wrote that part!)

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS:

> "A DLP Government will seek to improve the efficiency of the Public Service. To this end we will negotiate processes designed to enable the Public Service to transform itself into an institution capable of utilizing the knowledge and skills of public servants to the fullest in the context in which the accent will be on problem solving."

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to outline briefly the role and function of the Ministry of the Public Service, which is to co-ordinate all aspects of personnel activities in the Public Service towards greater efficiency in human resource management. The Public Service is made up of 18 Ministries and divisions, 50 departments, 54 statutory boards and 13 public enterprises in which the Government is a major shareholder.

This complex organisation employs about 22 000 persons, of which almost 16 000 are in the Civil Service, in Government Ministries and departments, excluding statutory boards. The annual wages bill of the Civil Service exceeds $360 million. Added to this sum is the cost of pensions for retired civil servants, which at current levels exceed $45 million, and Government's contribution as an employer to the National Insurance Scheme, which is almost $20 million.

Any economies, therefore, which can be realized in this vast expenditure, would complement efforts being made in other directions to increase revenues to provide funding for development programmes, which would ensure additional employment both in the private sector and in the public sector. The objective of the Ministry of the Public Service is to effect these economies by enhancing the productivity of staff through a programme of human resource development and by reform of work methods.

Mr. President, the responsibility for personnel management in the Public Service has traditionally been divided between Services Commissions and the Establishments Division. An example of this division of

responsibility may be shown in respect of the subject of training, which for a period between 1967 and 1978 was the responsibility of a separate division of the Prime Minister's Office. The subject had prior to 1967 been the responsibility of the Services Commissions department. Since 1978, training administration has been a branch of the Establishments Division. In some other countries it is part of the Ministry of Finance, so also is the Establishments Division.

The divisions of personnel management functions in the Public Service separates the more personalized functions, those relating to recruitment, appointment, selection for training, promotion and discipline, which fall to the Services Commissions, from the less personal aspects called establishment matters, those which relate to the staffing of Ministries and departments, classification of posts, industrial relations, the determination of salaries and other conditions of service, training policy, pension arrangements and organisational structure of Government agencies.

In devising a training policy towards staff development, it would be necessary to depend on the Services Commissions, the recruitment agency, to ascertain present needs and forecast future manpower requirements. The development of career streams and the placement of persons in such streams according to their aptitude and skills will require the combined effort of all combined agencies.

There is a drawback in the present arrangement. Whereas the role of the three Services Commissions as independent bodies with intense constitutional status accords with the noble objective of developing and maintaining a professional civil service which is largely non-political, and in respect of which patronage and nepotism are to be avoided, the ideal has two major weaknesses.

(Aside: Senator B. A. MILLER: You are the worst example of that.)

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: There is the fact that in the Civil Service there are two parallel systems of recruitment and personnel control, one by way of the Public Service Commission or the other Services Commissions, and the other embracing about one half of the persons in public employment those who are categorized as temporary or non-established staff, for whom different rules apply and who do not have the protection of a Service Commission.

The overlapping of activities of the two principal personnel agencies and the urgent requirement for human resource development in the Public Service demonstrates that there is an inseparable linkage between the two sets of functions, and that the responsibilities of the two agencies, Services Commissions and the Establishments Division, are complementary and, in reality, parts of a single entity, personnel management. But, traditionally, the three Services Commissions, as distinct from the department, have had no real responsibility for day-to-day management of personnel.

The first mentioned drawback requires an explanation. The Constitution of Barbados states that responsibility for recruitment, transfers, promotion and discipline of persons holding public office, that is, posts established by Order made under the Civil Establishments Act, falls to one or other of the Services Commissions. In addition, the holders of Judicial and legal posts and members of the Police Force have their separate commissions, but the bulk of public officers, those that hold established posts, fall to be processed in this respect by a Public Services Commission.
12.00 p.m.

The parallel service, which I referred to earlier, involving temporary and non-established offices comprises staff who are recruited and disciplined in different ways. Yet, within a department or ministry, the staff, whether it is established or otherwise functions as one whole unit, is the management responsibility of the Head of the Department. The work schedule of each member of staff complements that of every other member, whether he is established, casual, temporary, or non-established.

A second drawback relates to a temporary force.

Asides

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Miller, I want to draw your attention to Standing Order No. 33. I will not draw your attention to that Standing Order again. Standing Order No. 33 says that no Senator shall interrupt another Senator. I will ask you to abide by that rigidly.

Aside

Mr. PRESIDENT: I ask you to abide by that Standing Order and do not give me any problem with that. That is a Standing Order that is there, and I do not want to call on you again. Kindly accept this and do not let me hear you interrupting any other speaker during this debate.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, Mr. President, Standing Order.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not listening to that. I am drawing Standing Order No. 33 to your attention, and I do not wish you to draw any other matter to my attention. I draw to your attention Standing Order 33

on interruptions, and I take it very impolite for you now to be drawing some other Standing Order to me when I draw Standing Order 33 to you. I am not having any cross-discussion with you on the Standing Orders. I am drawing to your attention what Standing Order 33 states.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the second drawback relates to the recruitment to temporary posts, which may be highly politicised.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir. Standing Order 31(6)....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not dealing with Standing Order 31.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I can make a point of order at anytime, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That cannot be a point of order. Standing Order 33 is what I ruled on.

Asides

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Sir, I am not finished. This is what I am entitled to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That cannot be a point of order.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am not dealing with that now.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That cannot be a point of order because that is not up for debate. Nobody is debating that. The honourable Senator is debating the Estimates now.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: And I rise on a point of order in respect of that, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, Sir. You rose to a point of order about Standing Order 31.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am not rising on any point of order....

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is what you did. You rose to a point of order on No. 31.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: .....which is unrelated to the point you made earlier.

Mr. PRESIDENT: And I ruled there is no point of order on No. 31.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: But you have not heard the point of order, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The honourable Member is speaking. How can you be rising to a point of order on No. 31 when the honourable Member is addressing the Chamber and I spoke to Senator Miller about interruption.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I can only make a point of order, Sir, when a Member is speaking. If no Member is speaking, I cannot rise on a point of order.

(*Aside*: SENATOR B. A. MILLER: He is in here reading a speech. He is not debating anything.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, you can tell me if you are prepared to accept my point of order. If not, tell me and let me see what other alternatives we can have. But I do not see what my point of order has to do with your ruling earlier. It is an entirely different point.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not know what you have established. You have not established any point of order.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You have not even listened to me, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: A point of order based on what?

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You have not listened to me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What is your point of order?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Ah, good! I will now tell you, since you want to hear, Sir. Since you have asked me, Sir, I will tell you.

I am rising on Standing Order 31(6), which specifically says: "A Senator shall not read his speech but he may read extracts from books and papers to support his argument and refresh his memory by reference to notes."

I am submitting, Sir, that Senator Lewis is in breach of Standing Order 31(6), Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You rose on Standing Order 31 now for me to make a ruling now?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: That is what I rose for.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is what you rose on 31 now for me to make a ruling on?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Not now, Sir. From the time I got up, I said I was rising to make a point of order on No. 31.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I asked, are you rising to make a point of order on 31(6)?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have been timing the debate. the debate started at 11.10 a.m. and it is now 12.10 p.m. I do not accept your position now on that.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You could read as much as you like. I will rule when it comes to those matters, not you. I am the person to rule.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You will change your mind later on then.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes. It is only one President.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, a second drawback relates to the recruitment of temporary posts, which may be highly politicised. The persons who interrupted on points of order understand very clearly how those temporary posts have been used in the past. I am giving this Senate the assurance that that will stop, sooner or later.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: It has already stopped.

Filling a post when it is subsequently established, after having been occupied for years on a temporary basis, presents the Public Service Commission with a difficulty. It would be wrong of me to call names. They are legion. That have stopped. It is, therefore, desirable and necessary that in the future some search and process of elimination on the basis of relative suitability for appointment, on the basis of qualifications and capability, be applied in the filling of all temporary posts in the same way that it is applied to filling permanent posts.

Some 1400 temporary posts were, in fact, established between April 1985 and June 1986. These posts would invariably have been filled by persons recruited on a temporary basis.

Since every organization should engage in a constant programme of reviewing its activities in order that it may respond to changing times, new demands of its clientele, rapidly changing technology and the dynamics of modern management, the Public Service is no exception. The requirement for change in the Public Service will have to be addressed and structured in a systematic fashion. The regular review of organisational structures, supported by extensive purpose-oriented training, planned management and career management of the people to man the organisation, is a practical proposition to which the Ministry of the Public Service is committed. It will replace the present disparate nature of the central personnel management's function in the Civil Service.

What is proposed is an integrated approach with a single organization under the direction of a Minister, and that has been established with the clear understanding that the independence of the Service Commissions and the constitutional rights of the holders of established offices cannot be interfered with. They must be preserved. It has also been established that the objective of providing fair treatment, which is the established goal, will be pursued, and that all employees and potential employees of Government will be recruited and promoted along similar lines on the basis of abilities, qualifications and on merit.

12.10 p.m.

The perceived role of the Ministry of the Public Service, then, is an integrated approach to the future management of the Public Service, to co-ordinate all aspects of personnel management and to be the apparatus for a programme of administrative reform and human resource development in the public sector. This is important for the efficient and effective management and the achievement of policy objectives, which will depend on the responsiveness and the quality of the Public Service.

In addition to the traditional personnel functions, related services are undertaken by the Ministry of the Public Service. There has been a lot of discussion as to whether subjects such as Data Processing, Printing and Central Purchasing could fall properly within a Ministry of the Public Service. My answer is that there is a small number of support services. These agencies exist to permit public officers to provide a service more effectively to the public. They are common services. None of them exists to sell stamps, to collect revenues or to have any interface with John Public. It was considered that, in any attempt at administrative reform, these agencies would be brought together in order to more effectively perform their function of supporting the delivery of services to the public.

Some people, unfortunately, confuse the role of the Central Tenders Committee, the role of tenders, with the general day-to-day role of the Central Purchasing Department. The fact of the matter is that the Chief Supply Officer is the Chairman of the Tenders Committee. Not a single other member of his department has any role to play in terms of the award of Tenders.

In addition to these three agencies, an Organisation and Management Unit has been resuscitated. There was a small O & M Unit comprising a Director and six Management Analysts functioning as a division of the Prime Minister's Office between 1972 and 1980. For some unknown reason, that unit was abandoned in 1980. From that point onward, all hell broke loose in the Public Service. Posts were created without any examination, additional functions were undertaken by agencies, no study of them, just thrown about hither, thither and yon! The re-establishment of an O & M Unit is a conscious effort to restore some sort of sanity in examination of these matters.

One such area relates to the continuing study of accommodation for Government agencies, and in recent times, it has been possible to resuscitate the Accommodation Committee and give attention to this. The O & M Unit, therefore, has been re-established, along with the Manpower Development Division of the Ministry, the other main branch of which is a Central Training Administration.

The intensified use of tools of O & M and Training will be applied to enhance the capability of the Public Service to function effectively and efficiently. The proper management of the Public Service assumes an even more critical importance in the light of ever increasing demands on the political administrative machinery, and in view of the many deficiencies which tend to affect the performance, improvement and the efficiency in the delivery of goods and services.

Against such a background, it is crucial that the Ministry of the Public Service place a high premium on the development and implementation of appropriate mechanisms and systems, as well as the proper management and development of human resources, if Government's plans and policies as set out in the Estimates are to be realised in a cost effective manner. And in keeping with its stated role and mission, the Ministry of the Public Service will embark upon a number of strategies based on the following key objectives:

to enhance the various management systems within the public sector with a view to improving their efficiency, productivity and effectiveness where necessary and within specified time frames;

to develop, implement and monitor strategies and action programmes for performance improvement within the public sector;

to establish human resource management and development systems within the framework of predetermined philosophy and policies;

to develop systems of accountability as well as mechanisms for timely reporting and feed-back;

to provide advisory consultancy and essential common services to other public sector agencies as part of their organisational development process; and to embark on an appropriate programme of administrative reform and change.

The Ministry will not, without invitation from other ministries and departments, get into certain activities. The Ministry will assist other ministries and departments and other public sector agencies in reviewing and clarifying their roles and missions, objectives and unit goals. The principal means of assisting ministries and departments will be organisational development approaches which allow for the full collaboration and participation of client agencies, and where necessary, formal and non-formal training courses will be used.

Assistance will be provided in the development of appropriate operational manuals, procedures, rules and regulations which seek to ensure uniformity, continuity and coherence, thereby streamlining operations.

The Ministry will place high emphasis on the development of mechanisms which seek to ensure that there is full accountability regarding the operations of ministries and departments. To this end, systems for accountability will be developed and implemented to enhance reporting and feedback.

In relation to property management, assistance will be provided in the development of codes of use of Government property, as well as in the preparation of planned maintenance programmes designed to achieve cost effectiveness. Special attention will be paid to supplies and materials management.

It will be necessary, Mr. President, for examination to be made of various organisational structures to determine their relevance, and hence improve organisational functioning. These examinations will include job analyses, job evaluation and preparation of job descriptions so as to enhance effective operations and to determine relevant worth of jobs in the organisation's structural arrangements.

The Ministry will assist in the implementation of systems which allow for the proper collection, storage, retrieval and security of information. In the area of storage and security, the microfilming and microfiching of critical documents, as well as the placing of a high premium on records management, will be a priority item on its agenda.

A human resource management and development policy will be formulated which emphasises the human factor as the key element in the production process. In collaboration with the appropriate Services Commissions and recognising their constitutional authority and responsibility, crucial areas such as career and succession planning, recruitment, selection and placement processes,

promotion criteria, discipline, transfer, performance appraisal, training and development generally, conditions of service will be of major concern. In order to carry out this, the Ministry will examine training needs and analyse the structured programmes of training which will be developed over the next five years.
12.20 p.m.

The idea of participative leadership behaviour will be promoted as well as the effective use of teams so as to facilitate the attainment of objectives and to maximise the use of the human resource potential within organisations.

It will be necessary to develop appropriate codes of conduct. Ethics will be developed which seek to encourage proper work attitudes and behaviour in an overall effort at making the public sector more responsive to, and representative of, the needs of the wider society.

The Ministry will also have to revise the General Orders, which have been in existence for several years and are now often obeyed in the breach.

The Ministry will ensure that modern collective bargaining techniques are used as a core mechanism for the settlement of wages and salaries claims in future. On-going collaboration with union officials is regarded as a vital thing pertaining to union management relations, and the Government has committed itself to a regrading/reclassification exercise in the new year. The Ministry of the Public Service will have to give attention to that.

In terms of administrative reform, the Ministry will pursue initiatives which will embrace a total, planned system change approach, which, because of its comprehensive and collaborative nature, will seek to address in a systematic way the problems which hamper the performance, improvement and efficiency within the public sector. Already programmes have been mounted responding to the need for performance improvement in the public sector.

In the implementation of its programme objectives, the Ministry will be harmonising and co-ordinating the efforts of the various departments and units under its aegis. Various external costs, however, are envisaged, and for which external technical assistance will be needed.

The Ministry of the Public Service is of the view that benefits will be derived as a consequence of the implementing of a planned programme, benefits such as greater efficiency in the operations of the public sector by ensuring that the fullest and best use is made of available resources. This will impact on the expenditure pattern of Government.

Instillation of a new approach to work and a greater consciousness of efficiency and productivity at all levels of operations within the public sector will also help eliminate some of the wastes of expenditure in Government. Provision and maintenance of the best possible conditions of service for all staff in order to maintain a contented and efficient public sector will make people want to come to work, instead of coming to work late and leaving early.

In more specific terms, the programme will allow for a reduction in wastage and, hence, effect the necessary savings *vis-a-vis* Government's expenditure. It will provide for the streamlining of operations so as to enhance co-ordination and coherence in terms of efficiency, realising Government's objectives as outlined in the Estimates, and as will be outlined later on in the Government's Budget.

The programme will assist in bridging the existing technological gaps in order to keep pace with technological improvements. One of the areas will be to ensure that the existing proliferation of computers in this country is controlled, and that maximum use is made of those facilities which Government has already committed itself to.

In addition, the establishment of critical management systems, will, among other things, respond to concerns for management information, for supply and materials management, for better use and maintenance of Government property, and, ultimately, the creation of a more viable and efficient public sector.

Mr. President, if I have dwelt at length on the Ministry of the Public Service, it is only because nobody in the Other House made the sort of statements which would respond to the several concerns which have been legitimately expressed both in the Other Place and by the media.

The activities of the Ministry of the Public Service since June 1, when it came into being, include, among other things, the development of its own role and mission, recognising that we were dealing with disparate agencies. Let me say, Mr. President, that during my lengthy Public Service career, I believe that in several ways I touched all of the institutions. That the Prime Minister decided to place these subjects under the Ministry of the Public Service is, according to my understanding of it, his perception of the need to respond promptly, efficiently and effectively to the several public concerns with regard to the Central Purchasing Department, the role of the Data Processing Department and the Printing Department. In addition, persons on the other side and on this side have, over time, expressed concerns about the Public Service. Indeed the last Government went to Parliament

and passed a Resolution expressing concern about the functioning of the Public Service, and I believe that Dr. Cheltenham's idea would probably have ended up as a Ministry of the Public Service.

The new Ministry of the Public Service has had little time to settle down, and I am not, as Minister, particularly concerned about the several things which were said, because I think there is a general fear that the Ministry of the Public Service in its work, in carrying out its programmes of human resource development and administrative reform, is likely to strike upon and discover things which other persons might want to remain hidden. That could be the only motive for some of the peculiar comments which are made about the Ministry of the Public Service. We have, however, a commitment to correct what we perceive as the destruction of the Public Service, which was systematically undertaken over a period of time. We have a duty and a care to bring the Public Service back on stream and to make it respond positively and effectively towards the needs of Barbados in the 20th century. That is our role and that is our mission.

One of the ways we do this is by reinstituting an O & M function in the Public Service which has already undertaken initiatives. The Town and Country Planning Department is already re-organised and relocated out of a dump hole.

We will provide assistance in developing systems, financial and accounting, personnel management and general operations. We have already started some work for the National Cultural Foundation. A preliminary view has been undertaken of the Central Purchasing Department and the central supplies system. These will be in for substantial change.

We have initiated plans for a review of management records in the Public Service and for information systems in the Public Service generally. We have plans for a total census of personnel in the public sector to determine what are the qualifications of every individual and what is the experience, in order to determine what career patterns can be developed for them.

We have already commenced rationalisation of Data Processing hardware throughout the public sector, and we have recommended that persons do not go into expenditure which would be wasteful.

We have started a rationalisation in the allocation of Public Service vehicles to individual officers and employees.

We have assisted, in conjunction with other agencies, in steps towards an examination and re-organisation of the National Insurance Department, including the several systems of control.

The Office Accommodation Committee has been reinstituted, and in addition to the Town Planning Department, which I have earlier mentioned, departments have been relocated into the Treasury Building where the Auditor General's Department is now found. The Inland Revenue Department has been provided with additional space, and they really need it.
12.30 p.m.

The Attorney General's Department is being provided with additional accommodation. The Rates and Taxes Department will soon be relocating from the very difficult conditions under which they presently function, and other agencies, such as The Information Public Relations Department, will be relocated in order that the Post Office employees may get back the space which was promised to them when that new building was constructed at Cheapside.

There have been other initiatives relating to departmental training. Members may be aware of the training programmes which have been undertaken by the Customs Department to improve the quality of the service they render. Other programmes of training have been undertaken in collaboration with us for the Airport Civil Aviation Department and for the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. President, the record of the Ministry of the Ministry of the Public Service can stand the scrutiny of the day, and indeed the scrutiny of time.

The success or otherwise of implementing the Estimates of this country will not be reposed only in the Ministry of Finance, but it will be reposed in all of the agencies which together will form a team working towards bringing this country back on track.

Aside

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I ask the honourable Member to give way because of an oversight, for which I apologise to the Senate, on my part. I should have asked for the suspension of Standing Order No.45(2) in order that all these measures can be proceeded with in all their stages at this sitting, and I now formally move that Standing Order No. 45(2) be suspended, and I apologise to the Senate.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PUBLIC BUSINESS (RESUMED)

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move this Bill to grant a sum not exceeding $533 767 467 out of the Consolidated Fund for the service of Barbados for the year ended 31st March, 1988, be read a second time.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, we have been treated to a long diatribe, excerpts from, I think, a seminar some weeks ago on the Public Service. I do not know why the Minister is so defensive about his Ministry. If he cannot take the heat in the kitchen, he really will have to leave it. This is what the world of politics is about.

We have not heard from either of the Ministers in here this morning anything really to do with the Estimates of Expenditure which are before us, anything to do with the economy. Normally, in an introductory speech, we would expect, Mr. President, to have, at least in the briefest of terms, some overview of the economy. It would appear that neither of the Ministers here is able, or competent, or dares to deal with matter pertaining to the economy. The two members of the Opposition have every intention, Mr. President, of using every moment of time which is their privilege to have under the Standing Orders of this Chamber to address just such matters.

What we have before us, Mr. President, today are Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure – just that, no more – and these Estimates, in my submission, Mr. President, cannot be examined or read in isolation from the Budget of July, 1986, from the performance of the economy between May 1986 and today, and from what we anticipate will be the Budget for April, 1987, according to the Junior Minister of Finance.

The July 1986 Budget, Mr. President, was an election give-away Budget. The Government felt that it had to honour certain manifesto promises, and in that Budget, which was a give-away, nothing was taken – not one cent in revenue was raised. Much was given away $12 million in Corporation Tax, $6 million in Hotel and Restaurant Taxes, and even after that Budget, some $26 million in Civil Service salary increases.

What has happened in the interim, Mr. President, is that the economy of this country has been undermined to the point of collapse. We have seen steps taken which certainly over the past ten years had become, we thought, a thing of the past, part of the distant history of Barbados. We read in the newspapers every day about the inability of other Governments in the Caribbean to pay the weekly and monthly salaries of Government workers. We hear of the collapse of the economy here and the disappearance of foreign reserves there in another country. We had not thought to see this in Barbados in the year 1987, but that is what we have come to.

The Government is doing everything in its power, let me use a word which is much in vogue now, to obfuscate the true state of the economy. We know that, since December last year, instructions have come down from the Ministry of Finance to all Chief Accounting Officers that they should pay no bills. We know that, as recently as last month, certain Government workers, particularly weekly-paid workers, were not in a position to receive their salaries or wages on the appointed day. We know that a piece of legislation, which passed the Other Place as recently as last week, was tabled in that place as early as February 3 this year and was postponed time and again simply because the Government knew it could not meet its obligations to pay.

We had not thought to see this position in Barbados today. When the Barbados Labour Party left the seat of Government in May 1986, we left the Treasury in a sound condition. We left the foreign reserves in a sound condition. You do not have to take my word for it, Mr. President. The Central Bank Report is there for everyone to see and inwardly digest. It is not my fault if some people do not know how to read the Central Bank Report. But it is there for all to see.
12.40 p.m.

We have seen unemployment rising. We have seen exports falling over the past eight months. We had not thought to see this. We were told that in the magical Budget of July, part of the fall-out would be the creation of employment. We have not seen that. We have seen unemployment rising to 9.2%. And this at the height of the tourist season and the crop season. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that when these two seasons, which happen to coincide come, to an end, towards the end of May and June, we will well see the unemployment rate in this country rising to 22%, where we found it in 1976. It is possible that it might even go beyond 22%, because nothing that the Government has done or said that they would do has generated the employment that we were promised. It is on these matters that the Government is going to be judged in the end.

The Democratic Labour Party loves to make the point that the Barbados Labour Party is the party of the working class, the party of the commercial sector. And we saw, yes we saw, in here, in July, in the last Budget, how much was given back to that sector. Some of us wondered if it were a pay off against support in the campaign of April and May of 1986. Ten million dollars went back in Corporation Tax, to the extent that business Bridgetown could see fit to give back some $4 million, allegedly, for the tourist industry – not into the hands of the Government, because they do not have any trust in the Government to manage the economy, or even manage

$3 million or $4 million. Of course, there is a lot of self-interest in that. Business in Bridgetown knows where its ancillary profits are coming from, where its ancillary business lies in respect of the tourist industry. But they must be smiling all the way to the bank, smiling all the way to the shareholders, if they are in a position to say to the Government, here is $4 million that we will give back in price support, in a manner of speaking, for the tourist industry.

A great deal was made out of the fact that the Corporation Tax was decreased from 45% to 35%. Mr. President, Sir, there are roughly some 5 000 companies on the Companies' Register at any rate. But of these 5 000 there are only 21 which are regarded or referred to as the major public companies. Those 21 public companies are responsible for something in the order of, it is my information, about 85% of the Corporation Tax.

Let us get down to the nitty gritty of it now. We are not talking about the small businessmen out there. They have ways and means of avoiding taxes, not only of the corporation variety but of every other kind. We are talking about the 21 biggies responsible for 85% of the Corporation Tax. Approximately 600 shareholders, some being the same people, are involved in all of these companies. Out of deference to Senator Goddard, I will not use as an illustration Goddard Enterprises, which owns BICO, food fairs and no longer owns No. 1 Broad Street, or nearly no longer. But there are several other major companies, and you only have to dig a little bit to understand where the subsidiary interests lie, and that the 600 shareholders we are talking about are, roughly speaking, the same people.

The profits the Junior Minister of Finance said last July, these retained earnings that he went on and on talking about that would be ploughed back, that the employment that would flow from it, we have not seen any of that. We have seen a rise in unemployment. What we have seen, according to the company reports, is that these profits have not been spread down and around at all, but have simply gone back by way of dividends to these 600-odd shareholders. These companies, you know, Mr. President, are mostly in the distributive trades – we all live in Barbados, it is a small community and we know that – and so we have not seen the employment generation that was so much mooted. We have not seen the re-investment. We have not seen the kind of expansion certainly between, let us say, July, the date of the Budget, and today.

The fact of the matter is that it turns out that the Government is indeed the party of the merchant class, who were the greatest beneficiaries of the July Budget, the same merchants who cursed the Barbados Labour Party Government for the imposition of the Consumption Tax. They cursed us when we levied the said Corporation Tax, but this is how we raised the money for the increase of old age pensions from $13 a week to $48 a week. This is how we raised the money to repair the houses of old age pensioners and to help to support so many of the social services which are now being cut on a daily basis by this Government.

Mr. President, Sir, that is only the beginning of the history of the decline in our economy since July of last year. We can look at the tourist sector – I will speak to that later on – sugar and manufacturing. The Government, as I said, is not paying its bills.

We were castigated for seven years by the now Junior Minister of Finance on the matter of our foreign borrowing. I have made the point already in this Chamber, and I make it again, that we have hardly come in here, except for today and possibly one another occasion, when the Government has not had on the Order Paper a matter pertaining to foreign borrowing of one kind or another. If it were not one loan, it was another. They have borrowed consistently since July of 1986, and still propose to do so. Even now, we know that they are in London butting about on the market there to see what borrowing can be further secured.

We know, because as I said, this is a small community and we live in it. Our ears are to the ground, and my colleague and I here are front-loaded with information that they do not have, not yet. They, like their colleagues on the back bench in the Other Place, do not know what is going on. They do not know what the Government's policy is. To some extent, the front-benchers do not know it either.

We know on this side that they have gone wild with the foreign borrowing. I really do not know how much further they can go with that, because I really do not know which lending agencies are going to be disposed to lend to this Government to support or to underpin any Current Account deficit. We know they have virtually exhausted the domestic banking system. Listen and you will learn. Just look and you will see what has been happening with the Treasury Bills. They have been coming down like, I mean, race tickets!

(Aside: Tell them!)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Like Instant Money, Mr. President.

(Aside: Tell Lewis!)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The Minister over there, is not interested in these matters. He does not have to count the cost. He is not the bookkeeper. He is dealing with the bodies. He is the one wheeling the long

knives. He does not have to count the cost, but the domestic banking market exhausted.

We hear a lot of talk about efficiency, Sir. I translate that to mean cuts and lay-offs, because speaking to these Estimates which are before us, and I must speak to them since nobody yet has done so, the greater proportion of the money that we see voted here goes towards what is called fixed costs – statutory costs, salaries which have to be paid – utilities which have to be paid, National Insurance Contributions – yes, open it up and look carefully and see it under every Head – and travel. These are fixed costs which the Government cannot avoid, and that is where the hog share of the money that is going to be voted will go. So when we hear that they are going to raise monies by occasioning certain efficiencies, particularly through the Ministry of the Public Service, you have to understand, Mr. President, that can only mean one thing – cuts and lay-offs. It has already started. Many people have gone home to unemployment. Cuts in services are already evident. Ministers even have the gall to speak out about them. And this whole question of containing costs, Sir, is only wishful thinking, because I am very concerned that the Estimates before us do not present the whole picture. So carelessly were they compiled that, in the Other Place, many move-ins – and for the benefit of the neophytes, that means last minute amendments and additions of expenditure – occurred in the Other Place. I have not seen any documents before me yet today, Mr. President, which will lead me to understand exactly what the total cost of those move-ins amount to and what the real implications of the many amendments before us mean for the deficit on Current Account which is being mooted by the Government.

12.50 p.m.

If we look carefully under every Head here, any Ministry, any sector of Government, you will see, in addition to Statutory Expenditure, something called Other Expenditure. That is where the cuts are going to lie.

We are also aware, Sir, as I have already pointed out, that a large sum, a considerable sum of money which will represent payables, which the Government has now suspended, and has done since December, will be carried forward. That is another term which neophytes must learn to use during the course of the Estimates and learn to understand what it means where you carry forward from one year debts into another year.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: It is not simple accounting, because it has got both Ministers of Finance confused. When you have your turn to speak, you can try to explain how simple it is. It is not simple, because you cannot see it with the naked eye.

I address you, Sir. I beg your pardon. My remarks are respectfully addressed to the Chair, Sir.

The point is, Mr. President, that there is a lot in here which is not visible to the naked eye and which the Government is going to have to account for sooner or later. In my view – the sooner the better, because not one cent can be spent other than that voted by this Parliament. So we know that a great deal of money is going to be carried forward from this financial year ending March 31 into the new financial year.

There are other ways and means of manipulating these figures as well, Sir. Some of these monies which are voted, we know are never going to be expended and are going to be permitted to lapse. That is another way of obfuscating the real truth about what is the financial condition.

We know, too, Sir, that many of the figures which have been quoted in the Other Place by the Minister of Finance – nobody felt competent to quote anything in here, but they are now public knowledge – are questionable. We are concerned that the Income Tax projections are questionable. We are concerned that the overall deficit is questionable. We are not believing that it is anywhere in the region of $119 million as projected, because that projection does not include the Civil Service salary increases of $26 million. Properly speaking, that projected deficit should be more in the order of $216 million. So, together with the move-ins, it is very possible that at the end of the day, the deficit could look more like $250 million, and that is what the Government has to go out there offshore to borrow. There is no way that that order of money is going to be raised on this island. It certainly will be the largest amount ever borrowed by a Government in this country in the course of one year.

We know what the foreign reserves are. That is not any magical secret anymore. We know that the balance of payments position has been seriously weakened by the fall-off in performance of the productive sectors of our economy. Where is the money going to come from? It is too late for the Government to take the advice of the World Bank, Mr. President, because they have already gone ahead with these massive wage increases for the civil servants without any concomitant guarantee of an increase or an improvement in productivity. So that advice offered by the World Bank, has, as we say in parlance, gone through the eddoes. It came too late. No real incentives have been offered in the July Budget, and I believe that there will not be any offered in the coming Budget, to improve productivitv or increase efficiency, and I do not think that we should be fooled

by any seasonal increase, Mr. President. The unemployment figures cannot be disputed.

The Government has ruled out, or so the Junior Minister of Finance has said, devaluation as a solution. So that advice given by the World Bank has been already rejected. The Junior Minister of Finance has already ruled out any increased Personal Income Tax. The question, Sir, remains, where is the money coming from?

The emerging picture that we are seeing in here is one of increased direct taxation. That, too, has already begun. Business Bridgetown had better hold its bosom ready for it. I believe that they are and have already taken avoiding action. At any rate, it is my view that that kind of policy may well approximate to the devaluation of the Barbados dollar in the long run anyhow.

Therein, Mr. President, lies the fundamental quarrel between the Senior and the Junior Minister of Finance of this country. There are very clear, deep differences between the Prime Minister, who is the Minister of Economic Affairs, and who I now describe as the Senior Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance, substantively, who I now describe as the Junior Minister of Finance. There are deep differences between them over how the economy of this island should be structured and how it should be managed, and those differences have been surfacing in public from the very beginning. We will remember that at the time of the Japanese yen loan on the floor in the Other Place, there was a public humiliation. Last week, during the debate of the Estimates in the Other Place, again there was another public humiliation, not to mention the shearing off from that Ministry of various departments which are now housed in the super-Ministry known as the Ministry of the Public Service.

So, as I have said, Sir, what we have before us this morning are Estimates of Expenditure which can be supplemented by the Government during the course of the year, if they have the wherewithal to supplement it, or which can be permitted to lapse by virtue of non-expenditure, and I have already described ways and means by which visible and invisible cuts can be effected.

1.00 p.m.

In the productive sector, Sir – agriculture, tourism, manufacturing – for years now, and particularly during the past few months, we have heard a great deal about the need for price and other support. The question is, from whence will the money come? We were much criticised when we were in Government for the price support which we gave to the sugar industry. There has been an about face on that as far as the Government is concerned nowadays. But what about the cries for price support coming from tourism and from manufacturing?

If we look now at the much mooted Appendix G, for which a senior civil servant has been sent home on special leave, courtesy of the Ministry of the Public Service – Appendix G is at the back of this document, Mr. President – we will see where the cuts lie. It is page 41. Look it up, be instructed. Look and see where the cuts lie. Look and see what was requested by the statutory corporations for the financial year 1987 – 88 and look and see grant approved. Look under Tourism. The Board of Tourism requested $16.635 million, granted $15.4 million.

The Transport Board, Mr. President, almost drove me to tears this morning.

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I have not got to the rest of them yet. I am reading, Sir – I am willing to make the newspaper a document of his House – today's *Advocate News,* today being the 23rd of March, 1987. Way down on the page before the last, in a little corner, is the headline "Money for Board." It says:

> "Although there has been no subsidy in the Estimates for the Transport Board, this does not mean that no money is forthcoming for that institution. Minister of Finance, Dr. Richie Haynes, said that that Board will be financed this year through the Transport Levy Fund."

This is the fund which the Democratic Labour Party said on the platforms in April and May last year that they would abolish upon coming to Government, in the ways that we abolished the Sales Tax within weeks of coming to Government in 1976. Now we hear that the Transport Board is going to be financed from the Transport Levy Fund!

He went on to say that Government policy was to transfer the proceeds of the fund to the Consolidated Fund, but that this will take time. He said that the Board was currently receiving money. Listen to this, Sir. He said that the Transport Board, the Board which provides an essential service on a daily basis in this country, was currently receiving money under Pensions, Education and Police Travel, as well as under the Head of Subsidies, and by being delinquent on the payment of National Insurance dues. This is how they propose to finance the Transport Board. Subsidies for school children's bus fares, subsidies for police officers going free on the buses, the fact that they do not pay National Insurance dues, and not caring what that does now to the National Insurance Fund! This is the way that we are doing business in this country today!

The Estimates are here. Let honourable Members learn how to read and discern. Look under the Transport Board and see that this is how we are going to run an

important corporation. A little end from here, a little end from there, non-payment somewhere else and somehow it is going to get along and go along! This is the efficiency that the Minister of the Public Service is talking about!

There is a deficit of $26 million; the Transport Levy is $13 million. That means that the Transport Board is still going to be short by $13 million. Where is the $13 million going to come from? Because no money is being voted. The other sums we referred to are finite sums. Where is the other $13 million going to be coming from? It has got to be raised, unless of course, the plan is to privatise the Transport Board. I have asked the question in here before and it has not yet been answered from that side. Is that the real plan? That they are going to privatise the Transport Board? What we have seen happening is respect of the minibus service in this country, is that the beginning of the privatisation of the Transport Board?

We know that it is planned to retrench some 400 conductors, but that is not going to nearly approximate to the $13 million which is still going to be needed to run this board. It was said in the other place that bus fares are not going to be increased. Where is the revenue going to come from? These are questions which have to be answered in here. We are entitled to ask these questions in Parliament and we are entitled to have answers to them, and I am going to be asking a whole lot of other questions before I sit down, Sir.

When the DLP were in Opposition, they hardly asked Parliamentary Questions, or hardly asked questions at all. They made a lot of wild, irresponsible statements which are choking them today, although they are bold-faced enough to simply ignore and travel on because of the mandate which they have, 24–3. Three spoke for 16 hours and 24 spoke for 21 hours. Can you imagine that, Mr. President? Three spoke for 16 hours and 24 spoke for 21 hours!

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The truth is they had nothing to say, and half of the front bench, like the back bench, do not know what is going on, and they too, are asking questions. Today on the Order Paper in the Other Place there are 67 questions down. We never saw that when they were in Opposition and then was the time to ask questions.

I want to know the answer to this question. How are you going to finance the Transport Board? That question is going to have to be answered. I do not consider that this could be any policy for a Government to pursue, Sir.

Sir, it is not only the Transport Board, there is the Export Promotion Corporation. They asked for a certain provision of $2.1 million, were granted $1.95 million, say $2 million cut. These are the statutory corporations which are helping to underpin the productive sectors of the economy. Where is the export thrust that they are talking about? Where is the priority for it? EPC has been cut, and the IDC, Tourist Board, as I have already pointed out, are not getting the kind of price support or capitalisation upon which they must depend if the economy of this country is going to be stimulated.

Mr. President, in the Other Place during last week's debate of these Estimates, devastating enquiry by the Opposition disclosed many very glaring oversights. First were the move-ins. The Opposition Shadow Minister of Finance had to be moved on more than one occasion. When the heat is too much, Sir, they have to go and cool off inside the kitchen. The Shadow Minister of Finance, on more than one occasion, drew it to the attention of the Government in the Other Place last week that certain Government departments had not been properly provided for. Many move-ins, total costs, as I have pointed out, are not yet before us, so I am not in a position yet to know what is the total estimate or estimates for expenditure. I would hope that, before we finish with this debate, somebody from the other side is going to enlighten us on that.

1.10 p.m.

We have heard about Capital cuts. We have heard an excuse made that because the Government is carrying on the massive capital works programme of the former Government, there is no room for new projects. The fact of the matter is that this Government has taken a conscious and deliberate decision to cut capital expenditure. It has nothing to do with any overload of capital projects.

When we look at the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, there is nothing there upon which it can draw for its capital projects. That was a manifesto designed to win an election, not to run a country. There is no medium or long term policy there. I know, with my certain knowledge, just listening to Ministers of Government, that what is happening is that they are now, each one of them reading and inwardly digesting and trying to formulate policy from the Barbados Labour Party manifesto, which is a document designed to carry Barbados into the 21st century.

I listened to Ministers of Government, and I am hearing the exact words that I saw written on Government files. "We are diversifying around sugar, not out of sugar" – straight from the files.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Oh, yes. Barbados Labour Party files. What other kind? They do not have anything to write on the files. There is no policy. We hear the Minister of Housing talking about an environment plan. I am desperately interested in this, but all he does is talk about the plan, we do not hear the plan itself. I do not know if this plan is coming from overseas.

They recruited a fellow from the university. I thought that the fellows from the university were out of favour, the McCleans and the Alleynes who are now trembling in their boots, waiting to see if they are going to get re-appointed or get appointed. But these capital cuts can only be designed to increase unemployment. Do not mind that it was signed the day before the election.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: That is right, for the betterment of this country. It is one of the few projects providing steady employment for people today and that is what the cuts in the capital expenditure will occasion – increased unemployment. Where was all the talk from the Government.....

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: If I can be heard down in this corner, the pit, Sir.....

Asides

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I wonder if I can ask the honourable Member to give way so we can have the suspension. Is it all right?

(Asides: No, it is not all right!)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Well, you have two hours.

I think, perhaps, we had better take the suspension.

Mr. President, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for 45 minutes.

The question that the sitting be suspended for 45 minutes was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the Senate accordingly. 1.20 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: This sitting is now resumed.

On the suspension, Senator Miller was addressing the Chamber.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, before we broke for the suspension, Sir, I was saying that devastating enquiry by the Opposition in the Other Place last week during the debate on the Estimates of Expenditure occasioned several of these last minute move-ins, and I was on the point of asking one of several questions which I will ask before I sit down.

Looking at the Estimates, and that is why they require scrutiny, let us use, for example, something I know is dear to the heart of my colleague, Senator Tull. What was the point of voting money for equipment for the Glebe Polyclinic without at the same time voting monies to staff the said polyclinic? You see, these are the ways and means that are used to hide so many things behind the figures in the Estimates, because the question that you must then ask is, is the intention of the Government really to put the Glebe Polyclinic into use? That would need a complicated and long drawn out supplementary now to get money for staffing for the Glebe Polyclinic. What is the Government's intention?

You would not only stop at the Glebe Polyclinic, you would then have to go on and ask, is this what is likely to happen when the new wing at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is completed? I gather that it is just a little ahead of schedule. Are we going to find then that no monies have been voted for the staffing of that new wing, or are we going to find that some equipment has been provided for and other equipment has not, which would render some wards in that wing inoperable? That is why I continually say, Mr. President, that there is a lot behind the Estimates that does not meet the naked eye.

Now, Sir, some of the divers questions. On the matter of Trade, we have been hearing over the past months from the Minister of Trade that he had made a breakthrough here and Government had made a breakthrough there. We are not hearing that anymore.

Asides.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: No, he is not dishonest.

We are hearing that the Trinidad situation is so bad that the breakthrough was not what it appeared to be. We are hearing now about the attitude of the industrialists and the manufacturers of Barbados and how they need to change. Yes, everything that we told them. The talk about divestment, Mr. President, is severely undermining the Minister of Trade, and he has said so, particularly in respect of the Arawak Cement Plant. Puerto Rico is now accusing us. The Minister of Trade said that, and an editorial in the *Barbados Advocate* gave him credit – it is no recommendation, except it is advertising you, Senator Smith – for attempting to be responsible in his statements in respect of the Arawak Cement Plant.

Today we have Puerto Rico accusing Barbados of dumping cement, and we read in the newspaper report that that accusation was made by a Minister of the now Government. That accusation was made by the now Minister of Finance when he was in Opposition, and we are going to reap the revenge of the Puerto Ricans, because you know what happens when countries are accused of dumping. He can kiss the whole market good-bye. All the abuse that the Prime Minister of this country heaped on the head of Puerto Rico, that was received with abiect silence by Puerto Rico, they will reek their revenge on us for it now. So God, indeed, will have to be the one agency to help the Arawak Cement Plant.

The World Bank makes the point that it does no good for our tourist industry and for our tourist market image abroad if the Government has so little confidence in its own tourist product that it wishes, and trumpets to the whole world, to divest itself of not one, but two of the major hotels on this island. Now, of course, we hear the Minister of Economic Affairs, who is also the Prime Minister, lamenting that it is not so easy to sell a hotel. We said so at the time as well. I talked myself hoarse on the platform in April and May making this particular point.

But the question that is being asked in the public domain, Mr. President, is what does divestment really mean when we hear it in the mouths of Government Ministers? How do we have one Minister proposing to sell two major hotels, which are a critical and vital component in the tourist industry, when another Minister is proposing to buy No. 1 Broad Street, whose square footage is way in excess of the needs of the Barbados National Bank, so we hear that commercial business will continue at street level, and possibly at the floor above as well? They are speaking with forked tongues, speaking out of both sides of their mouths at one and the same time, wanting to eat their cake and still have it in their hand. We all know, Mr. President, as human beings, through hard experience, that it cannot be done.

When the Government proposed to cut back on the Drug Service and the polyclinic services – and they will have to answer to the man in the street for that – and yet we are going to hear that they are going to buy the St. Joseph Hospital at one and the same time, what does divestment really mean? These are questions which I hope are going to be answered. How are you approbating and reprobating at the same time?

In Tourism, the Minister there loves to talk, even more than I do, if that is possible, Mr. President, and he has been talking about break-throughs a lot. But the only break-through he has done is right through the ceiling, through the flooring and into the ground. Apart from the very terrible negative signals which the mooted sale of the Hilton and Heywoods hotels are beaming to the world – and that includes our competitors in the tourist industry, do not let us forget, and we are doing this in mid-season – the Minister of Tourism's handling of the cessation of the operation of Caribbean Airways left everything to be desired.

Yet, I can read either in yesterday's paper or that of the day before that he has a meeting organised for him to meet the Mayor of Boston or some high-sounding individual like that. Why did the newspaper reporter not also tell us at the same time that when the said Minister of Tourism was in the same Boston to meet the said Mayor, the agents of the travel industry and the tourist industry there, who were invited to a promotion by the Barbados Tourist Board, were outnumbered by the Barbados Tourist delegation? In other words, the Minister had more in his delegation than people who turned up to hear what he was going to say. It is a pity the reporter did not say that, because those people could have done more for the tourist industry of this country than meeting with the Mayor of Boston, or whoever it is that he met with. In fact, the cost of the promotion, Mr. President, because you know he stayed in the most expensive suite in all of Boston, was more.....
2.10 p.m.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I have never stayed in a suite yet, and you are not in a position to know that anyhow.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order. Senator Smith, I do not wish you to get into the habit because Senator Miller feels you have the right to address her from your seat.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: He knows, Mr. President, that the real cost does not lie in the air fare. The cost lies in the hotel bill.

Aside

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill!

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The cost of the promotion was more than the business generated by the promotion. That is what is going on in tourism.

Everybody knows that this has been a very disappointing tourist season. Do not let us fool ourselves. All of the people in the ancillary trades can tell you that. The people who are in the dry cleaning business and the laundry business can tell you, by counting the sheets alone coming from the hotel industry, that we are having a disappointing season. Where I live, I can tell you from the people I see moving in the supermarket, the number of mini-mokes I see up and down

outside my house. I can tell you without anyone having to give me any statistics that we are not having the season that we contemplated. It is very disappointing. In fact, we hardly know what is going to happen, up to the end of March, and nobody in the hotel industry, you will notice, Mr. President, is saying one word about April yet.

In Agriculture, the Minister of Agriculture, to give him credit, admits to his failure to come to grips with his portfolio. As I said already, he is just quoting what his civil servant advisers write on the file, write in speeches for him and tell him. He has no policy, because the Democratic Labour Party's manifesto will disclose no policy. In fact, the manifesto is very clear on the fact that there is no agriculture policy.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: People did not vote for the manifesto. If people had read the manifesto, they would not have voted for it. They voted for other things. But I will not be taken off on a tangent, Mr. President. I am not afraid of being in Opposition. I am a professional politician, secure in the knowledge that some years of my life I am going to be in Government and some years in Opposition. I am in Opposition now, and I am never going to let the Government forget it.

(Aside: SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You are in Opposition now!)

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Boxill.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: The democratic system that we practise here guarantees me a return to Government, possibly sooner than you think, because if this Government destroys the economy of this country, you better believe that the people of this country will call upon the Barbados Labour Party to put it right yet again.

As I was saying about agriculture, Mr. President, they are not sure. We hear them talking about diversification, but we are not hearing any details as to how, when and why they are going to diversify. They are not sure how they are going to diversify. They do not know where their exports markets are. They do not know how they are going to combat protectionism from the metropolitan countries.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Caricom we take for granted.

They do not know how they are going to ensure foreign earnings, because they clearly understand now that all the talk we hear – it is a pity that Senator Fraser is not in her seat – about self-sufficiency in food is not enough. We have to have export earnings from the agricultural sector, and that is the magic of sugar through all the centuries to date, and that is why we cannot adopt the policy of never a cane blade. We need the foreign exchange that it earns. We cannot hear from the Ministry of Agriculture where the foreign earnings are going to come from in a diversified agriculture, and we are not hearing anything in this Estimates Debate about price support for non-sugar agriculture. These are questions to be answered.

Housing. That is a Ministry that has been severely cut. I have made the point, and I am going to make it *ad nauseum* in here Senator Comissiong – you are going to hear it every time I speak, if I think it can be relevant – whither the Pondside Housing Project? The policy of urban renewal which was well underway in Bridgetown has been halted. The Pondside Project has been halted at its foundation. That is a severe cut. It means that you are condemning people in the city of Bridgetown to live in substandard housing, as they have done for generations.

Again in this sector, Mr. President, there is no policy, and I can only refer the Government to the Barbados Labour Party's manifesto. What I have had to say about the environment, I have already said.

Education. We are mindful that there are three former Ministers of Education in here.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I forgot you. Four.

Laughter

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I beg your pardon. Mr. President, Sir,...

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: That is only a sly way to remind that you were a Minister of Education, but that nobody does not remember about you.

Laughter

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, there are four former Ministers of Education sitting at this Table over whom you preside, Sir. We are hearing the present Government say that nothing has been done over the past ten years in education. Nothing has been done? This is a report on education that has just come to hand. This is a document specially prepared on education. The ten primary schools in the first World Bank Project – that is nothing! The increased number of Barbados Scholarships – that is nothing! I will not bother to list off all of what has been done.

What concerns me is that, despite assurances given by the Minister of the Public Service in his address this morning, or his diatribe this morning, I still see in this document that there are, indeed, going to be cuts at the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. What is going to become of the thrust in technical and vocational education, which is critical to the future of this country? What is going to happen in manufacturing? What is going to happen to us if we are going to set ourselves up as an attractive offshore base? What is going to happen to agriculture if we are really determined to diversify, which has implications for new technology in every form and shape? Do not be led astray by comments about repairs and improvements at the polytechnic. Part of the second World Bank Project is an expansion of the offerings at the polytechnic by way of equipment and technical assistance. But the vote for the polytechnic itself has suffered a cut like any other, at a time when we need more instructors, at a time when we need to take the polytechnic up to its full complement of 4 000. How is this compatible with the Government's alleged support for a forward thrust, a real leap forward in technical and vocational education?

There are many other areas where cuts are going to be in order in education. I am deeply concerned about it, because it is the largest sector or the second largest now in the national budget. The Public Service is eating up everything, but Education still enjoys the second largest chunk of the national budget.

The implications for the university are dire. The university is causing the Governments of the Caribbean great concern with its spiralling costs. We are one of the few regions of the world where tertiary education is as free as it is, and we would want to keep it that way, but there is a high wastage factor at the university. There is high wastage in the number of people who go up and come back down in the first year. A lot of first year tuition fees add up to thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars right across the Caribbean. It is true that the university has seized upon the new technology and distance learning, and the challenge programme at the university sets a wonderful example to the world at what we can do in an archipelago like this with the new technology. But even so, university costs continue to spiral, and one wonders where the cut in education will come in the end.

2.20 p.m.

This Government, like the Government before it, places great emphasis on primary education. I can have no quarrel with that, that was a major plank of our policy. In fact, there must be a realignment within the Education budget to be fairer to primary education, because the gap is so wide in respect to the provision made to primary education as opposed to secondary or, even for that matter, tertiary education, and I am pleased to see that the second World Bank Project will continue. Even though I am aware that a measure of tinkering is proposed, I am pleased to see that it is continuing.

But within the Education budget itself, severe economies would have to be put in place if it is expected to live within what is going to be voted to it. Because do not let us forget what I said in the very beginning. In all of these budgets, and particularly in Education, because it is one of the high employers, the hog share goes to the fixed costs. Certainly, when I was in the Ministry of Education, well over 72% of the budget went to the fixed costs. It went to salaries, utilities and travel.

When my colleagues in the Cabinet heard me complain that at a particular primary school they were running out of chalk, they were horrified, they were disbelieving, and they said it was impossible. How can you run out of chalk? Well, if you are paying 76%, I think it was at the last Estimates of your budget to fixed costs and the university is costing you close on $20 million a year, and the School Meals Department is costing you close on $12 million a year, and you have the Textbook Loan Scheme, it is not incredible. It is not so difficult to believe that in a particular primary school, they would be running out of chalk and toilet paper or whatever.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, on benches, too. In view of what I know, from my intimate knowledge of the financial management of the Ministry of Education, I am deeply concerned at where the cuts in education will come, because cuts there going to be. The Government's overall policy makes it clear that cuts, particularly in the social service sectors, are the order of the day, and I must be deeply concerned as to where the cuts in education are going to come.

Mr. President, this morning we have heard what was almost a lecture on the structure and the intent of the Ministry of the Public Service, which I am told, Sir, by one who would love this little piece, is run by the "Gang of Three" up in Bay Street.

(Aside: Who?)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: You would not know because you are not in Cabinet. You would not understand about those things. There is a gang of three up in Bay Street.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Collymore, Rogers and Lewis are running the works. It is not unlike what we see now in North America with Reagan. He does not know

what is going on. It is the back room boys running the works and you would not know that even the fellow down in Jemmotts Lane, the Deputy, had difficulty with the "Gang of Three" up in Bay Street. None of them was elected by the people, but they wield great power, and that is what the diatribe was about this morning, Mr. President. It had nothing to do with the Estimates. It had nothing to do with the economy of this country. It was a man revelling and luxuriating in the great power that he now wields, greater power than any other Minister barring the Prime Minister. That is what he was doing – luxuriating in this power which terrorizes other colleagues in the Cabinet. It cannot make the Deputy Prime Minister sleep easily in his bed to know that he has to operate from low down in Jemmotts Lane whereas the "Gang of Three" are further up on Bay Street on a day-to-day basis, which is actually where the power lies and where the power emanates from.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Jemmotts Lane is where the Deputy Prime Minister is. He is also Minister of Education and Leader of the House.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Do you mean that you do not even know that? Oh dear, man they are giddy, Sir! These revelations do not come easily. People do not like to be told these things.

I have asked a lot of questions, Sir, and I would love to believe that some of them will be answered here. I know that the relevant Ministers are not all here. I also know, as I have said before, that a lot of the back-benchers and the Senators on the Government side in here really do not know, for the most part, what is going on. I mean, we have a former Minister there in the person of Senator Morrison, a man not without skills and talent, but nobody will show him a file. He is not in a position to articulate the Government's policy on anything. I have a quarrel with that. Do not say that is not true. Nobody will show him a file. He is not allowed to get up in here and pilot anything, and he was a former Minister of Government.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: But you do not count Boxill!

The back-benchers, Sir, do not know what really is going on anymore than the Senators in here. It is a very unhappy situation.

What I hope that I have done, Sir, is to draw a large picture for our benefit as to what the current situation is in Barbados today. I had never thought in my wildest dreams that, less than a year after assuming office, the new Government would have brought our country to the position in which it finds itself today. These are very serious times, very serious times indeed, a time when this region appears not to be at its most stable. There is a Government virtually under seige in Jamaica. There is an election due April 6 in St. Lucia. There is a Cabinet divided against itself in Antigua. There is disunity in Grenada.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, Tom has been dead now for some years and he is still haunting the people on that side of the table. I cannot help that, Sir. I do not know why they call his name all the time.
2.30 p.m.

The fact is that at times like this in the Caribbean, they still look to Barbados to set an example. They still look to Barbados for guidance on the most simple and sometimes on the most complex matters. In every respect they look to us, and more than look to us, from time to time they borrow from our talent, they borrow from our experience. Now I am living to see a time when Barbados is, to use a phrase, being less counted in the Caribbean. It is not easy to stomach that.

I travel the Caribbean quite a bit and I sense a loss of confidence in the strength that people associate with our style of Government. I sense that there is not that looking to Barbados as there used to be for guidance and advice. Everybody wants to blame Tom for everything. It is amazing how he speaks back from the grave to these people.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: No, they are concerned about this Government. Imagine a Prime Minister in another country in the Caribbean, which shall be nameless, could say to his Ministers in my presence, Mr. President, for their benefit, on the importance of being responsible in Opposition, "so you see what has happened in Barbados?" The people who are the Government now were irresponsible when they were in Opposition, they had everything to say, and now they are in Government it comes back to haunt them." I never thought that I would come to have a Head of Government in the Caribbean say that about Barbados, or about the leadership of Barbados or the Government of Barbados.

Mr. President, I want to come back to these Estimates, because that is what we are in here about today. I said at the beginning that they cannot be read in isolation of the general temperature of the economy. They cannot be read in isolation of what all of the

economic indicators are at this date, today. They cannot be read in isolation of what people are anticipating may well come in a Budget of April in 1987.

I know that the Democratic Labour Party, because it has already started, is going to want to claim some credit for strong performance of the Barbados economy in some areas during 1986. In the early part of 1986, there was strong performance which cannot be credited to the Democratic Labour Party, but that is not going to stop them trying to claim credit for it. Everything that we left in place, we are seeing reversed, not only in individual Ministries, as in the Ministry of Education, they seem to take especial joy in reversing everything that I did over five years, or nearly everything, but we have seen other reverses as well.

The rate of inflation was the lowest in this region, thanks to the management of the Barbados Labour Party. We are going to see a reverse in that any minute now, because we are all waiting for this first quarter figures. It is just a pity that we did not have them in time for the Estimates. I trust we will have them in time for the Budget Debate.

The very disquieting increase in unemployment, particularly at the height of the tourist and the crop season, must be cause for the greatest possible concern. The Government appointed a Task Force on Unemployment. This, of course, was not in its manifesto, we heard no talk of this from the platform. The people of Barbados did not vote for any task force, they voted for a Government to govern, and on the question of unemployment, one should be deeply concerned, especially those who are in Government and those who are on the Executive, at the usurpation of power of the Executive by Commissions, task forces and the like. But the people of this country did not vote for any task force. Those who were unemployed were told that they were going to find employment. Some were told they would get it the Monday after the election day, and many turned up looking for it – in vain.

This employment task force laboured and laboured in vain, and in the end gave birth to a report, and the report is perhaps the most serious document, apart from the Budget which we are anticipating, that is going to be laid on the table of this Parliament during 1987, because that task force has stated, in the first place, that whatever tax measures the Government has already taken, or is likely to take in a forthcoming Budget, can have no effect for employment in 1987. That is what the task force report says, and that is the worst possible news for the unemployed out there, and particularly the unemployed who voted for the Government in 1986.

These Estimates make it clear that there is not going to be any expansion in public sector employment. The Minister of the Public Service has made it clear in his talk about efficiency that there is not going to be expansion in public employment. In fact, all other indicators point to shrinkage in public sector employment.

The task force falls back on the policies which were being pursued by the Barbados Labour Party. It says that we must go back now for temporary employment to a major beautification programme. That is only another way of putting debushing, Sir. It is only other language for the debushing programme which was underway.

The report says that, apart from that, we must go back to road construction. The Honourable Senator Smith does not lose an opportunity in this House to be negative and abusive, as is his wont, in respect of the road construction and the road maintenance programme. It is still today one of the major employers staving a lot of people off from unemployment. So here we have the Government now being advised, so that it will find itself speaking with forked tongue yet again. You are going to have the Senator Smiths of this world, mercifully in a minority.....

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Leave you out in here? You are in here, you are my stamping ground.

The Senator Smiths of this world, mercifully in a minority, are telling you that you do not need a road construction programme and if he had his way he would have stopped it and all this kind of talk, and you have the task force advising the Government.....

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, on a point of explanation.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: But he has not spoken yet, he cannot explain anything!

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: On a point of order.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: It is a bogus point of order, because you really want to make a point of explanation.

Mr. President, not that I am trying to usurp your power, Sir. I am not being exactly rude, I am just giving Senator Smith a little advice.
2.40 p.m.

As I was saying, Sir, the Senator Smiths of this world, mercifully in a minority, are the ones who are screeching to the heavens that we do not need a road programme, that the money could be better spent doing this and doing that, and yet we now have the task force

reporting to the Government that road construction and maintenance must be an important component in any programme to generate employment in this country.

The task force's report really is a very sobering document, because, as I said, it makes it very clear, it is honest, and says that there is no magic that is going to be worked straight away. There is no magic in the crash programmes that the Democratic Labour Party is so enamoured of. It only adds to the larger picture.

The economic outlook for 1987 was never discussed in the Other Place last week during the Estimates Debate. Neither the Minister of Finance nor the Minister of Economic Affairs dared to discuss on the floor in the Other Place the economic outlook for 1987. Nobody from the other side has yet done it in here today, and I do not believe that anybody from that side is going to do it during the course of this debate, because, Mr. President, it is a very dismal outlook: (1) the balance of payments position continues to weaken, (2) the prospects for growth are very dim.

We are seeing contractions in manufacturing and in agriculture. In fact, the Minister of Trade had adverted to this. The manufacturing industry in Barbados cannot be expected to work any special miracles. We cannot depend upon it as a major plank in our economy, because, it simply cannot compete. We cannot compete with the sweat shops of the Far East and the Middle East, and it is that component, which you, Sir, will appreciate more than any in here, which makes the prospects so gloomy for manufacturing. Our wage structure just cannot compete.

Even where we would want to find markets for more sophisticated goods, the markets are not there. In the metropolitan countries, they are seeking to protect their markets. I hear the Minister of Agriculture at the top of his voice saying that he is going to increase the subvention, as he has indeed done, for the Barbados Horticultural Society, and making a great deal about the cut flower industry and the foliage industry. But I also hear that horticulturists in North America are now petitioning the United States Government to protect them against the Columbian roses, the anthuriums and ginger lilies coming out of the Caribbean, and against the people who are growing anthuriums also in the Dominican Republic. They can be grown in various parts of the United States as well as they can be grown in the Caribbean, so I do not know what the certainties are.

The employment prospects, as I have just been canvassing with you, Sir, are the greatest of all, and the task force offers no real hope. The task force pointed to no major new strategy. The task force has simply done what we know of our own knowledge. They have simply rehearsed what are the facts which we know and drawn clear for us to see that the Government really has no policy, no programme, no plan, not even an idea of how it can realistically begin to deal with the problem of unemployment.

The problem of unemployment is not peculiar to this country. I am not saying that if the Barbados Labour Party were in Government, we would not also have a severe problem with unemployment. It would not be as acute as it is today, though, because at least, we had a plan, a programme, a policy and, particularly, a development plan designed to attack this universal problem of unemployment. Not so this Government!

Four thousand more are going to come out of the schools toward the end of June/July, many of them unskilled, and as I have said in this Chamber before, until we do something to redirect education in this country so that young people are coming out of schools, at least, partially skilled, we are making up a very very hard bed on which to lie, and the fact of the matter is that the Government has no hope to offer those young people. The measures they have taken so far, as I have already pointed out, have done nothing to stimulate employment generation, neither in the public sector nor in the private sector. Do not let us fool ourselves about it. I would defy anybody to get up in here and suggest that the statistics lie. They do not. You only have to look and see what is being drawn down in respect of unemployment benefits in the National Insurance Scheme, benefits put in there by the Barbados Labour Party. That Scheme has helped to cushion the sting of unemployment in this country, and many people are grateful for it today. So we are at a very grave impasse, and it must be part of the Government's job, it must be an obligation on the part of the Government, to reassure the people of this country what steps they propose to take to relieve us of this anxiety.

And there is anxiety. There is a nervousness in the market. In Swan Street, United States dollars can be bought for Bds. $2.25. That was not the case a year ago. There is unease out there, a flight of capital. I have said this before, I know, Senator Comissiong, but it bears repetition. Let it never be said that the warning signals were not sounded. There is a flight of capital out there. There is a flight from the manufacturing sector going on out there, and we are not seeing any return business coming in the other direction. We only hear about the breakthroughs, but we do not see the jobs on the ground, and the Government must tell us what its intention is.

The people have given this Government a five year mandate. Almost a year has gone, and the economy is on the brink of chaos in less than a year. We cannot now be hearing that they are putting together a plan, or putting together a Committee or a task force to come up with a plan. That is what we are hearing in almost every sector of Government. People voted on the assumption that the

Government was coming in clear in its intentions, clear in its programmes and knew what it was going to do. The few steps that have been taken have turned out negative consequences. The Prime Minister finds himself, as Economic Affairs Minister, very ill-served by the cohort from the university. At the Barbados National Bank, there is chaos. You have the Chairman of the Board, when he should be at Princeton pursuing his sabbatical business, on the shop floor, and you know what the implications of that are, Mr. President. The Chairman of the National Bank is to be found on the bank floor directing the day-to-day business, interviewing clients, interviewing staff members on a day-to-day basis. Even in the worst years under Senator Lewis that was not permitted, in the days of the Barbados Labour Party. Senator Smith says that is true.

2.50 p.m.

Asides

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Nobody can give away money from the National Bank, and anybody is entitled to borrow money from the National Bank, just as the Franklin brothers did borrow from the Barbados Development Bank.

(Aside: Without collateral?)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: You ought to ask them that. I am not in here to expose their business. If you want to expose it, let that be your function.

Mr. President, as I was saying, we have at the Barbados Development Bank another one of these special advisers who had a lot to say at the time when the April and the July Budgets were being formulated. What are we hearing from his mouth today? What he is not responsible for and what a terrible position it is at the Barbados Development Bank! Imagine at an annual general meeting of the Barbados Development Bank, for the first time ever a layman gets up on the floor to correct the chairman in his report on a matter of importance, critical to the day-to-day management of the Board. That is what we have come to now in the management of the affairs of this country.

The National Insurance Scheme is managed by another one of these university bright lights. It is no wonder that the Prime Minister has no respect for them and has told them that they are theorists and theoreticians, and that their place is up at the university and not within the corridors of Government. That is why the Chairman of the National Insurance Scheme is now trembling in his boots wondering if the new Minister is going to re-appoint him. I hope he gets a disappointment. He cannot take any strain. We saw him in the by-election campaign in St. Philip North in 1976. He had to be carted away on a stretcher, physically so.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That has nothing to do with the debate. These extraneous matters have nothing to do with the Estimates.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I know that, Sir. You are perfectly right, Sir. The attack that was made this morning by Senator Lewis on the Managing Director of the *Barbados Advocate* would fall into that category, but my remarks are really just friendly asides to Senator Boxill.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think I have given you a wide berth. Do not go any further.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: No, Sir. I would not go down that avenue anymore, Sir.

Talking about the management of these key institutions of Government, do not let us forget the Central Bank. The Lord giveth and the Lord is about to take away. I gather that the Lord has already taken away, because I gather that the Central Bank Governor has long ago received a letter advising him that his contract is not going to be renewed at March 31. The Central Bank, Governor was appointed by the Minister of Economic Affairs who is now the Prime Minister, and it is now his privilege to disappoint the Central Bank Governor. But what does that speak for the morale and the image of the bank in respect of the manner in which it was done. It must be grossly improper that a Prime Minister would stand up on the floor of Parliament.....

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Excuse me, Senator Miller. Senator Boxill would you allow Senator Miller to address the Chair without any interruption. Otherwise, I will have to invite you to read Standing Order No. 33. Standing Order No. 33 is for all Senators, not some.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am saying that it really is most *infra dig* the Governor of the Central Bank should be publicly humiliated and chastised on the floor of the country's Parliament by no less a person that its Prime Minister, who is also its Minister of Economic Affairs. It is not going to stop him from making a living, and a good living, but what one wonders if at such a time in the life of the economy of this country a new person will not have to be wet footed in as sensitive an institution as the Central Bank, at a time when the foreign reserves is slipping, at a time when exports are plummeting, at a time when devaluation is common talk in financial circles, at a time when Government is under

severe cash flow difficulty, at a time when the Government cannot balance its budget, and in the end that is what this is partially about.

But this is only one part of the arithmetical sum that any business, any household, any Government has to do. These are only the Estimates of Expenditure – I am not going to tire of saying that – and they do not on their own work any magic. The Government has found, and can and does find, it possible to camouflage the true financial situation and the condition of this country, notwithstanding that these printed figures will govern every cent that can be spent from the Government Treasury.

There is great disquiet out there, and no amount of talk about increased efficiency, no amount of layoffs in the various sectors of the economy, no amount of capital cutbacks, Mr. President, is going to hide the fact that we are in deep financial trouble. The Barbados Labour Party said in April of last year – we had two budgets, do you remember, Sir? The Bree St. John budget and the Richie Haynes budget – that the arithmetic was wrong and your calculations were overly optimistic, and the spokesman for Finance in the Barbados Labour Party at the time said that within 18 months we were going to feel the pain. It is less than a year, Sir, and we are feeling the pain.

3.00 p.m.

I want to have some of the questions I have asked answered. I am not interested in any airy-fairy predictions about what percentage of growth is likely to occur, or where the unemployment percentage rate is likely to fall to. I do not want any of those fancy predictions. I want hard answers to do with some of the figures I see in this document.

I want to hear the real truth about the Current Account deficit. I really want to know what is the end figure that this Parliament is going to vote. I want to know the real truth about capital expenditure. Not all of the answers are to be found in this document. They should be found in it, but they are not to be found in it, because the Government has ways and means to manipulate. But Parliament and the people of this country are entitled to know. After all, it is our money, it is our taxes, with which the Executive runs the country. So in all the talk and in all the figures that are bandied about, it is time now for the truth to come out.

I hear about revenues estimated at $698 million, expenditure at $711 million and an anticipated shortfall of $13.5 million. I simply, Mr. President, do not believe those figures, because the revenue is not going to realise $698 million. It simply will not, because it is depending, as the Minister said, on certain efficiencies to be effected in order for that to happen. I do not believe that expenditure is going to level off at $711 million. I just do not believe it, unless there are wholesale cuts to services, unless they are going to do something dramatic, like close down the School Meals Service, $12 million; unless they are going to close down some of the secondary schools, close some of the polyclinics, never open up the Glebe. Unless major cuts like that occur, there is no way that expenditure is going to level at $711 million-odd dollars, and there is no way in this world that I am going to be persuaded that shortfall is going to be in the order of $13.5 million.

At this time, we are entitled in this debate on the Appropriation Bill to know what the real figures are. One of the prime functions of Parliament is to scrutinize expenditure and to vote monies, because without our voting the monies, the Government could not do the people's business. At a time like this we do not want any fancy accounting or bookkeeping. I do not want any of the fancy jargon or terminology used by the economists or the accountants. I want plain, ordinary, Bajan-English that we can understand around this table. I want figures that are credible and figures that reflect the truth.

I know that in the end, these amendments which have been served on us are simply going to be lumped in, and we are going to hear that we are going to pass all of these Heads as amended. We have not had any time to scrutinise these. I have said before, and I say it again, there is no way, therefore, that I can know what the true end cost of the move-ins are going to be. We are entitled to know that, because after all, we are expected to vote.

I hope that the two Ministers who are here and who have so steadfastly and skilfully avoided any discussion so far – they still have time – on the state of the economy, on the state of the Estimates, would before this debate is ended, give us these figures, not only for the sake of us in here, but for those in the public domain. The man in the street wants to know as well, because, in many instances, his future, his welfare, his employment will depend upon it, the Government being the largest employer.

It is a source of much regret to me that I am limited by the Standing Orders only to two hours and that time is fast approaching. It is a very great pity that things are not so structured that in here Senators might be permitted to speak more than once. It is a pity, too, Sir, that it is not possible for us to give away time. I know that there are many sitting at this table, some out there especially, who really do not want to speak, and it should be possible under the Standing Orders that they could give me ten or fifteen minutes of their time. I would have been grateful for it.

Laughter

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, that is my contribution on these Estimates of Expenditure for 1987–88. They leave me greatly disturbed. I have never seen them in such disarray. I have never seen such uncertainty about the total figures, the end figures. I have never found myself at the end of an Estimates contribution so unsure of where a particular department of Government was going, or what might be the fate of a particular programme. I do not believe that during the life of this Senate in 1987, we are going to see very many supplementaries, because I do not think that the Treasury is going to be able to afford many supplementaries. I am concerned at the rate not only of domestic borrowing, but of foreign borrowing as well, because I know that very soon the guillotine is going to come down not only on my speech, Sir, but on the Government's attempts to borrow externally to prop up their Current Account deficit. Nobody is going to lend you money for that kind of day-to-day housekeeping. I do not want to see Barbados in the regional pages of Caribbean newspapers, like we sometimes see other islands which are beleaguered, cannot pay the civil servants for two months or three months. I do not recall that in the past ten years we ever came to such a situation. I would not like to think that in 1987 that would happen. But when I look at what the task force says, when I look at these Estimates, when I look at the way in which the economy is structured today, when I look at the arguments going on in public between the Minister of Economic Affairs and the Minister of Finance, and when I listened to the Minister of the Public Service today, it is clear to me that we are in big trouble, and that, very soon now, we are indeed going to feel the pain.

The ball is now, as far as I am concerned, in the Government's court, and I do not really want to hear, as we have heard in here before that the two Ministers are not economists, they are only politicians and that the substantive Ministers are not in here to answer the questions. That is what in here is about. You should come in here prepared, and if you are not, you have to take your blows, and if I do not get the answers to these questions in here, Mr. President, they have to know that we will go into the public domain and then the public will offer answers to them.
3.10 p.m.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, Sir, I would like to approach the discussion on the matters before us from a rather different point of view. But before moving into the points which I had planned to speak on, I would like to make a brief comment, rather regretfully, but I think, necessary, about something that occurred in this Honourable Chamber earlier during the session. I refer, Sir, to what I think was a very inappropriate reference to a member of the public by Senator Lewis, not named by name literally, but so specifically mentioned as Managing Director of a particular newspaper as to leave identification very clear. I would like to submit that this was a matter in very poor taste.

The first matter, Sir, which I would wish to touch on is one of legislation. In the Throne Speech last year, Government indicated that it had in mind making a number of amendments, and I would wish to commend it for the statement of intended policy. Included there were references to the Liquor Licence Act and Landlord and Tenant Act, and I have no doubt there are fairly obvious changes needed in both of these. But I want to submit two things. One is that, to date, as far as I can judge, Government has brought no substantive legislation to this Chamber, and while one does not expect Rome to be built in a day, one would expect some evidence of progress in some of these directions, and such evidence is so far as I can see, non-evident. But an even more pressing matter for me, Sir, which I would like to raise in this Honourable Chamber, is that I think there is an urgent need for a comprehensive review of labour legislation.

The interesting thing about the Throne Speech was that it indicated certain concerns which the Government had, particularly with reference to employees. I share those concerns, and I would indeed wish to see Government act in accordance with what it intended. But I confess that my concerns cannot end with what appeared to be the end all and be all, the implications of what was stated in Government concerns.

I once suggested that there is a particular need, if I may repeat this, for a comprehensive review of existing legislation, because I have a feeling – and I do not pretend, so I would not wish to be misinterpreted to be claiming the professional knowledge of an attorney-at-law – I merely am speaking in the capacity of what I would consider a reasonably intelligent and informed citizen – that the existing legislation appears to be unduly weighted in favour of the employee. This is not a comment which I am making for the first time. Sometime ago I became involved in a public debate on this matter, and I want now to express the view I held and expressed then, that the pendulum would appear to have swung much too far in the direction favouring the employee. There was a time when it was clearly legislation strongly in favour of the employer. I guess human nature, being what it is the swing has gone too far in the opposite direction.

I want to submit, Sir, to you and to this Honourable Senate, a concern that is best put in this way – that both employer and employee have rights, and that an even-handed justice requires that the rights of both be adequately protected. I would conceive that in today's world, including Barbados, this may not be a particularly

popular point of view, but I do not think that its possible lack of popularity has anything to do with its intrinsic merit, and I wish to argue, as I have done before, that if we want a just society, then we must give as much attention to the rights of the employer as to those of the employee, for both are citizens under the law, and the rights of both must be protected. I believe that there will be other occasions on which one can expatiate and give particular examples in this connection. But I wish, through this means, to alert this Honourable Senate to some of these concerns.

Let me now, Sir, turn to the matter of Education. Here again, I would like to look in reasonable depth at some of the matters which I think the Government must increasingly pay attention to. I would not wish to have it understood, nor do I wish to imply, that Government is unaware of the matters that I intend to raise. But I think that part of the responsibility of the Senate is to share, through its discussions with the Government in power, concerns of citizens and indeed suggestions as to how Government could function, because I assume we would all agree that no Government, whichever party is in power, has all wisdom.

Let me take, first of all, Sir, the matter of primary education. As a professional educator, I am very concerned about the fairly evident shortcomings of youngsters leaving our school system. Some of these concerns have already been expressed by me in this Chamber. Others have been expressed in other fora, including the public media. I believe these are matters to which none of us can afford to be indifferent. None of these is a matter about which we, as a body, can be unconcerned.

I think particularly about the fairly evident lack of command, reasonable command, of the language which is, after all, our language. Whatever might be the antecedents by which we come to speak English, I think it is a fact that English, for the majority of us in this room, is our first language, and to have youngsters leave our institutions of learning – after five to 11 years, six years at primary level, at least, plus sometimes another 13 years at secondary level, indeed plus sometimes another three or four years at university level – with demonstrable inability to express themselves with reasonable competence, either in speaking or in the written form, is a matter that deserves our serious concern.

It seems to me that if we accept this, and I believe that it is a point of view that is so easily demonstrable that it is not likely to be seriously challenged, then we need to ask ourselves something about how can we at least seek to tackle the problem. I would like to suggest, Sir, that one of the things that we can try to do is to look more closely at the way in which teaching goes on in our schools, where the emphases are, how the emphases are placed, which and what methods are used, which approaches are used, when, where, and how. I have argued it in another place that we need now, perhaps, to go back a bit and pay far more attention to the structure of our language – what I called – teaching grammar in our schools.
3.20 p.m.

There are other aspects, Sir, which are equally disturbing. If one talks to youngsters, one gets a fairly strong feeling that, for example, written work, in a number of cases – I will not say all cases, that would be untrue – I will not say the majority of cases, because I do not have the statistical data on which to make such a statement – in a disconcertingly large number of instances, which come to one's knowledge, there are reports to the effect that work of students is not properly corrected by teachers, to the effect that, again in a disconcertingly large number of cases, far too frequent for one's ease of mind, work is "corrected" by pupils, perhaps under the teacher's direction. But any practising teacher of anyone who has practised will recognise that, except for some purely factual information, this is a very unreliable means to use, because judgment is involved, and a youngster of 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 of 14 or 15 would seldom be considered competent to make the kind of judgment as to whether an answer which is not right or wrong – 2 plus 3 equals 5, 5 plus 4 equals 9 – sort of thing – is acceptable.

Another concern clearly coming out, although perhaps the students do not put it in those words, is that when work is corrected by the teacher, it is returned so long after it has been handed in, to use that phrase, that its usefulness is, to all intents and purposes, lost. Let me correct that – much of its usefulness is lost. There is lacking the immediacy of effect if the work is returned shortly after it has been handed in.

There is another matter I would like to raise. I recognise that in this I differ significantly from the present Minister of Education, but I trust that he will respect this view just as I respect his right to express his own. I do not share the Minister's view, which I am pretty certain he has expressed in public, that the time has passed – I do not remember the exact words – words to the effect that he will spend no more time, or waste no more time on a review of matters like the school year, the length of the school day.

I wish to submit, Sir, with due respect to the present Minister, whose capabilities are not in question – please let me make that very clear – that both these are matters which in 1987 deserve serious reconsideration. Merely to continue doing something because it was done in the past is, in my view, the poorest of poor possible

reasons for doing something, and clearly any knowledge of educational systems, which I know the Minister has of other educational systems, would make it clear, would make it evident that the proportion of time which our youngsters spend in the classroom is by no means among the upper proportions of time in countries across the world, and we need, therefore, to ask ourselves just what it is we are doing.

If we look at what has happened in our school system, the facts are that the effective school year – and I am not talking about the number of weeks and days which the Ministry states officially constitutes the school year, I am talking about what I would call the effective school year – has been seriously diminished. Let us say it starts very early in September, exams now, I believe, actually start, some of them, in April, so that the effective school year for examination students is not September to July. Anybody who thinks that is living in a dream world which has no connection with the realities of 1987.

I am therefore asking very serious questions about the whole matter of how we organise the school programme in terms of time, and I wish to submit, through this Honourable Chamber, a view which I hope will be forwarded to the Minister of Education for his consideration and those of his professional colleagues and advisers in the Ministry, that this is a matter which deserves consideration and reconsideration and very careful examination and re-examination, the whole matter of how long should be the school day, how long should be the school year. Does it really make sense in the Caribbean to have vacation spanning from – I do not know, let us say – the middle of June, end of June through July through August? Is this the best way in which to organise our limited resources? If I can be presented with evidence that this is the best possible way, then I would at least seek to treat it seriously, but short of evidence that that kind of examination has taken place, I feel duty bound to press for a re-examination of this matter.

The next one or two points may be deemed minor, but I think that they have to do significantly with the prestige or diminishing prestige, as I see it, of heads of schools. If one visits schools – and I am not even talking about the primary schools, which tend on the whole to be less well provided – notice I say tend on the whole, I am not trying to make categorical, blanket statements – in terms of facilities than the secondary schools, if one ignores the primary schools and just looks at the secondary schools, if you visit some of the secondary schools you see heads – I was going to say in offices, but I would prefer to say cubicles, perhaps cubby holes would be a more appropriate phrase – which are far from appropriate to the responsibilities and dignity of the office of principal of a school. There is certainly little or no room for privacy. I can think of one office, and I will not mention the name, where the Head would be hard put to it to have three persons in that office where he, or she – let me put it that way – has to walk around and in and about boxes to get to his or her desk. Sir, I submit that this is inappropriate to a person who is expected, and I think reasonably so, to set an example to and to manage upwards of 1 000 youngsters in schools.

Another related matter, again a relatively minor one, but I do not think it is totally insignificant, is that one may ask, what's in a name. I would like to suggest that we ought to consider seriously getting rid of the phrase "Head Teacher". I feel discomfort when I hear a principal of a secondary school being addressed as "Head Teacher". It annoys me intensely every time I hear that. I cannot see any rationale for its introduction. I understand it is used in official correspondence. If I am wrong, I will gladly accept the correction. If I am right, then I say that it is most inappropriate in my view. I can see no reason why we should not return to the use of words like headmaster, headmistress, principal. Surely these are far more dignified, far more appropriate to the status and prestige of someone in that category.

I have already touched, I believe, in this Chamber on another matter – if I have not, I should have, so let me make sure I do now – and that is, Sir, that I think we need to ensure we make provision for adequate promotional opportunities for classroom teachers so that they do not feel constrained to leave the classroom in order to get appropriate promotions. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not saying, nor am I seeking to imply, that there are no promotional opportunities for teachers. What I am suggesting, Sir, is that from my knowledge of a number of teachers, they have felt that, in order to be promoted to increase their income beyond a certain point, they had to leave the classrooms and move into administration.

3.30 p.m.

I wish to suggest that a continuation of that state of affairs is inimical to the best interest of education, because what we often do is to take a very competent person, who has amassed years of sound professional experience, and one can almost say is at the peak of his or her capabilities of a classroom teacher, and put him or her into administration. I am not saying that administration does not require expertise, but it requires expertise of a totally different kind, and we lose, thereby, the experience, the wisdom, the insights that come from a person who has gained, not from going to a Dip. Ed course, or a M. A. course, or a Ph.D. course, but from classroom experience, which cannot be bought. It has to be earned, this is the only way one gets it, and we throw that all aside and put the person into administration. I am suggesting – if this Honourable House would permit me

– that that is madness. It is a waste of good human resources, and we need to re-examine this and to find alternative routes. Please let me add that if someone wishes to go into administration, I am not seeking to debar that person, but I think it is unfortunate that persons should feel constrained to leave the classroom in order to get reasonable promotion.

I wish to advance a view that I have advanced elsewhere. There was a time when it was apparently the view that the director of a hospital should be a professional in Medicine. We no longer hold that view and I do not think that either the professionals in Medicine or the hospital administrators feel that either or both has, or have been disadvantaged. Hospital administration requires certain skills for which we train the person, a surgeon, or paediatrician or X, Y, Z in the profession of Medicine has special skills for which we train the person, and I am arguing, Sir, that it is about time that we apply the same kind of logic to the school situation, that we employ somebody to run a school as a school administrator who will need to know about schools, to a certain degree, just as a hospital administrator must know something about the operation and functioning of a hospital. I wish to submit these matters, through this Honourable Chamber, to the Honourable Minister of Education.

I note, also, Sir, that, unless I have misread the figures, there appears to be only a token provision for adult education. On page 93, I see a figure of $100 or thereabouts. If I have misinterpreted this, I am quite certain I will be very quickly corrected by those who speak after I have closed. But if I have correctly interpreted it, then it worries me, because it seems to me that we are ignoring thereby the necessity to provide in any adequate form for a range of adult education facilities of, let us say, a very general nature, not adequately met by what is going on at the Community College, the polytechnic, the university, the Barbados Workers Union Labour College, or the Public Library system. All these make their own significant contributions. I am not knocking any of them. I am only saying that it seems to me that there is a case for a set of provisions that does not, as a group of provisions, fall logically under any one of those.

Sir, so far as adult education is concerned, let me take the opportunity to say something that I have not said in this Chamber before. In my view, neither this Government, and I would not wish to make any comments about other Governments in the region, nor the university, has accepted the importance of adult education. I can say this – and this can be easily checked, and it is beyond successful challenge – that the university has not yet accepted and given its blessings to the only professional training programme for teachers of adults in the region, the three year programme for teachers centred at the St. Augustine Campus. We cannot get university certification for that, and it has been going since the late 70s.

That programme was set up with the approval of the International Council for Adult Education. And as if that is not enough, it was set up under the guidance, and with the assistance, of the Ontario Institute For Studies of Education, which, Sir, for the record, is the Graduate School of Education of the University of Toronto. It was set up with the advice and guidance of people in the Department of Adult Education at that university, which offered degrees and diplomas in Adult Education. So it is not even as though the programme was put together hastily by people who had no competence, and yet, over the years, those of us, and I would have to say it that way, who were involved in it, were not able, and to this day have not been able, to persuade the university to give its blessing to this certificate. I wish to add that both of the successive Governments of this country, have failed to give recognition to that certificate.

Let me make a plea for something that the Principal of the Community College pleaded for at the last graduating ceremony, and that is for a set of awards comparable to those available to persons in Arts and Science which could be applied for specifically and which would be open to persons in technical and vocational areas. My regret is that that suggestion was not made years ago, but I think it is not too late, and I would hope that Government would treat that recommendation very, very seriously.

I wish to urge, Sir, that Government review its allocation of resources to schools. In correspondence which, I know, has reached the Ministry, I have tried to point out that there exist continuing major disparities between the provisions of staffing at secondary schools in the country. I have provided analyses in some detail, both to the Ministry and for public consumption through the media. The figures are not in dispute, they are taken directly from Ministry publications, but I am not certain that I see evidence that this idea has generated any serious attention.

Let me take the opportunity, also, to give credit where I think credit is due, and one is to the Minister. I have disagreed with him previously, let me support him on this matter. I was delighted that he took the view that rather than support the calls for additional sixth forms, he would see a better investment in the equivalent of a second Community College, if the additional facilities were acquired.

Finally, I think, on this matter, I want to touch on the whole question of the university, its resources and the extent to which it meets the needs of our country. Mr. President, according to the Estimates, it seems to me that

the subvention to the University of the West Indies is of the order of $19¾ million – $19 749 496, I believe, is the actual figure there out of a total of $155 million plus, which I put at something like 12.7 per cent. I suggest that that is a tremendous amount, and I am not saying, I would not wish to be misunderstood, that we should not spend that money on the University. What I am asking, Sir, is whether we are, in fact, spending the money in the most effective way, and I want to give two examples.
3.40 p.m.

Some time ago, I asked a question, through the Leader of the House, of the Minister of Education, to which I have not yet got a reply, and I hope that in due course I will get a reply. I asked about the respective costs of the N I Programme taught both at the University and at the Community College. I do not have the actual figures which I had hoped to have, but I am prepared to state, on my knowledge of the publicly indicated cost, that the economic cost at the University of the West Indies at the Cave Hill campus is some $8 000 in Arts, that is the lowest cost course per year. For Natural Sciences, it is higher, for Engineering more, for Medicine still more, so the minimum we are talking about is $8 000 that the Government pays for each student who goes there. I am not saying the Government should not pay. What I am saying is that when, in addition to the three year programme, we proceed to pay very high university salaries, and they are high – I had meant to bring a statement with me today, but I forgot – they were published in the Press within the past two to three months, because there was an advertisement for some posts – then you can appreciate what I am saying.

When we have the N I course, this is the equivalent of an "A" level course. That is exactly what it is a preliminary course to the degree programme, and when we teach that in the university, we are paying through our noses a very high cost for teaching which could be, has been and is being provided more than adequately at lower cost at the Community College. Indeed, the records will show that, on the basis of last year's N I examination, in at least one of the subjects the students at the Community College had a higher percentage pass rate than those taking the same programme at Cave Hill. These are facts that are on record.

I am saying, therefore, Sir, that I can see no logic in, nor justification for, continuing to support that programme at the university. I recognise that one cannot easily wave a wand and say you will stop it next year, but I am strongly of the view that Government ought to indicate immediately to the university that it will discontinue support of that programme, having given due notice.

I want to mention another programme where I think we are pouring money down the drain quite unnecessarily. Can you imagine, Sir, that we take up expensive university staff and pay them to teach a programme called Use of English? In the name of goodness, Sir! Sometimes I cannot help feeling that we act as though money is no object, though we are a poor and impoverished country. I cannot see any other way in which we can rationalise that. How can we, and we have done this for years and years, pay university staff to teach a course in the use of English? I will suggest that it is about time we stopped that. Take a similar approach and say, no, this nonsense must end and we will discontinue support after due notice has been given, and give due notice.

The next point I want to make, still in connection with the university, Sir, is that I believe, and I wish again to make the argument which I had made in public before, that, with all due respect to the Minister, whose public statements indicate that he does not share this view – but I respect him for his view, and I trust, as I said before, that he would respect my right to express a different one – we cannot afford in our poor country to continue the present practice of making no charge for university education. I am well aware of what Government has said its policy is. But that has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness or justification for it, and I am saying that that policy is an unrealistic one, and I propose later on to give, justification for this.

Let me explain what I am talking about, Sir. I believe that if you look at the Estimates for the Child Care Board, those have been cut. The allocation for the Child Care Board has been cut by something like $800 000, from $7 301 441 to $6 500 000. Sir, all that I am saying is that I believe we ought to change our policy and say to people, look, we are not going to make things more difficult for you to get into the university, and I wish that those who criticise would listen carefully to what I have said and not comment on what they would wish me to have said, which is a different matter entirely. I am not suggesting, and I wish to state this very clearly, Sir, that we ought to make it more difficult to get into the university. In fact, I would wish to see us liberalise it so that even more students who meet university entrance requirements could get in. But what I am saying is that when persons have completed their degrees, and when those persons are working, they ought to be required at that stage, after completion, after qualification, to repay to the Government of this country, something of the cost of their course, and I cannot see anything unreasonable in that. And I am saying more than that, that if that were done, then we would have funds to avoid cutting things like the Child Care Board grant, and to me there is no question as to which is the greater priority. I invite, Sir, the Government, through the Leader of Government Business in the House, to pass on these views.

Let me pass on now, Sir, to the handicapped and express appreciation for the very strong support given by the Minister, the Honourable Wes Hall, to the whole question of the handicapped. Sir, some of my legal colleagues, and in this case I am not including Senator Blackman, so that he is not to be indicted for anything I say – I deliberately did not turn to him for this information – have given some indication about where we are with the handicapped.

The Constitution under Chapter III, Section 23, protects against discrimination, by implication requiring equal, though perhaps, not identical facilities. The Education Act, I think it is Section 9, provides for the handicapped child to be educated in a manner suited to his or her requirements. The Education Act also empowers the Minister to remove from ordinary school and to provide special provision for youngsters who need those special provisions. The evidence available, Sir, is that if the Minister tries to do that, there would be very few places available. There is certainly an insufficiency of appropriate places, and yet both the Constitution and the Education Act, when put together, place very clearly on Government a responsibility to provide adequately for the needs of youngsters who are handicapped.

Sir, the legal view, a view shared by a number of other persons and myself, if I may add myself to that group, is that the Government has a responsibility to provide for every handicapped child what is required, and if it cannot do so directly through its own institutions, then it must seek to do this by an appropriate level of assistance to private institutions which cater to the handicapped. I am saying again, Sir, that if one looks at our situation logically, we have to choose between providing this level of assistance and making people who go through our university at Government expense, pay back some money, or let them continue with the free-for-all which they now have and not provide these resources. I have no difficulty in deciding which one we should do.
3.50 p.m.

I intend to do a little scenario, with your permission, Sir, and I should like to do this now. I am going to take two students, A and B. A leaves high school, Community College, what have you, goes to the university, and Government, without any hesitation whatsoever, is willing to invest a minimum of $24 000, because that is the minimum it takes. To the other person, who goes into the work world, Government effectively says, "No, we have no more money to invest in you. We may lend you money, we may assist you in getting a little bit of training, but we are not putting $24 000." There is no other student, there is no person outside of the university who gets that clear support, financial guaranteed support of a minimum of $24 000. I am saying that they are both citizens of our country, and I can see no reason why one should be treated with great largesse and the other one should get nothing. I am saying make A put something back into the kitty so that we can do more for the other. There are a whole lot of reasons, sound, and I think, incontrovertible arguments that can be advanced for the kind of case that I am making. I trust that those who disagree will deal with the arguments that I have put forward and not with pseudo-arguments that they themselves put up as straw men to knock down.

Let me take now in my remaining minutes, the matters of Health and Police. I do not think that there is any doubt that both this Government and its predecessor, as in so many things, share very similar views in principle. That is the view of a non-Government person, so I may be wrong, but as I see it, they share a number of views, concepts and precepts, and one of those, I think, is certainly a concern for health, as is education.

But I find some actions in the present situation – anomalous would be an appropriate word, if I had more information. Since I do not have all the information necessary to justify use of the word "anomalous", the most that I can say is lacking in understanding to me. For example, Government quite legitimately, has said repeatedly, that it proposes to make a thrust towards coping with drugs, and crime in general. Cheers, one would say! Great support! But when I look at the Estimates, Sir, I do not see again, unless I have been misinterpreting them, in which case I am sure I would be hastily corrected, I do not see this provision reflected. On page 81, as I see in the Estimates for 1986–87, is some $31 347 000; for 1987–88, as I see it, it is $31 245 000. In actual fact, it is something of a diminution, and I find it very difficult to understand how this can be related to the stated emphasis on giving additional support to the police. I would be happy, Sir, to receive an explanation, and I hope it would be an explanation and not merely a comment saying how stupid I was without further support of the indictment.

In terms of Health, some of my medical friends – I have medical friends, Sir, as well as legal ones – have drawn to my attention – in part because I asked, I would admit this – some concerns which they have about aspects of medicine. The one I wish particularly to refer to, Sir, is a matter of community-based medical services. I have been advised – and since I am on another professional ground, I would try to stick closely to my text and my notes – I cannot easily improvise, because it is easy to run astray – that the case for it is that if we had more health visitor nurses trained to function in this way, a number of things would happen. They would be able to, if there were a sufficient number of them, to do what is required, visiting all mothers within 48 hours of birth and continuing such visits for the next three months. The implication is that those facilities do not now exist.

What would be the outcome of this? I was assured that the medical people could easily count on things like an increase in the degree of breast feeding. You might say, so what? But if there is an increase in breast feeding, again the medical people tell me this is likely to result in a diminution of the purchase of powdered milk, and even the non-communists like myself will recognise that if you do not have to purchase powdered milk, then you do not have to spend X dollars of foreign currency for that purpose.

They go further and they tell me that this kind of support would not only lead to a lower incidence of respiratory problems, of gastroenteritis and of allergies in later life – so it is not just the child, but the child as he passes through into adulthood – but that it is likely to lead to improved day-to-day care of the children and overlapping directly into my own professional field, it would provide an opportunity for parents to be helped to understand and to come to grips with the developmental needs of the child.

I can assure you, Sir, that this is one of the areas in which we are sadly lacking. As I believe I have taken the opportunity to do in the past, I have given praise to the pre-natal clinics and the programmes involving their use. But what is very clear is that those tend to focus on, let us say, the fairly straightforward needs of the child, bathing and feeding the child, taking its temperature. All of those are important, nobody is denying that, but I am not aware, Sir, of any carefully planned and pushed – if one could use that – implemented programme to help the parent understand the developmental needs of the child. Parents still continue to say to a two or three year year-old child, "Do not worry me" or "Child do not worry me any more, I am too busy", because they do not realize how important it is to talk to the child.

We have documentary evidence from research in the Caribbean – not North America, although we have it there, too – that youngsters fall behind in their intellectual development simply because parents do not talk to them. How is the parent going to know this? We feel that the electrician must be trained, and the doctor, the nurse, the attorney-at-law and the painter. You name it. We do not seem to recognise by our actions, whatever we may say, that the parent has to be taught. This knowledge is not intuitive, Sir.

My medical friends also advise me that if we could implement, in proper form, this programme of health visiting, it might well lead to a lower demand for admission to hospital, with clear implications in terms of the demands for the hospital beds and nurses. It might well lead to the possibility of earlier discharge of youngsters from hospital, because there would be somebody to follow up. So one wins both on the swings and on the roundabouts, which is rather unusual, because the normal phrase is if you win on the one, you lose on the other. This is a case where you win, whatever you do, and I do not see any reason why we should pour scorn on or ignore this view.

4.00 p.m.

In addition, I have been assured that it would make easier the identification of critical children, and that is the specific phrase which I put in quotes, Sir, here in my notes, because this conveys a special concern of the medical body, youngsters who are at greater risk for one reason or another, who have particular problems than others.

If those nurses are to be provided, then we have to provide funds to pay them. We have to provide funds to train them. I submit, Sir, that these are matters that deserve the serious attention of our Government, that provisions along these lines will be more effective and more efficacious in terms of medical health maintenance, that they will help to change, as the medical people have put it – I am using their words – the focus much, much faster than is now the case, from remedial to preventive, and this is what they are asking for. I wish to submit, Sir, that this case is one which deserves attention from the Government of the day, and I would strongly urge the consideration of these matters with the appropriate professional bodies.

Sir, I come now to what I have called a set of miscellaneous matters. The first of these is the Ministry of the Public Service. I do not understand a number of things, Sir, and I would suggest there is insufficient information available at the moment to permit one to make definitive statements about the Ministry, about its role and its operation. I know that statements have been made, but I am not certain that those give the whole picture, and there are certainly grounds, I believe, among the public for uneasiness and concern. For example, one does not know whether there have been other encroachments – and I use the word deliberately and, I think, advisedly – into other Ministries or other bodies, not necessarily Ministries, but public reports suggest that there is good ground for believing this or being concerned about it. One does not know what other encroachments, if any, will take place, or whether such encroachments have ended, or whether more are yet to come. Even a non-economist must feel surely, Sir, concern about the transfer to the Ministry of responsibilities and controls normally attaching to the Ministry of Finance, and I will have to confess that, I do not find the statements that have been made by the Minister of the Public Service convincing on this matter, with due respect to him, Sir.

What is more, you know one has to get worried when public figures at the head of Government make statements like, according to the report, "any number can

play". What does this mean? What are the implications? I can only say, using the words of a well-known book, that it seems to offer naught for our comfort. As a citizen of this country, Sir, I have to confess.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: What do you mean by encroachment, though, in the sense that you are using "encroachment?"

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Am I expected....

Mr. PRESIDENT: You said something about the Government is encroaching. Can a Government encroach on a Government?

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: No, please, Sir. My statement was, if I may be permitted to repeat it – one does not know.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I only want to know from the point of view of the record what do you mean by encroachment?

Asides

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: I am going to explain, Sir. I am just waiting for the asides to stop. I am not competing with them.

What I was saying, Sir, one does not know whether the Ministry of the Public Service will – I used the word "encroach" – extend its tentacles into and bring itself into aspects of other ministries. That is what I mean, Sir, by encroaching. The Ministry of the Public Service is here, and we have noted that its responsibilities have stretched into other Ministries. I define them as tentacles.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I wanted to know what you meant by encroachment in that it is the same Government, so I want to know what were they encroaching on. I do not take it that one Government can encroach on itself.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Sir, I have tried to make my words very clear, and I will repeat them, that in my view, the Ministry of the Public Service has aggregated to itself and has been given areas of responsibility drawn clearly from other Ministries, and in my view, therefore, has encroached on those responsibilities.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, Senator Shorey. What I mean to say is that a Ministry of a Government in power cannot be encroaching on the same Government.

Asides

Mr. PRESIDENT: He cannot be encroaching. It has to be from another Government, not from the same Government. There is one Prime Minister. You cannot be encroaching in our Constitution. Our Constitution does not permit encroachment within the same Government.

Asides

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Sir, you have asked me to explain....

Mr. PRESIDENT: What you meant. I heard what you said.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: I have explained what I meant, Sir. With due respect, I am not saying that you need accept it. I have explained it in very clear terms to myself.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is just like saying the Minister of Education can encroach on the Minister of Labour. He cannot. If he takes over, he is taking over. It cannot be an encroachment. I am only trying to get it clear as to the constitutional term that you are using. There cannot be any encroachment in the system that we have in Barbados. Do not allow the lawyers to your left to confuse you.

Asides

Laughter

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Sir, the next point is one which, I believe, will be raised more substantively and in far greater detail by a colleague, but it has to do with the resources available to Senators. I hope that when this point is raised at greater length, it will receive due consideration by this honourable body.

I also find, Sir, some other things that do not quite mesh in my mind. There is, for example – and Senator Miller raised this, but my notes were prepared long before she spoke, and without consultation with her, so I think I am free to make them without, I hope, being accused of copying from her – there is the Ministry's statement, on the one hand, that it wishes to divest itself of Heywoods and the Hilton, and almost simultaneously, relatively speaking in terms of time, there is the proposal to buy Harrison's. I do not understand. To me, that is a conflict in policy.

There is the matter of Defence and Security. I looked at the Estimates for 1986–1987 and I see something of the order of $19 664 000 plus. I look at the Estimates for 1987–1988 and I see, as I understand it, estimates for precisely the same figure. I do not understand how to interpret this when the Prime Minister has said repeatedly that he proposes to reduce the size of the Defence Force. It is possible that I misunderstood his statement, in which case I will no doubt, be corrected.

But if I did understand him correctly, then I do not understand – I do not see such a reflection in this.

Finally, Sir, and I recognise that my time is within about two minutes of ending, report – I would not say rumour – has it that the Governor of the Central Bank will not have his contract renewed. If this does indeed come about, then I would like to record, as a citizen, my own appreciation to him for the service he has rendered to Barbados through assistance to the management of the economy of this country.

Thank you, Sir.

4.10 p.m.

SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN: Mr. President, having studied the Estimates 1987–1988, there are a number of questions which I should like to ask, and I will start with the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Quite a lot has been said about our foreign policy, and I should like to start with London. Even before I do this I should explain a bit of the rationale behind my statements here. I do this because I have heard it said that out of every dollar spent on Government, the Foreign Ministry really takes two cents. I do not know if that is the current ratio, but this is what I understand, and therefore I think we ought to have them accounting to a great extent for their policy in many matters.

I observe that there are apparently only about 150 people employed in this Ministry, and, therefore, that it is not very labour-intensive. The 150 people I see even include the local administration. In London, we hear that there must be approximately over 60 000 Barbadian nationals or descendants of Barbadians in the United Kingdom, and, therefore, they ought really to be very well represented. We have heard that the High Commissioner there and the Deputy High Commissioner, who they tell us has lots of empathy and who has been doing quite a lot with the nationals, have been able to look after the interests of these nationals very well over the years, but within recent times we have been hearing that Mr. Owen Eversley is or is not appointed the Deputy High Commissioner, and it may be just as well if the Minister of Foreign Affairs would enlighten us and tell us something further about this, because I do think that, for such a large body of persons, we ought to have proper representation in the United Kingdom and that they ought to be very well served.

While I am on the matter of the United Kingdom and of our Barbadian nationals, it is my understanding that a number of them have returned to Barbados and that the pensions which they earned while working in the United Kingdom were frozen at the point which was given to them when they came home. I happen to know that in the case of the nationals of Barbados who are receiving pensions from certain other countries, when there is an increase granted to others, even though they may be resident in Barbados, they also receive this increase, and I should like to ask the Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs if it is possible or if in fact any consideration has been given to the possibility of obtaining for the local Barbadians who are now back home and retired the benefit of an automatic increase just as is granted to the Barbadians who have served in other countries. This, I know, has been a sore point for a number of them who have spoken with some of us, and it would be greatly to the credit of our Government if they could state that they have been able to effect some such change.

We can go over to the European Continent and see what is happening with our Foreign Affairs there. I think of the Embassy in Brussels, for example. I know that the ACP/EEC involvement makes it necessary to retain a presence there, but I am asking, how much are they actually doing for us financially? I am thinking of specific things. I know that, some time ago, I had to assist in a specific project here where two of us went to the EEC Representative here and we were able to obtain about a quarter of a million dollars for a certain project. What I am saying is that a lot of this is really available if only it were made known to our people, and that is what the financial aspect of this project is all about. Are we really seeking out the opportunities which are there for our people in Europe? That is the sort of thing I should like to hear more about from our Embassy in Brussels.

I will be a bit more specific. There are a number of organisations which have their counterparts in Barbados, which can apply for specific grants to be given to them because of their kinship to those organisations, or because for one reason or another they qualify. I can speak with authority on this, because, as I said, in that case it may have been a little time before they got it, but we got about a quarter of a million dollars granted to us because we took the time to do our research, and I should like to see more Barbadian organisations benefiting from the EEC. I should like to know that our representation in Brussels, therefore, has the opportunity to have a Commercial Attache there as well. I know we have to operate within certain financial constraints but is it not more worth our while to have one such person covering so many countries and deriving for Barbados far more benefit than the additional expenditure, say, of a single additional salary would be?

I move on, Sir, to Caribbean representation. I hope that we will soon have someone accredited to countries such as Haiti and Suriname. I appreciate that there is a certain state of flux in the present political situation in these two countries, but it does seem as if Haiti is rather out in the cold at the moment. I know, because I have visited Haiti, and I can say that in recent years there was a Consul there for Barbados who certainly served us very well indeed, and it would be very desirable for us to re-establish our diplomatic links with Haiti,

when this, of course, is politic, Mr. President, and also with Suriname when that is possible, when their political situation returns to normalcy.

I should also like to ask the Minister, what is the position with respect to the Guatemala/Belize problem; that is, what is our stance there? So much is said about that matter and also about the Guyana/Venezuela relationship. We have bilateral agreements with these two countries, but what exactly is Barbados' position? What is the stance with regard to those and also with regard to the U.K./Argentina problem as far as it affects the Falkland Islands? I do not know if there is a P. R. Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but I think that others like myself would like to know exactly what is the stance of Barbados on these matters.
4.20 p.m.

I would like to say that I think we are doing a very fine job in Canada. Certainly, our High Commissioner there is doing an excellent job. But there is Toronto and there is Montreal, and I should like to think that it would be possible soon for us to have some kind of Commercial Attaché in those cities as well, whose responsibility it would be, to directly see that we improve our financial position with regard to those countries, for example, things like exporting lots of furniture which would be knocked down. They tell me that the North American enjoys putting it together himself, and that kind of thing, just as an example. We would have to have someone out there who is actually working at this kind of thing.

Even though the High Commissioner himself visits those cities from time to time, certainly, he is far too occupied with other matters to give this his day-to-day attention, and I submit, Sir, that perhaps, the cost of an additional body in one or both of those cities would be to the advantage of Barbados.

If we look across the ocean, we see the African states. Because of our ethnic ties and our historical ties, I would also like to see closer relations with some of the African states. I think of Togo, for example, whose capital, Lomé, has given its name to the Lomé Convention, although I do not know exactly what we subscribe to there. I would like to hear more about that.

I should like to know that our relationship with Nigeria is strengthened, and this brings me to another matter. I remember that, some years ago, when General Kuanda was in Barbados, and I think it was in 1975, he was reported to have donated about half a million dollars, Barbados, and I am asking if the Minister can tell us what has become of this half a million dollars. I think it was after the Commonwealth Summit in Jamaica that General Kuanda was here, and that would be quite a sizeable sum of money. Is it just there lying idle? What has become of it? What was done with it? It is important that we retain and improve our cultural links with the African States.

If nothing has been done, I think that we ought to, perhaps, commemorate his visit. I do not mean by something such as a stature or anything like that, but I mean that if you were giving a scholarship, perhaps, we could give it his name. We could do a simple thing like that, but, something which would, perhaps, encourage others to do likewise. I am not suggesting that because he has given this we should spend a whole lot of money to commemorate his visit, but what exactly are our relations with the African States? We are spending a whole lot of money in this Foreign Ministry and we need to have it broken down. We need to have it spelt out for the benefit of the community.

Another matter which causes me some concern, Mr. President, is that of terrorism. It has been becoming increasingly fashionable, or, I should say, it has been happening anyway in certain parts of the world, that there are some unfortunate acts of terrorism. Has our Government issued a statement condemning the acts of terrorism which, even now, are so very prevalent? What are we really saying about these acts of terrorism? Have we made it clear that we openly condemn the actions of persons who put innocent lives at risk?

This has caused me quite a lot of concern, and I think that the actions, whether they be of states or organisations, are crimes, I think they should be treated as such and we must place on record our abhorrence to these acts. This should also form part of a general policy statement, I think, which would accompany the actual facts and figures which we have received.

Asides

SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN: The bottom line is, however, that developing countries must so conduct their foreign affairs to be able to sell their goods and products at remunerative prices. That, really, is the bottom line. How much is being done in those circles to affect a reduction of the interest rates on our international debts? That really is one of the major functions, in my opinion, of the Foreign Service. We see block figures here but we do not know how they are broken down.

We can turn our attention to the South American Continent, and I think, in particular, of Brazil, which is the largest country of the South American Continent. It is important that we strengthen our ties in Brazil. We have certain ethnic and cultural ties. I have been there in very recent times, and I can say that in one city they have some cultural shows which are very definitely akin to those in Barbados. There are, in fact, some Brazilians of Barbadian descent, and we cannot afford to ignore a country as large as Brazil. I think it should be high on

our priority list that we should establish a Consulate or an Embassy in that country as soon as our finances permit this, Mr. President. We really need to have very much stronger bilateral ties there.

I know it may have been said in the past that we did not have the airline links, but now that we have direct and indirect links to Brazil; it is important, in my opinion, that we establish some sort of link with that country. I am thinking, for example, that, as far as I know, Brazil has a service from Caracas, but I do not see anything here which would indicate that there is very much money in the budget which could possibly be used to service Brazil. I should like to see that situation improved.

The matter of graduation, as it is called, has also caused me some concern. It is important that the doctrine of graduation, as it is understood or applied by the United Nations and the World Bank and other financial institutions, be rejected. Barbados, it would seem to me, is to be the victim, among other developing countries, of this so-called graduation. Does this mean that there is a penalty for good government, Mr. President? If you manage to govern wisely and well, will you not be able to progress beyond a certain point? Are they saying thus far and no further to certain developed nations? As soon as we let you reach a certain plateau that you must stay there and you must no longer be allowed to progress beyond that point? Certainly, this doctrine of graduation must be rejected out-of-hand, and we have to explain to them why it is undesirable for us to be graduated. Certainly, there will be a matter of retrogression, because nothing is really standing, and we really would not just stand still. I should like the Minister to let us know, therefore, if there has been a reversal of the position of these financial institutions, and if we are once again eligible for certain types of aid from which we had been debarred.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. President, I am also concerned when I look in the Estimates and I see certain sums of money for the purchase of vehicles. I understand, for example, that there have been perhaps requests for far more vehicles than we have permitted, but I wonder if we are not being a penny wise and a pound foolish. By that I mean, and we certainly were regaled in this Chamber quite recently by some details of what has happened in Canada in respect to one of the vehicles, would it not be wiser for use to replace more of the vehicles rather than spend large sums of money which I see shown here in the Estimates on maintenance? I submit that it might, indeed, be far better economics to spend more money replacing those vehicles.

I should like at this time to sound a word of caution. I do not think that the longest fishtail cadillac or any such vulgarity is necessary, Mr. President, for one to represent one's country properly. I do not think that it is necessary for you to impress, or you may impress unfavourably, certain other Governments which know of your poverty by buying that type of vehicle, but I should like to see us replace the vehicles which need to be replaced sooner, and so, in my opinion, effect even greater savings. There is a very large sum here under repairs. I do not want to spend time looking at it but it is somewhere I think on page 107.

I should like to turn my attention to a similar matter, acquisition of property. My reason for saying this, Mr. President, is that I observe that – I think it is the second biggest head under Foreign Affairs after Personal Emoluments – in New York we are about to enter into new negotiations to lease premises again. I understand that we are likely to be offered them at very high costs indeed. Would it not be more economical to purchase a property rather than to find ourselves engaged in this every few years? It may even be economical to purchase a property which would have some lettable space and get some worthwhile returns for it. It might be good to get some knowledgeable nationals to examine this in the cities to which this applies and see if it would not be better to do this, but certainly not to spend the amount of money which I see in the Estimates for rents, knowing that this is likely to come up shortly. I submit, with all humility, Sir, that we go back, have another look at this, and see if it would not be more in the interest of the country to purchase some properties and avoid these excessive rental and lease charges.

In similar vein, I understand that in Venezuela and in Trinidad we do not have properties of our own. Would it not be wise for us to acquire properties in these two territories at this time? My reason for saying this, Mr. President, is that because of their present currency conditions, it would seem to me as if this would be the time. I have visited the embassy in Caracas on more than one occasion within very recent times, and I can tell you that it would seem as if we would certainly effect a saving by buying our own property there. The bolivar is very much depressed at this time, just as the Trinidad dollar is, and we should take a very serious look at doing this.

When one goes out there and buys a property, the furniture may not be compatible, the decor may be changed, the lady of the house may want to have something different, and they are constantly changing the leases, and it does seem to me as if one would run into a lot more expense doing it this way and constantly changing the houses which we are renting. I would therefore suggest, while I am fully cognisant of the financial constraints, that it might be more in the interest of Barbados to purchase at this stage properties in Venezuela and in Trinidad in order to effect savings.

Mr. President, I should like to support the Estimates as they are presented.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I do not propose to occupy anything like my allotted hour, but I want to take up one or two points, at least in the spirit of Senator Shorey's remarks. We are concerned at Estimates' time with money. Senator Miller was at pains to point out our concern with the amount of money we either win or lose in the whole Estimates exercise. Senator Shorey, as I read the spirit of his intervention, while not denying the importance of money, pointed to areas where the deployment of that money was in question. Many of the things that he suggested do not really cost any money at all. Its expense lies in the area of imagination and the best use of our resources, and I want to draw attention to three or four things which might follow on from that.

I have now been in the Senate for a fairly long time, and on each Estimates' occasion I rose to draw attention to a national asset which has been disregarded and put aside year after year, and I refer to the Richard B. Moore Library. Now Government acquired this library, an outstanding library of negro literature, on the occasion of our independence. Heaven knows what state it is in. The Ministry of Education and Culture, I believe, is responsible for this asset, but it lies in ruins, perhaps in mildew, somewhere in a room at Cave Hill. I think this is a really disgraceful use of a national resource at a very time when the whole excitement of roots, the theme of roots, is among us. Here we have a collection of books made by a Barbadian who has attained international respect for his collection, which has been made available to the Government, but which lies neglected. It seems to me we deserve a better treatment, Richard Moore deserves a better treatment, and we also deserve a better treatment, and it is going to cost no money, or very little indeed, to make sure that these books are stored and used for the benefit of the young population.

I must refer, too, to the Reference Section of our Public Library. This is another hardy perennial. There is a whole period of our history – and one is reminded by the recent Emancipation series lectures of the importance of the Thirties to our new vision of ourselves, a whole period of newspapers to which the public has no access. They lie crumbling in the Reference Section, withdrawn from service, and rightly so, because they are so fragile, they cannot be used. All they need is to be put on microfilm or microfiche. Year after year, I ask that question, and I get the most cosmetic answers and no action at all. The papers are still unused. It seems that we are not worth anything if we cannot take care of that.
4.40 p.m.

I raise this in connection with the preparations that we shall have to make for celebration of our 350th anniversary of Parliament in 1989. Those two assets we have could form part of a very interesting national exhibition. Yet, we do nothing about it. Nineteen eighty-nine is not very far off, and if our celebration of that event is to take the size and comprehension that I expect it ought to, it seems to me that an exhibition of our national treasuries ought to be a part of it. It is not too soon, therefore, for us to pay attention to these things.

I want to make an overall comment on the whole question of this Estimates exercise. We are presented with large volumes of books, large numbers of statistics, bits and pieces of paper year after year, and we see how much money we spent and how much money we propose to spend. But there is nowhere in the documents which offers us any chance at all of looking back and seeing how the money we last voted was spent, how efficient was the handling of the money we have at our disposal. This is not satisfactory. None of us in our domestic capacity would keep shelling money out unless the last money we handed out was reasonably well spent. We do not know, and we are given no opportunity to know in this Estimates exercise.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Applause

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, as a neophyte rising after the last four Senators who have spoken, I believe that I am going to have to try to put my best foot forward to even half-way match the performances of those Senators. We were subjected, Sir, to three discourses of an educational nature and one, obviously by Senator Miller, mostly of a political nature, which has to be understood.

Before I get into the topics on which I should like to make a few comments, I should like to make two observations. One is of a congratulatory nature and the other one is an observation made while listening to the Estimates Debates in the Other Place.

I should like, Sir, to take the opportunity to publicly congratulate the Minister of Finance in the Other Place for what I consider to be an excellent presentation of the Appropriation Bill. I think he did justice to this country of Barbados in his presentation.

The other comment I should like to make concerns the closing of the Estimates Debate in the Other Place, and it refers to the contributions made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of Government's Business in the House of Assembly. Both of these goodly gentlemen expressed deep satisfaction that the Estimates Debate of 1987–88 was easily the best debate they had experienced in their political lives in this country. That,

in my view, Sir, speaks very highly for the level of politics in our country. I think that gone are the days of the haranguing, when politicians thought that people of the ordinary class could not understand the problems of the country without the use of abusive language, the calling of a whole number of names and the use of scurrilous language. They are now a lot more analytical as they listen to political people.

I should now like, Sir, to deal with a few matters I am going to address my mind to in this Estimates Debate. I should like to remind this Honourable Chamber that against the background of public concessions, both to the business houses and to people by way of personal relief on their Income Tax, the Government, obviously, has to pay great attention to the area of revenue collection. The three areas of revenue collection are in the areas of Income Tax, Customs Duty and Land Tax.

Let me first deal, Sir, with Inland Revenue. It is extremely important that the Government has to make a very concentrated effort in the collection of outstanding debts, or overdues, as they are known, which are owed to the Inland Revenue Department. It is to my knowledge that there are large quantities of Corporation Tax, and Personal Income Tax which are past due for as much as seven to ten years. I am submitting, Sir, that the Government needs to institute strong collecting measures, which must be enforced, to get this money off the road to assist Government's finances. People just cannot continue to joy ride on this department of Government.

As a strong measure, especially for the collection of Income Tax in relation to persons, I am suggesting that Government institutes, like the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, what is called a Tax Clearance Certificate when people want to go on overseas trips. This, I am sure, Sir, would force many persons who owe the Government large sums of money to find the money in order to clear their indebtedness to the Inland Revenue Department, because travelling, especially to business people, is of great importance. I feel, Sir, that this is one measure the Government should seek to institute without delay in this very financial year.

Another area where great attention must be put is in the area of the collections of National Insurance and of the Pay-As-You-Earn. However, I realise that Government has taken some steps in the area, because I know a circular has come from the Ministry of Finance to the various statutory boards in relation to the award of contracts whereby one qualification for the award of your contract is that your National Insurance payments must be clear and that your Pay-As-You-Earn must be paid up. This, in my view, is a step in the right view, but we have to be tougher than that.

Now that the Government has reduced Corporation Tax by as much as 10 per cent, I feel that some strong measures must be brought to bear on the business community to force them into arranging loans with their financial institutions to loan them monies to pay their outstanding Corporate Tax, because it is without doubt, Sir, that the Government was very kind and very liberal in the granting of that relief of Corporate Tax. In exchange for that the business community owes it to the Government now to clear all those outstanding arrears which I know corporate businesses owe to Inland Revenue.

4.50 p.m.

Land Tax. I believe, Sir, that there is need to upgrade the Division of Land Tax to deal more efficiently with the collection of this tax. I believe it will be to Government's benefit to have a Collection department operating on the same lines as some commercial houses, dealing strictly on a day-to-day basis with the sending out of collectors and with making calls to people whose Land Tax is in arrears.

However, Sir, I believe that in that area, the problem is a little deeper than probably even I can see. I believe that the records of that department are somewhat behind hand, and in spite of the department being computerised, I believe that somebody will have to be instituted by Government to be able to do sort of a follow-up on this department to make sure that not only current Land Tax bills are sent out, but that arrears bills are sent out to remind people of their indebtedness to the department. All of us who are in business know that it is a day-to-day process of calling people to collect your cheque or sending a bill to collect a cheque. This sort of collection is not beyond the Government. It would pay Government to employ another 12 or more persons in that department – call it the Collection Department – in order to carry out the exercise of which I have made mention.

The other area of concern to me, as far as collection of Government monies is concerned, relates to the Customs Department. In recent times, a number of persons and it has been advertised, too, by the airline people have been going to Margarita, Venezuela and to Puerto Rico with bags, which could hold 70 or 80 pounds, empty and are returning with them filled with clothing and then selling it here. One wonders, Sir, if Customs is deriving the fullest benefit for the Government of this country from that sort of activity.

One also has to remember that there is another problem relating to that sort of purchase, and it relates to clothing manufacturing. It is my considered opinion that if our people in clothing manufacture had the necessary initiative, all that would be necessary for them to do is to take the periodic visit to MDC countries or to New York, Miami, or wherever and acquire some samples, set up their own working operation here, make the identical garment and

then market the garment here. But I certainly feel, Sir, that to encourage that sort of large scale hustling, or whatever you would call it, is against the better interest of this country in relation both to the tax structure and to the employment problem.

I would like, Sir, to draw this Chamber's attention to an ad which I saw appearing in an *Advocate* Newspaper of last week. This ad was presented by an organisation called Scotties, which has a large chain of companies operating mainly out of Miami, and the ad says quite clearly that you may make one stop at Scotties, collect all the items which you will require and, they will send you these items containerized.

The problem that I see in that is this. Mortgage money is now readily available for the construction of houses. A person who wants to buy a house and has the Miami taste is not going to go to Miami with the kind of money which is lawfully allowed by the laws of this country, because that sort of money could not do the sort of purchasing which would make it viable to him. You would need, off-the-cuff, in the vicinity of US$10 000 to $15 000 to go on such a shopping trip. What that will mean is the collection of U.S. notes which you would have to take in order to make it a viable proposition for you. That would be a way of breaking the foreign exchange laws of this country, and an ad like that should be taken up at the Ministry of Finance and should be followed through in order to determine how people are getting that kind of money as individuals to purchase from such an organisation.

My own view, where the business community is concerned, is that that kind of trading can be easily followed, because we have to have authentic invoices to present to our Customs. But when you do shopping on a personal basis, it is quite easy, and to my knowledge, that you can have invoices of a greater reduced value, so that when you come to pay the Customs here, really and truly it is tantamount to defaulting the Government of revenue. So this is an area that I think that Government has to pay some attention to. It is always good to nip a thing in the bud, and that suggestion is made so that the Government could nip that one in the bud.

There is another problem that I would like to draw to the attention of this Chamber in relation to Customs. From my experiences – I know there are probably about three other business people in this Chamber and I believe that they would have similar experiences – quite frankly, I often think that the Customs Department has to be greatly understaffed. Maybe the Minister of the Public Service could have a look at that. But let me explain to you, Sir, what transpires when a shipment arrives for the merchants. First, you are only allowed to have the goods at the port for a total of five days before demise charges begin to accumulate. As a rule, Sir, the documents take at least three days to be processed by the Customs Department, which gives you only two days to remove the cargo from the port. If you take organisations that are engaged in the same type of business like me, lumber yards and people who do that heavy trading, and you have a large shipment at the port, normally a shipment like that would take anywhere between five and ten days alone to remove from the port, and the demise charges, as I said, begin at five days. You do not get back your Customs documents until after the third day. The demise charges, Sir, are added to the cost of the goods, and this obviously increases the price to the consumer. I feel, Sir, that the Customs Department needs to be looked at in that area. I do not understand Customs very well myself. It appears to me that three days is a disproportionately long time for a merchant to be waiting on a document to clear his goods from the Port.
5.00 p.m.

I would like now, Sir, to move to an area which is, obviously, of great importance, to the overall development of this country in these present times. Regardless of what anybody would say, I know that the sugar industry has great problems. As a matter of fact, I know that the whole of agriculture is a problem, and that there is no way where total reliance should be put on this. As a matter of fact, as the years go on, it appears to me as though the reliance on agriculture has to give way to tourism. That is my personal view, that is not necessarily the Government's view.

Sir, the Government seeks through its Board of Tourism to do two things; to increase on a continuous basis the level of tourist earnings; and secondly, to achieve maximum employment in the industry, directly and indirectly, and reduce the level of seasonal and other under-employment in the industry.

Like in all good businesses, Sir, there are problems. The three main problems of the tourist industry are as follows: the increasing degree of seasonality in the industry, the general decline in the number of tourist arrivals and, thirdly, the declining levels of income and profitability, particularly to smaller enterprises.

The Government is anticipating arrivals in 1987 to be in the vicinity of 380 000 and, with their thrust, they are looking at what I consider to be a marginal increase for 1988, when arrivals would be 400 000. The Government, through its Tourist Board, has embarked on a dynamic marketing and promotional plan in order to achieve the desired levels of arrivals. Greater emphasis is being placed on the summer trade, that is during the months of July and August, and during the fall, September to October. Ongoing discussions with the airline people, along with the efforts of our overseas embassies, should achieve the positive results which the Government is looking for.

Government is aware that the pricing mechanism, both of board and lodging, is critical to the success of Government's efforts. In other words, what you find happening here, Sir, is that as soon as the business begins to look good, restaurateurs and hoteliers automatically increase the price of their food, even if they cannot do it for the rooms. This, obviously, is no secret to people visiting here, and when this begins to happen and the news gets out, then people shy away from Barbados and go to other destinations that are just as attractive, but where food and services are rather more reasonable.

During the course of the year Government began to do promotion to attract teams of sportsmen to visit our country. What that does is not only get the sporting teams, but you get their friends, families and supporters of their teams coming along with the teams. That, to me, is a step in the right direction, because in that way we would be able to get a wide diversification of people coming here to participate in varying sports, not only cricket and football, but in volley ball; tennis and all that sort of thing.

However, we need though to improve our sporting facilities in order to attract the international-type player to our country. I would have very much liked to see an improvement of many of our places of scenic and natural beauty, such examples being Cove Bay – not because I live nearby – Archer's Bay, a place called Broadey in St. John. There are many such areas in Barbados which I think that the Government, and not only through the NCC, could generally upgrade these places of interest in order that when tourists come here, they could have more and more places to visit, rather than just be attracted to Harrison's Cave and the things that we currently have.

We need, Sir, to pay more attention to our culture and arts. More use should be made of the Barbados Museum, the Frank Collymore Hall, the Queen's Park Theatre. Shows of an indigenous nature, I submit, would attract visitors to our country. Indeed, Sir, we could invite talented artists from Caribbean countries to beef up our entertainment. Upgrading of our restaurants, bars, discos and other places of entertainment is desirable. I feel, Sir, that we need to make use of the Police Band which, in my view, is an outstanding orchestra. I believe we may be able to persuade the Barbados Defence Force to have a band, these sorts of bands would the effect of interesting the tourists, other than just the disco music, the jazz and so on. These military bands, I think, would cause some interest to the tourists.

We need, in our continuing development of tourism, to pay more attention to our infrastructural development; that is, our roads and public amenities along the same roads, designed particularly for use of our visitors.

There is need for a rapid removal of garbage from the streets. I feel that the removal of garbage is something that we could look on as how we looked on it in the old-time days when I lived in the city. By 6 o'clock the morning the streets were completely cleaned. I feel that we would have to discuss this matter with the unions, because I do not know what the unions say in relation to times of work and overtime, but certainly the times in the mornings that I see garbage lying around is by far too late to have garbage hanging around. I am wondering if something could not be done to introduce that early morning removal of garbage, which would lend a lot of interest to our country.

When it comes to roads, Sir, I know that even those same places of interest that I mentioned – Cove Bay, Broadey, Archer's Bay – and there are lots of others, some in St. Philip and some in every parish, the access roads are so terrible that the tourists come to a point, and although they may be told by us in one of our brochures or whatever about the beauty of the place, they do not proceed there because the roads are in a bad condition. I feel that in the development of tourism, Government has a right to look at the total development of the infrastructure, which would go as part of the development of tourism.

5.10 p.m.

I believe, Sir, that if we could put ourselves in a position to open new areas of interest on a year-to-year basis for tourists, this could only do us well. I think it would encourage repeat business. But if every time you come here you see the limbo, fire-eating, and all you have, in general, is the Animal Flower Cave, Harrison's cave and so on, I think people will get tired of that.

SUSPENSION

SENATOR THE HONOURABLE SIR JAMES TUDOR: I apologise, Mr. President, for interrupting the Senator, but if he is likely to be just as interesting for a little longer than he has been, would he allow us to take a tea break now?

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: I would suggest, Sir, that we take a break now, because I believe I have some more time.

SENATOR THE HONOURABLE SIR JAMES TUDOR. Yes. All right. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. President, I beg to move the suspension of this sitting until 5.45 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: There being no objection, this sitting is suspended until 5.45 p.m. today.

5.15 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: When the sitting was suspended, Senator Phillips was addressing the Chair.

Senator Phillips.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: At the suspension, I was on the question of tourism. I was about to wind up by saying that I am satisfied that the Government is trying its best, through the Ministry of Tourism and the Barbados Tourist Board, to put this industry on the right footing.

I will not say much on the price, because we have some four Attorneys-at-law here, and this is, obviously, their field, I would just like to congratulate the police for the service they give to this country. As in any large organisation, there would be those few who do not perform at the same level of efficiency as the majority, but this must be seen in a realistic manner, and judgement must not be passed on the Force because of a minority. By and large, their duties are of an arduous nature, under conditions which, to put it mildly, are not the best.

I believe, Sir, that the police station at Oistins easily stands out as the outstanding station. It would be good, at some stage, in the very near future, if the Government could find itself in a situation, where even if it had to reduce the number of stations, it could build more edifices like Oistins to provide proper accommodations for people who serve the country in the manner in which the Police Force does.

Quite recently I read in the newspaper that the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Durant, had visited, I think, Japan, where he had familiarised himself with a number of modern systems in the detection of crime. I believe that, by now, he would have made certain recommendations to the Ministry of Legal Affairs or to the Attorney General, as the case may be, in order that the equipment which he needs should be bought by the Government in the pursuit of increasing law and order in this country and the detection of crime.

I have one very disturbing comment, to which I believe the legal people in this Chamber will address their minds, and it is in relation to the operations of the magistrate's court, particularly in the area of drug related crimes, the use of illegal drugs. I believe that a Police Sargeant prosecuting cannot match the skills of lawyers of the quality of Senator Tull and many of his colleagues, who, obviously, would just make mince meat of Police Sargeants. This is in no way talking down the Police Force, but I wonder if at magistrate's court level, the judiciary of this country, in the proper administration of justice, could not look at having some legal officer attached to the magistrates' courts who could represent the Crown, rather than allow Sargeants to be made mince meat of by learned attorneys. There are no two ways about it – there is no way a Police Sargeant could match his skills with skilled attorneys, and I feel that the Ministry of Legal Affairs could give some consideration to this suggestion. I know, Sir, that the whole question of the police in areas like that will be dealt with by other Senators, but I just thought I would make that observation which concerned me.

On the question of state trading enterprises, the Government has expressed its desire – I would not like to say, to rid itself of – if possible, to sell at a reasonable price certain state trading enterprises which we have, which are nothing short than a drain on the Treasury of this country. I am not saying, Sir, that the Hilton is a drain. I believe that at some period of time the Hilton must have made money. I do not know if they are making money now, but anyway I believe that by now the Hilton would have been amortised, and any price you sold the Hilton for would obviously be a profit. But I want to turn my attention to the Arawak Cement Plant, which is sort of more in my field than the hotel business. I believe persons like Senator Ward who has knowledge of that industry would deal with those matters.
5.50 p.m.

The problem-plagued Arawak Cement Plant! It is estimated that, by the end of 1988, the Arawak Cement Plant would have lost $94 million. I believe all Senators know that the Arawak Cement Plant is owned jointly by the Government of Barbados, which owns 51 per cent, and the Government of Trinidad, which owns 49 per cent.

There is a long history leading up to the establishment of the cement plant. This political party which forms the Government of this country would like to distance itself from that cement plant. We do not mean, Sir, that we would just leave it without taking care of it, unless we could get it sold, but what we want the people of Barbados to know is that that figure which I mentioned just now, which represents, the loss, I think, for a four-year period, is not as a result of the Administration of the Democratic Labour Party.

That cement plant, Sir, has so many problems. I believe that some goodly Senators here might know of the problems, others will not know, but I think we owe it to this country to let the people know the problems which surround the cement plant. One of the first problems that I would like to mention is that when the agreement was signed between the Barbados Government and the Trinidad Government for the establishment of a cement plant, there was an agreement, maybe a gentleman's agreement, that Trinidad would purchase whatever

supplies the Trinidad Cement Limited could not supply for consumption in Trinidad. I do not think, to this day, that Trinidad has, and I speak under correction, purchased any cement. I know of one or two shipments which went to the sister island of Tobago. It is my understanding and my recollection, Sir – and I feel that what I am going to say now has some bearing on Trinidad's attitude towards the purchase of cement from the cement plant, although they own 49 per cent, I cannot recall the year – that there was a diplomatic wrangling between the then Prime Minister of Barbados, the late J. M. G. M. Adams, and his Administration with the late Mr. Basil Pitt which caused great concern as to the way Barbados handled that particular situation, and it is my understanding that that might have been a contributing factor to Trinidad's attitude towards buying cement from Barbados.

I would like to make mention of the equipment. I am of the considered opinion that the newest thing at the Arawak Cement Plant is the building. I feel very strongly that there is reconditioned equipment at the cement plant. From the amount of breakdowns they have, I really and truthfully cannot see how that could be new equipment. I feel strongly that it is reconditioned or second-hand equipment, and the only thing new is the building. If my assumption is wrong, I am sorry, but that is the way I feel about it.

Furthermore, there is the question of the technical staff at the cement plant. Every time there is a breakdown at the cement plant, we have, I believe, to send to Austria to get engineers to come to repair the plant. In recent times they had a breakdown there which required some special clay blocks. It is my understanding that those blocks had to come from Brazil. I do not know if they have yet arrived. The catalogues and the manuals for the equipment are written in German, so unless we had an engineer here who spoke German, or we brought an interpreter, we still would not understand what is going on as far as the equipment is concerned. That is one of the basic problems.

Then, Sir, there is the management and the behaviour of the management, which, in my view, is very questionable. I feel, Sir, that the Government of the Democratic Labour Party owes it to the people of Barbados to investigate the operations of that plant, in particular a number of transactions which seem, in my view, not at arms length. I make reference, Sir, to a barge. A barge was purchased to tow the cement from here to wherever we go. It is my understanding that the Belgian manager of the plant is a partner in the firm that owns the barge. The plant has a three-year contractual agreement for the rental of that barge, and in spite of that, when Arawak bought a crane some time ago, a sum of US$85 000 was charged for the bringing of that crane here. I would have thought that if we had a contractual agreement with a barge, there would be no question of our having to pay an additional amount for the bringing of the crane.

I feel, Sir, that these problems are serious problems. What is unfortunate, in my view, is that we had a Board of Directors in charge of that plant, and as far as I have been told they were able people, but how could some of these problems evade an intelligent Board? I really do not want to say much about the Board. I believe the Chairman of that Board is a very highly recognised civil servant of this country, and I do not need to offend him either, but I am a businessman, and I understand what directors should know about companies. Small day-to-day occurrences in a plant are really not for the ears of a director, but certainly some of the problems of that plant had to be for the ears of that Board of Directors, and I really have to seriously ask, how much interest, at least, were they putting into the operations of that business, which I understand cost the Government of Trinidad and the Government of Barbados something like $200 million? That is a substantial investment by all standards, and it is the duty of this Government either to get rid of the plant for what they can get for it, or we would have to look at it very seriously and probably have some expert advice – I do not know whether from the World Bank – in an effort to try to get the thing into a more viable situation.

Another problem they have there is the question of marketing the cement product. The concept of the plant, when the plant was first mooted, was that the surplus of cement, other than that for the domestic market, was meant for the Trinidad market and for our CARICOM brothers and sisters. Instead of that, we have seen that cement is marketed in Puerto Rico at a price, I understand of some US$3 a bag. That is a ridiculous thing, because the people of this country are paying $10 for a bag of cement. I am not really questioning that price of $10 – quite frankly, I think it is worth $10 – but why should the Puerto Ricans pay US$3 for the sake of foreign exchange and the local people pay $10 a bag? That, as far as I am concerned, is an impropriety.

6.00 p.m.

There are other matters relating to that plant. I turn Senators' minds to a situation that occurred at that plant, I believe somewhere in 1984, where a watchman, let us put it this way, was not found. That is the only way I could put it – he was not found. His clothing was found, his wife said he was a person who never drank, but he was not present – just his clothes.

Asides

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Rumour has it, Sir, that he may have lost his life through.....

Aside

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: All right, Sir. Let us go on. Let us look at two important areas in relation to that plant that I have not reached yet. One concerns, Sir, the question of illegal immigrants. It is known that persons have come there to that plant in St. Lucy, came ashore there in Barbados – of course you know there is

no immigration there – and are still living in our country. That is a serious matter. As far as I am concerned, if the Arawak Cement Plant is doing overseas shipments, it should be seen as a port of entry and the Government should have Customs and Immigration there. How do we know really for sure how much cement is being shipped, and if we are getting our share of the cement that is being shipped? All those are very serious matters that this Government has to address its mind to if we cannot get the plant sold.

There is a matter relating to the pricing structure at the plant in relation to cement, even that sold locally, a contractual agreement with that same General Manager, who I mentioned earlier, arranged with two truck owners in Barbados. These two truck owners were given the concession to draw cement from the plant to the local distributors. The local distributors are asked to pay seventy-five cents a bag for freight. I know, as a matter of fact, that the freighting contractors receive sixty cents. As to where the fifteen cents goes, I do not know, Sir. But this, too, is a matter to be looked at.

There is yet another situation in relation to that pricing structure. There are some concrete mixers in Barbados and some merchants, including the Barbados Lumber Company, which I have the honour to manage, Barbados Hardware and a company called Marine Trading. We are disadvantaged to the tune of fifty cents per bag in relation to Plantations Ltd. and Manning, Wilkinson and Challenor. Why is this? This is a matter which I have already discussed with legal advisers and I have been told that a case should be brought against the Arawak Cement Plant in an effort to recover that surcharge, or penalty, or whatever you would care to call it. I am sure that my case would involve in excess of $120 000.

The Arawak Cement Plant has been telling us again that this pricing structure has been a Board decision. I question that seriously, because I do not see a person with the character of the past Chairman being any party to such a decision. Then, I would have to see him as an irresponsible person. But I do not! He has been a highly recognised and honoured civil servant in this country for many years. I really feel that that was just a matter of pulling the wool over my eyes, and Barbados Hardware and Marine Trading and so on. I feel that the Board has no knowledge of this.

One has to wonder. Where is the excess money going? How can you have a manufacturing plant in this place and some merchants getting the product at one price and you drawing your own cement and paying more for it than the other people? There is something seriously wrong with that? I feel that all of these are the sorts of situations this Government has to address its mind to. For sure, I am going to address my mind to this differential in price, because it really is an expensive proposition continuing buying cement from the Arawak Cement Plant and paying more than those people who were in the business for a long time. I have already discussed this at many levels and the whole situation is quite well understood.

There is another situation, Sir, related to the purchase of a crane. That crane costs US $350 000, but, for whatever reason, that crane was bought through brokers for $750 000. The mathematics are fairly easy – $400 000 in excess of the cost of the crane! Where is the money?

There are more questions than answers, Sir, as far as that plant is concerned. There are also more managers there, Sir, than there are cement packers. I understand that some time ago managers were asked to give a report of their daily duties. One guy handed back his sheet empty. You know what that means? He did nothing! Each one is armed with a car. I am questioning the ability or the integrity of all the managers. Certainly I know some of them to be people of very high integrity and to have a good knowledge of what they are doing. But there are others down there who I am not sure I could use in an organisation to which I was attached. The quality is just not here.

Fancy, Sir, we have a cement plant that put down what is called a conveyor belt to load the ships at a cost of approximately Bds. $3 million and it has not loaded a bag yet! One can see the sort of wastage that has gone on in that operation. Then, Sir, when the barge comes now, they have to go and hire trucks to carry the cement from the delivery berth down to the quayside to load on the ships.

Aside

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: No! The conveyor belt does not work. Trucks are hired at the rate of some $30 or $40 an hour to carry the cement. A plant that has invested in it $200 million is renting forklifts to load trucks! I think, Sir, a forklift is an investment of $60 000, and they are hiring forklifts!

6.10 p.m.

The problems are just like too many to mention. I believe, Sir, I have exhausted myself on that Arawak Cement Plant. But I thought it was important that some citizen of Barbados drew to the attention of one of these Houses of Legislature the problems that exist in the expensive investment that is the Arawak Cement Plant.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I will begin my contribution under this debate on the Appropriation Bill 1987 by expressing the hope that I trust that the format for the discussion of this annual session of the Estimates in future years could at least provide a more detailed scrutiny of this important Bill. I think it is really a bit of a burden on the Senate and Senators to require members to limit their overview of the appropriation of considerable sums of money, close to three quarters of a billion dollars, to service the country, to merely one hour, without affording anywhere a critical examination of the several Heads. I hope, Mr. President, that fellow Senators will support my early meeting of the Standing Orders Committee to frame such proposals as will permit of the Standing Orders so that future debates may proceed with a more detailed scrutiny than this format now permits.

Sir, I should like to first deal with a Head, to which I refered to in a recent meeting of this Honourable Chamber, and that is Head 11 – Judiciary. Last year, Sir, during the debate on the Bill to provide for judicial pensions, I adverted to the likely attraction which that amendment will offer to judges to take an early retirement than to continue to work, as they will be better off with a tax free pension on full salary rather than have a salary which would subject to Income Tax, and my colleagues in the legal profession here are aware, and probably Your Honour as well, that one of the lordships is serving his last week as a judge in this country. I would suggest that if others are not to follow this example and enjoy the benefits of a tax free pension, and still perhaps engage in consultancies with certain law firms not far away from where I sit, then Government may take the logical step of perhaps ensuring that the salaries paid to judges are tax free. There are only four or five of them, Sir, so it really would not cost the Treasury too much money.

Next, Sir, I would like to look at the Head relating to Parliament. When we came here as new Senators some time last year, the Clerk took the opportunity of having what I could only describe as orientation sessions with new Senators, which I personally would like to place on record as being very helpful and useful to my ability to understand how this Chamber operates. But, Sir, I would like to think that, on a broader basis, new parliamentarians of both Houses should be provided with a briefing by public officers of this country on assumption of office as to the functions of their several departments. If sometimes we speak here inadvertently, it is just essentially out of basic ignorance of not knowing even what some Government departments do, and I am sure that most Ministers are in that position when they go into office. We would be more effective public servants, better able to serve the people whom we are here to represent, if we had a working knowledge of the functions of Government departments. Sometimes we do not know who to ask for information on certain matters rather than just rely on the goodwill of someone who will say this is the position or that is the case.

In addition, Sir, I think that for parliamentarians to be effective representatives they need some sort of research assistants. They tell me there is a library in this Honourable Chamber. I am yet to find it, and I think that there is need for parliamentarians to be provided with access to research assistants in a number of disciplines so that we could do our job more effectively. I think we need people who have disciplines in Economics, Agriculture, in matters of International law, a whole area of disciplines, who we as parliamentarians can call on them for assistance.

In the Other Place, they provide for MPs by giving them what they call Constituency Assistants. We do not have that provision made for us up here. There are a whole number of matters that Government, not through any malice or inattention, cannot necessarily take up for themselves, but if parliamentarians were abreast of exposure and had some assistance in having research done, then other measures can be put before this Chamber which Government might then be able to take forward and bring into law.

Sir, I next turn to the department referred to in the Estimates as State Enterprises, and in part, I wish to refer to some of the things said by Senator Phillips in relation to his comments to the Arawak Cement Plant. I understand the concerns expressed by Senator Phillips in respect to the Arawak Cement Plant, and I think that there is some genuine concern that these issues should be looked into. However, Sir, I think that we have a responsibility that in a way should transcend the political divide in terms of how we treat what I would call national assets. There may be something on the debit side in respect to whether it is a full asset at the present time, but, in the fullness of time, if you give them a chance, it could well prove to be a national asset. And what I want to say in respect of the Arawak Cement Plant is that notwithstanding the legitimate concerns which Senator Phillips has adverted to, and which probably needs some detailed enquiry, I am suggesting that we, or persons in an executive role in Government in relation to matters which fall under their purview, ought to be a little bit more careful in making damaging statements of something which is part of the national assets of Barbados.

6.20 p.m.

There was a newspaper article on Wednesday, March 11, Sir, where an American attorney is alleged to have said that he had evidence that Barbados had been exporting to Puerto Rico at a cost below that which we produce and which is being sold on the Barbados market, and he said: "Asked about the evidence, the lawyer said

that Hansard, the verbatim record of debates in the Barbados House of Assembly, will be used against the country." I was trying to find a more harmonious phrase to use other than the one I am about to use, and I therefore ask the Senate's apologies in advance for what may appear to be a vulgarism, but I have always learnt that no cook spits in his own soup, because it comes back to haunt you, it comes back to affect you.

I think that the concerns which have been adverted to by Senator Phillips are ones that, in my view, do not give any aid and comfort to anybody else, really. They are things we need to look into, but we have to be careful of making charges of dumping, which is a very emotive word in the American lectionary; a very, very emotive word.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: On a point of order, Sir: I never mentioned the word "dumping" for the evening.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I did not say you said it.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: I did say, Sir, that cement was being sold at US$3.00 in Puerto Rico, but I never said "dumping."

Mr. PRESIDENT: He never attributed the word. This is an open statement, not that a member of this Chamber said it, because if it was said in this Chamber, I would have had to draw to his attention that he was breaking the rule. I have not heard any member of this Chamber make any statement in this way about your dumping it there.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I am obliged to Your Honour, Sir. I have not attributed that to Senator Phillips. It has been said elsewhere.

There may well be a legitimate explanation for selling cement at US$3.00, I understand. I have no intimate knowledge of the matter, that it is sent in bulk over there and then they have to bag it and maybe that is the reason why it is being sold at that price, but the point is that I think that matters that come under the control of the Government of Barbados, regardless of which party is in office, should be treated with a certain measure of decorum in making criticisms of it, because it comes back to haunt the institution.

In relation to that, Sir, there is another institution of Government, with which I had a connection until last June, and that is the Barbados Development Bank. That institution every now and again comes to the public with bond issues, and the history has been that those bond issues have been more or less fully subscribed. I noticed when I was Deputy Chairman of the Bank and had to sign the dividend cheques, that the investors with the bank came from the whole spectrum of the society in Barbados. Some people had just had the minimum subscription and they got $5.00 half yearly, whatever it was, but they came from St. Lucy to Bank Hall to the Parks and Terraces of Christ Church and St. Philip. They had broad-based support.

However, Sir, at the last general meeting there was some discussion on the provision of some $7 million of bad debts in the accounts, and one speaker from the floor, who spoke – and if I am in error, I apologise – as if he had been primed to say it to get back a certain response, spoke in terms of saying 'you mean we went from a profit of $1 million in losses in one year to $8 million in another year?' The Chairman's response was yes, just so, without going into any detailed explanation, until one was eventually offered by a former member of the Board, who was sitting on the floor, and said it was a mischief on the part of the Chairman to give the impression that an infelicity had taken place.

The point I am making about the Development Bank is that the cavalier approach to a question in respect of the bank's operations, I know, has caused some concern in the minds of future investors. In fact, one person has said to me, "If that is how my money is being used, I will not put money there again." But really, it was not an infelicity on the part of the institution but an accounting recommendation that, because of certain things, provision must be made for the bad debts. We all know from our businesses that a provision for bad debts does not necessarily mean that the money is not going to be pursued and collected. You just ensure that you tell the Commissioner 'do not look too hard at my profits now, because I may have a bad time collecting these.' So it is really a provision set aside to say, 'I am not sure about this, but still every effort is being made to get those monies in.'

I think that people who hold responsibility for public institutions where public confidence is concerned have a responsibility to be responsible in their remarks and not create doubts merely because there has been a change of pattern. It is still a Barbados institution, irrespective of which party is in charge, and if you erode the confidence of the public of Barbados in it, it is very hard to replace that confidence.

Sir, I move to the matter of Finance. One of the areas that is being looked to in the raising of funds to meet the deficit in funding for this country is the earnings from the insurance industry, and I would like to take this opportunity to say that the Supervisor of Insurance and his staff, who have a lot to do with the exempt insurance industry, are doing a great job under some difficult circumstances.

I would like to make an appeal, Sir – the Minister referred to a committee dealing with office accommodation – that the staff of the Supervisor of Insurance Department be given improved working conditions. Many people call on them daily, people whom we are trying to attract to set up captive insurance market here, and their current working conditions might be less than desirable. They need expanded working areas and they need an increased staff. There are only two people of senior rank in that department, and I think they need an enhanced staff to do the work which the department is doing.
6.30 p.m.

In this connection, Sir, I think the efforts of the General Manager of the Central Bank, Mr. Teddy Griffith, and the former legal officer of the bank, Mr. David King, need commendation, because they have gone the length and breadth of the United States to promote Barbados and to take advantage of the double taxation treaty with the United States, to make people aware that Barbados is an offshore domicile. I would like, as someone who has worked with them, to commend them for their professionalism and the fact that they are doing a tremendous job in respect of the offshore industry.

I would like to twin to that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I know that there is a debate, hopefully, within the next few weeks on our foreign policy, but I think I should say it at this time. I have held the view for some time, Sir, that there should be what I call a holistic approach to our foreign affairs. I have been to the mission in New York where you have IDC, Tourism, Consul General, essentially in one building. The same thing is true in Toronto. But you have three little empires. They all report to their different Ministries in Barbados, with the result, I am told, that there is not always an effective utilisation of manpower. I would like to think that Barbados, with a small Foreign Service, with small resources, should use its personnel at that level more effectively so that a man sent overseas to represent Barbados should be an attache with a briefing to promote Barbados as far as he is able to totally, so that you would not find a Tourist Board man going down to San Francisco tomorrow, and next week a man from IDC making the same trek, that there should be some co-ordination of efforts so that the resources are maximised, that when they go out to wherever they go to, one can speak for Barbados in the entire area of services that we seek to promote.

Last year, in a conversation I had with the gentleman who is going to demit office as our Ambassador to Washington, U.S., Dr. Peter Laurie, he indicated that he would try to utilise the staff that was within his department to do that sort of thing, because it is all very well for large numbers of people to go out from Barbados to promote in the field of tourism, but there is a lot of leg work that needs to be done on the ground by people who are based in the particular country and who should be able to follow it up. I think that since the higher echelons of the Foreign Service are now in the hands of, – as I referred to them last week, non-career people, you should use your career people, by giving them suitable briefings, to work real hard as ambassadors for Barbados, to work as attaches in tourism, industry and off-shore matters, and if then they need assistance in terms of supplementation, the people from Barbados can go up and assist them.

Sir, I next turn, and very briefly, to the area of Education. I have looked in this Estimates to see the expenditure provided for capital expenditure with respect to Education, and I notice that money is being spent on a number of schools by way of repair or otherwise, and I would like to comment on an omission. As the Honourable Leader of the Senate said last week, he noticed that a number of things stopped for me in 1986. One of them was my ceasing to be chairman of the Governing Body of St. Leonard's Girls' School, an institution with which I have had very pleasant association. It had been indicated to me some long while before election that if there was a change in government, there was a promise made that would be kept, that I would not stay as chairman, and the promise was kept. I do not know what I had done at the time. Perhaps, I had spoken too much, but that is my nature.

What I note, though, is that when I was chairman of that governing body, I made a recommendation, and my board called in consulting engineers to look at a problem which we perceived in the walkway of the school, and a report came back saying that it was dangerous. A report was sent to the Ministry and promises were made. I see no provisions in the Estimates for rectification of that problem and, according to my information, nothing has been done about it. The sum involved is too much for the Board to undertake out of the funds available to it.

As Senators would be aware by now, in these Estimates, if you look at the back under Schools, Appendix "A", there is a large sum in the total, but the bulk of that figure is provision for all the schools, which is really statutory expenditure. It is out of the "other charges" that the school has to run the other things, and it is always a sum which, from my experience in going with estimates to Senator Miller when she was Minister of Education, always caused the knife to be wielded strongly. I think that irregardless of whichever party is there, the knife gets wielded where "other charges" are concerned, so we did not have that sort of money for capital expenditure.

I am asking the Honourable Leader of the Senate to look into the situation with respect to St. Leonard's Girls and the walkway. I would not like to think, even as

a former chairman, that that causes a tragedy in this school.

The Estimates provide under Capital Expenditure for expenditure of certain monies in respect of Queen's College. A call has been made for the resiting of Queen's College. We do not yet know the location, but there are rumours as to where that location may be, and I am going to say up front now that the location which has been mentioned is a place out at Warrens – that is the information we have, unofficial, in the proximity to the Ready-Mix Cement Plant.

The point, Mr. President, is that I am reliably advised that a medical practitioner who practices in the area has done a study of children who were brought to him in that area, and he has evidence that the lungs of the children in that area have all the attributes of adult problems because of the inhalation of dust emanating in that area. A word to the wise is enough, and I would like to think that if there are plans for going to Warrens, it should be rethought. The other problem is that I understand it is going off the new highway with all the noise concerns that that creates. I am hoping that by mentioning it now, it will probably influence them not to make the decision to go to Warrens.

I am not urging that the school should remain at its present site. There are problems with that, and there are others who would be better able to articulate that than I am. But I would like that some consideration be given to this matter to ensure that the school, which is still, notwithstanding what has happened in other schools, the premier girls' school in the island, is still regarded by people as a choice, because I have heard it said by persons connected with the school, and persons who already have children at the school, that if the Government plans to build the school in that area are proceeded with, it will not be a school of first choice.
6.40 p.m.

Sir, I next turn to a matter that is supposed to be broadly looked at in terms of consumer affairs. In the Press of last week, and in fact in recent media as a whole, there have been some concerns about cases of thallium sulphate poisoning in Guyana. There is a very helpful article written by the Environmental Education Officer of the Caribbean Conservation Association in last Sunday's *Advocate* entitled "Pesticide danger in Third World", and he makes reference to the fact, if I may be permitted to read certain extracts from it, that it takes about $40 million and eight to ten years of testing and production time to develop a pesticide for marketing in the United States of America, but pesticides produced for export are exempted from these requirements, and many US manufacturers take advantage of this loophole in marketing certain pesticides for export only.

In 1986, the United States Congress approved for sale to foreign countries several drugs which the U.S. Food and Drug Administration did not approve for use in the United States. This was not a typical. Thallium sulphate has been banned in the United States since the mid-Seventies.

Then he said: "Drugs are routinely sold to Caribbean and other Third World countries which European and American pharmaceutical firms cannot sell in their own countries. The active ingredients in these drugs are often unknown or of dubious nature."

Sir, in the document we have before us, one of the agencies of Government which, I think, will have an interest in monitoring this, the BNSI, has had its request for funds cut by $100 000. I would like, Sir, to make a plea here for increased staffing for customs and BNSI to give them a more effective machinery for monitoring the importation of pesticides and other drugs into Barbados. I think, Sir, that we also have to go into the area of training, that the officers in the Customs must be exposed to the type of training that is essential to enable them to effectively be able to monitor and be aware of what hocus-pocus is put before them when they are asked to approve a licence.

This brings me to another area which I think is related to the business of Parliament and the effectiveness of parliamentarians. In other Parliaments, Sir, there is a situation where there are what you call Committees of Parliament to look at an overview of certain matters. I would like to suggest that, perhaps without trying to impose something on us, there might be value in the Houses of Parliament in Barbados, with the 48 members made up of those bodies, having some sort of broad-based committee to look at and monitor several things that otherwise get ignored, and which the committee will have the power to call people on to explain, give evidence and approve certain things. I think that in matters of this kind, wherein there should be no partisan divide, no political divide, it would be of benefit to the community if there is this sort of general participation of parliamentarians in matters of health, matters of environment and matters of education. I suggest that this could be done even in matters of foreign policy and matters of defence, and there are other Heads that probably recommend themselves to be dealt with by a committee free of the rancour that sometimes characterises debates, which I think sometimes are not for Your Honour but for my friends of the fourth estate, because we all know when we sit and have tea or lunch how harmonious these sessions can be.

Sir, I next turn to the matter of housing. It seems to be a perennial problem in relation to all Governments that people who occupy Government houses do not like

to pay their rent, and on occasions the politicians among us – and I do not count myself a politician, I am a parliamentarian – there are twelve and two that are politicians, I am a parliamentarian – some would see it as a distinction with a difference, but I see it as a distinction – encourage people for political reasons not to pay rent. That is how they perceive it as being told to them – we are going to ease you, so do not help them out, do not pay. Whether that is intended or not, that mischief gets in and then you get the problem that you do not get the money that you need to build other houses for other people to use.

I think, Sir, that housing is as much an essential necessity as food, and no one today, with few exceptions, can buy food at any place in Barbados unless they pay cash for it. Sir, you go into every shop and you see a little sign "In God We Trust, All Others Pay Cash".

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Senator Ward will deal with praedial larceny. I am not expert on that; that is his field.

I want to say in respect to housing, Sir, and the matter of people in the National Housing Corporation houses, that people in Barbados have got accustomed in one way or other to making payments through the co-operation of their employer by deduction. As an employer I am asked sometimes to send part of the cheque to the bank for a car loan, or the Barbados Mortage Finance to pay the mortgage. Why can it not be provided for that tenants of National Housing Corporation houses who are gainfully employed be required to sign a standing order to pay the rent from their salaries.

(*Aside.* They do.)

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: In every case? I do not know. I started off by saying earlier in this debate that I might say something through ignorance. I am not aware of what happens in Government departments. If it is happening, I am now learning it is happening. It certainly should apply also in the private sector. They should be required, as a condition of taking a Government house, to have a standing order so that the rent is got up front. There are cases of hardship where you have to make provision for those, but there seems to me to be too many problems where people would have very nice arrangements, the latest motor vehicle and what not, but the rent is not a priority.

6.50 p.m.

I know, from professional experience, Sir, that someone rented a house from a client of mine, and the first month's rent cheque bounced. But because she has become a tenant, to get her out I have had to go through a long thing. It is now four months she is still there, but hopefully I will get the order for possession and soon she will be on her way. You even had difficulty to get the marshals to go and levy on the goods to pay for the arrears of rent because that is another matter. Sometimes the marshals do not like to find people whom they know.

Aside.

Laughter.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: But if it is paid by cheque and the cheque bounced, what do you want them to do?

Mr. PRESIDENT: They may be a tenant of the marshal, too.

Laughter.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Well, Sir, that is another matter.

Sir, Senator Phillips made certain remarks with respect to the Ministry of Legal Affairs that I just want to touch on briefly. When I was President of the Bar Association, I made a call for trained legal prosecutors to be used in the courts. Senator Phillips made reference to the matter of prosecuting drug offences. It goes beyond drugs. Just a few weeks ago, we had the spectacle of a customs officer doing a valiant job prosecuting a case in the Magistrate's Court in respect of a currency offence, a very technical matter. What is more, Sir, it was his first appearance in the courts. He had no idea of the rules – nothing. Naturally, the accused was very well represented, and the result was that the case had to go with the man being discharged.

I do not want to pre-empt it, because it is going to be sent on, but there are recommendations which were being worked on about increased staff in the Prosecution Department in the Ministry of the Attorney General so that matters of complexity will be dealt with by qualified lawyers and not just have this matter of a Police Sergeant, Superintendent or Inspector prosecuting. Some of the police officers are very good, I am not gainsaying that, but certainly it is in the interest of justice that the two people who are prosecuting and defending should be as well matched as possible. I do not think the ends of justice are always served when you have the police prosecuting matters and the other side ably represented by eminent counsel like Senator Smith, Senator Tull and Senator Comissiong.

(*Aside:* SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Hear you! We got honourable mention!)

Laughter

Mr. PRESIDENT: He has gone up with the QCs.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, there are a number of things I wish to touch on briefly. I had hoped to take all the time allotted to me, but I am under some disability this afternoon with an imminent flu.

Reference was made in these Estimates, and I do not want to steal the thunder of anyone who may speak after me, to the substantial cut in the allocation to the Child Care Board. I do not want to go into that in any detail, Sir. It is a cut of $800 000, which, when you look at the other charges, amounts to virtually to one-third of the other charges. I do not want to go into the demerits of that, but there are certain concerns I have with respect to child care.

One of the abuses that take place in terms that there is a lack of authority for the Child Care Board to deal with people who fall foul of them is that a child is in care and then the father or some other relative goes and takes the child out of the care without being in breach of any law. I should like to suggest, Sir, that the Minister gives some consideration to amending the legislation to provide that every child in care shall automatically be deemed to be a ward of the court. The consequence of that is that if you trouble that child while it is a ward of the court you are guilty of contempt of court. It will certainly go a long way to enforce the authority of the Board in the cases of abuse that they have to deal with.

In a Commonwealth jurisdiction, they have someone who is known as an official guardian, who is the sort of legal officer who looks after matters in respect of people in care. I think that without a great deal of expenditure of funds, it would certainly do a lot to give the Board the authority and clout it requires, and the legislation ought to be amended to ensure that this happens.

The final thing, Sir, I would say before I sit down is in relation to the highways which are being constructed in this island. I have a concern that the new Airport to West Coast Highway is bisecting a number of currently primary or major roads. I wonder what is going to happen where they intersect. Have the people in the Ministry of Transport and Works taken adequate precaution to ensure that adequate roundabouts are built that we do not have the proliferation of accidents that have characterised the Spring Garden Highway and to ensure that people who have lived for many years past in certain areas will be able to get out and around without great inconvenience?

I see lots of construction going on where the road has been cut in such a way that there are little pieces of land, agricultural land and other land now, seem to be left, for which no useful purpose can be put. It seems to be designed, with great respect to those who were involved, without regard to our land resource in a proper and effective fashion. I see in the Balls area that the roads coming across there at a point where there is land now that is no use for anything, either for growing cane, agriculture or what. It is just a little triangle of nothingness. There is a school of thought that some people's properties have been appreciated as a result of the construction of the road. I fear, Sir, that in some cases, it is really a depreciation of their property, because the way the road has been constructed in relation to some areas is to increase noise, environmental pollution and hardship.

I am obliged to Your Honour.

Applause.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, in view of the fact that I had consulted Senators and there seems to be unanimous feeling that we should meet at 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning, I am suggesting that we proceed no further on this occasion.

I therefore beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no objection the Senate is suspended until 10.00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

7.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is now resumed.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Mr. President, I should like in my contribution to this debate to do two things: one, first of all, to respond to some of the wild and unsubstantiated allegations made by the Opposition Senator, Senator Miller, yesterday – I am sorry that she is not here, because I would like her to be here as I respond – and secondly, to look at the Estimates and to put them into their proper perspective, because I do not believe we can deal with these Estimates in isolation. I think that they are part and parcel of a whole process that began, first of all, with the reply to the Budget by the then Opposition last year, and that progressed to the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, the Throne Speech, the Democratic Labour Party's Budget and now this year's Estimates.

So let me begin by responding to some of the – as I characterise them – wild and unsubstantiated allegations made by Senator Miller, because I notice that, as usual, they have been given great prominence in the local media. One of the more extreme allegations that she made was that in December last year instructions had been issued from the Ministry of Finance to Heads of Departments

not to pay bills. This, Mr. President, is an extremely damaging allegation, if there were any truth in it. Conveniently, Senator Miller did not deem it fit to specify which departments, she did not deem it fit to specify what bills. All we have from her is this wild and loose allegation.

It is an allegation which, I am informed by the Minister of Finance, is totally false. In fact, when you look at the position of Government's outstandings, Government bills owed by the Barbadian community, whether it be the business community, as opposed to what Government may owe business in Barbados, you find that more is owed to this Government in terms of PAYE, in terms of National Insurance, in terms of Hotel and Restaurant Sales Tax, Income Tax, Corporation Tax, duties payable at the harbour, by the business community of Barbados than Government owes the business community. So the allegation is so ridiculous. Well over $50 million is owed to the Government in these outstanding taxes and duties.

The second unsubstantiated allegation was that we are now experiencing rising unemployment. Again, she made that allegation but gave no figures. It seems that you can just get up here and say anything, no documentation is called for, no figures, no facts. My information is that unemployment has, in fact, dropped by at least 1% over the rate when this Government took over office. I am also informed that at least 4 000 more people were working at the end of 1986 than had been working in 1985. So that there has, in fact, been evidence of job creation in Barbados over the past year, and I know that some of the businessmen in here can verify that. In fact, if you look at the back page of the *Nation* today, right under the report of Senator Miller's speech, there is a short column dealing with some comments made by the President of the Chamber of Commerce, and he supports that. He says that since December there has been a resuscitation in employment.

A third wild and woolly allegation made by Senator Miller was that there have been cuts in Government services. Once again, where were the examples? It is not good enough just to say there are cuts in Government services. Where are the examples? She gave no examples. She did give examples of certain relatively minor reductions in Government expenditure, but there is a distinction between saying there is a cut in Government expenditure in a certain area of activity, or a certain department, as opposed to a cut in the actual service. In fact, at the very outset of the DLP taking office the point was made that there would be minor reductions and adjustments in expenditure, but that, concomitant with that, we intended to ensure that we would be instituting cuts in wastage and increasing efficiency, and I challenge anyone to say that between May 1986 and today that there have been cuts in Government services.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. President: I hate to interrupt the distinguished Senator, but in quoting from today's newspaper I think it is only fair to this Chamber that he should quote all of what was said and not only part of what was said. What was said here goes on to say that stemming from the 10% reduction in corporation taxes last July, they will, however, take at least a year to come about. We cannot have half of the truth or part of the truth in here, and I repeat my call of yesterday, it is time for the Government to tell the whole truth about the economy.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Mr. President, the fact is that the goodly gentleman did say that there has been a pick up in employment since December. He is saying that for the full effect of the tax measures to come about, it would take at least a year. But that does not gainsay the fact that he did say that there has been some pick up, particularly since December of 1986. So do not accuse me of telling half truths. He is saying that it would take at least one year for the full effect to be felt.

Another allegation that she made, Mr. President, was that we are experiencing falling exports. There is some truth in that, but it is not good enough just to say that we are experiencing falling exports, you must go on to give the full picture. Again, though, the allegation was made but absolutely no examples were given. It cannot be simply good enough to say we experienced a fall in exports. Give examples!

The fact of the matter is that exports have indeed been declining in Barbados since 1981. It is not a new phenomenon, it has existed since 1981 and it deteriorated in 1984. It got even worse in 1984. This is a five, six year trend that Government cannot be expected to turn around in the space of eight or nine months. If there is to be a resuscitation of our exports, it calls for certain fundamental things, for new investments, for the development of new international markets. These are not things that happen overnight, it takes time. You cannot expect that in eight or nine months the Covernment would have sufficiently developed new markets and sufficiently garnered new investment to make any significant improvement in the level of your exports. These things take time.

She also alleged that there had been significant layoffs of workers in the Government Service. Once again we were treated to no figures, no documentation, indeed no examples, just the wild, unsubstantiated allegation. I would admit that initially there were some layoffs of workers employed by the National Assistance Board. That is public knowledge, but what were the reasons for the layoffs?

10.10 a.m.

In the first instance, these people had been employed, but no money had been voted for them. It was obvious that they had to be laid off. How can you employ people, vote no money for them and expect that they will continue in employment? In any event, these people had only been employed on a temporary basis, so it was clear from the very outset that this was only a stop-gap measure. A more cynical person would say only an election measure. Since then we did have, we admit, those people who were laid off, but there were good and valid reasons for that. And since then the NCC has started its new programmes and there are today more workers employed with the NCC than when this Government took office. I do not know where they are from, but the fact is that there are more Barbadians employed than when we took office.

Another allegation – and I am sorry that I have to go through these allegations in this somewhat pedantic way, but they are made and reported in the media, and I feel a responsibility to answer them – is that Government had borrowed consistently since July 1986, and is continuing to borrow. In fact, the phrase used was "Government had gone wild with the borrowing." It was also alleged that Government had borrowed so much that it has now exhausted its domestic banking system and is now only able to borrow on the foreign market. Again, an extremely damaging allegation if it were true. But how was this allegation presented? Where were the facts? Where were the figures? Where was the documentation? No proof, just an unsubstantiated allegation! And it is so far from the truth that any person involved in banking in Barbados today would tell you that, far from the Government having exhausted domestic markets, there is in fact, excess liquidity in our domestic banking system. That is still the position in Barbados today. Even further evidence of this is the fact that all Government's offerings on our domestic markets have been over-subscribed. Again clear evidence proves that this suggestion that our domestic market has been exhausted is far, far from the truth.

Government has borrowed externally. A lot of the measures have come before this Chamber, but all of our external borrowings have been to service foreign debt that we inherited. It is as simple as that. It has been to refinance debts that we came into office and inherited, and I have heard particularly Senator Tull on many occasions saying that he sees nothing wrong with foreign borrowing, so if that is the position they take, it ill-behoves them to now come in here and suggest that we have gone on an orgy of foreign borrowing. You saw nothing wrong with foreign borrowing. You amassed massive foreign debt. We took office from you. We have to borrow to refinance those debts, service those debts, and then you criticize us! We have been forced into it because we have inherited it from you!

Another allegation that was made concerned our balance of payments. It was said that our balance of payments position is weakening. The first point that must be made clear is that the balance of payments as of today are in surplus, and I challenge the Opposition to prove otherwise. Any weakening that is in evidence is due to an outflow of foreign exchange for payment of inherited debt, and Senator Miller knows that. In fact, any weakening may well be due to the fact that we have had to use foreign exchange to service inherited debt, but this Government, with its well known aversion to foreign borrowing, as Senator Miller herself acknowledges, has perhaps, borrowed far less than it could have in meeting its foreign debt repayments, so if there is any weakening of balance of payments position, you must put it in its context. It has nothing to do, or very little, with the fiscal measures of last year. It has much much more to do with the inherited foreign debt and the need to service that debt.

Finally, Mr. President – and this is, perhaps, one of the worst allegations made – the allegation was made that there is a flight of capital from Barbados. It is really easy to get up in here and say that, just as it is easy to get up in here and speak about having gone around the Caribbean and spoken to Caribbean people and politicians who now look at Barbados with less respect than they did some years ago. Again, that is utter nonsense! Can you imagine Caribbean people having less respect for a Government led by a man like Errol Barrow as opposed to a Government led by a Tom Adams or a Bree St. John? I cannot imagine that, not from my knowledge of Caribbean people, not from my ten years in a place like Trinidad at the Law School and my knowledge of how Trinidadians perceived the late Tom Adams as opposed to Mr. Barrow!

So it is easy to get up in here and make these sort of facile statements, but this allegation of a flight of capital from Barbados is a very serious one. Senator Blackman yesterday admonished certain people about spitting in the food that they were cooking, and I would have thought that he would have wanted to extend that admonition to Senator Miller, because the bandying about of that type of allegation, the allegation that businessmen are now rushing to take their foreign exchange out of Barbados, can do far more harm to the economy of Barbados than any allegation of the dumping of cement in Puerto Rico.

10.20 a.m.

Senator Miller knows that foreign exchange transactions must go through the Central Bank. If you know that they do not, I think you should report that to the Commissioner of Police. That is a matter for the Commissioner of Police if you have this privileged information, as a responsible citizen and Senator; this is not the place for it.

Mr. President, the honourable Member treated us to a litany of wild and unsubstantiated allegations. She gave no figures, no facts, no documentation, no proof, no evidence. In fact, if she had taken that type of performance into a court of law, she would probably have been laughed out of court. Where is the proof? Where is the evidence? You would hear me with it. If Senator Miller really wanted to talk about an economy on the brink of chaos, to use her own words, if she really wanted to talk about an economy undermined to the point of collapse, again her own words, I would have been happy to assist her by referring her to the Report of the Central Bank of Barbados for the year 1985. If she really wanted to talk about chaos and collapse and crisis, I think she should have looked not to the performance of the Barbados economy over the past year, but to the performance of the economy in the year 1985.

I have with me, Mr. President, a copy of that report. I believe it is already a document of this Chamber. I know that Senator Morrison intends to deal somewhat with this, so I will not go into it in much detail, but the fact is that in this report, Barbados in 1985, is where you find chaos and imminent collapse. If I just quote a few sentences from this report, the section dealing with production, prices and employment, it says: "Economic growth was negligible in 1985 after a year and a half of tourism-led growth, starting from the last quarter of 1983. Real GDP is estimated to have increased by no more than 0.3 per cent following the 3½ per cent expansion of 1984. After a promising winter season, tourist arrivals fell sharply in the summer; the output of electronic components slumped and manufacturing suffered badly as Trinidad and Tobago cut its imports from Barbados by half. Sugar production remained flat and the fish catch fell off sharply."

And so it goes on and on about every sector of the economy.

On tourism: "Real output in the tourism sector is estimated to have declined by 3 per cent during 1985. This reflects a 2 per cent fall in arrivals and a 6 per cent decrease in average length of stay."

Manufacturing: "Manufacturing output sank to its lowest level in ten years following several years of stagnation and decline. Real output fell 9.3 per cent....."

Employment and Prices: "As recessionary conditions persisted, the unemployment rate remained high throughout the year. Since later 1984, most firms have been cutting back employment to trim costs. The slump in electronics and summer tourism caused further jobs loss in 1985. Several hotels were forced to close temporarily in the summer. In addition, other manufacturing plants, faced with sluggish domestic sales and restricted export markets in the CARICOM region, were forced to reduce staff."

It goes on like that in just about every financial sector. So if Senator Miller really wanted to speak about an economy in chaos, about an economy facing impending collapse, she should really have averted to the Central Bank Report for 1985. I do not want to go into much more detail, because I do not want to step on Senator Morrison's territory. I know he intends to deal with that.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that things have been difficult for Barbados, and for a large number of other countries, for a number of years now, and for a large variety of different reasons as well. In fact, a number of experts, including those from the CDB, the IMF and the Inter-American Development Bank, believe, and have believed for some years now, that these adverse conditions will persist for a number of years to come.

The stagnation, for example, in tourism over the past three or four years can be traced to a number of different causes besides the obvious one of mismanagement by the Barbados Labour Party. We take that for granted, but there are a number of other causes that it can be traced to, for example, the strength of the United States dollar in recent years and the consequent decline in the number of European visitors. That has been in existence for a number of years now. It is predicted that it will persist. The economic hardship being experienced in Trinidad and the consequent fall off in tourist arrivals from Trinidad is another reason, and has been one for a number of years, for the decline in our tourism industry.

In addition to that, some people have argued that our tourism industry has reached a stage of maturity, and that as we come under increasing competition from other destinations, other less costly destinations, the industry will stagnate. It is something that we are faced with. There are some other destinations, now on the way up, which are now developing. We have reached a certain level of maturity, and therefore there is that much less room for growth.

Another reason for the decline was the collapse of a significant number of Canadian tour operators that serviced Barbados. Last, but not least, there was, and is, the world recession. So let us not fool ourselves. There have been a large variety of reasons for our economic straits over the last three or four years.

Our manufacturing industry has been undermined since at least 1984, and it has been undermined by relatively high costs, particularly our wage costs *vis-a-vis* those of competing countries. Again this is a fact of life. Also there has been an international slow down in the

demand for our manufactured goods, including the slow down in Trinidad and our other CARICOM trading partners.
10.30 a.m.

This trend showed itself from as early as 1985, it is nothing new. As early as 1985 INTEL was operating way below its capacity. This suggestion that INTEL shut down in Barbados because of some comment that the Prime Minister made is utter nonsense. Since early 1985 the signs were there – INTEL was operating way below capacity and it was exhibiting a trend in our manufacturing industry. Further evidence of the trend was the fact that CORCOM, the electronic component company, closed in August of 1985 with a loss of some 250 jobs, and this is 1985 we are talking about, and Koves, the garment manufacturer, closed in June of 1985 with a total loss of some 600 jobs. Apparently when they did close in June, the full 600 jobs was not lost then, but they had been laying off over a period of time, and there was a maximum loss of 600 jobs.

The point is, Mr. President, that we have been in dire economic straits since at least 1984. The people who are knowledgeable in economic matters have been predicting from as far back as 1984, at least, that these adverse conditions will continue to at least the end of this decade. And in making that type of prediction, they have not concerned themselves with what party happened to be in power in Barbados. What they have been saying is that we in Barbados find ourselves in a generally deteriorating economic environment, both internationally and regionally, that this will continue to be the case until at least the end of this decade and that we in Barbados will suffer as a result.

I think that we should be very, very clear with what we are dealing with here. When the Democratic Labour Party came to power on May 28 last year, Barbados was in a state of economic crisis, and the experts were confidently predicting, as far back as 1984, that that economic crisis would continue for many years to come and that it would, in fact, even get worse as the years progressed. That was the reality that the DLP and the people of Barbados faced on May 28 last year. Let us not fool ourselves about this, that was the reality.

How did the Democratic Labour Party respond? We responded by the programme outlined in our General Election Manifesto of 1986, subsequently implemented in our 1986 Budget. Those who characterize our 1986 Budget as an "election give away Budget" or as an exercise in largesse and freeness have totally and perhaps deliberately misinterpreted what happened on May 28 last year. They have totally misinterpreted – deliberately, I believe – the nature of the Democratic Labour Party programme and the nature of the covenant, the working relationship that the Democratic Labour Party made with the people of Barbados on May 28 last year.

Mr. President, our programme as contained in the Budget and in this manifesto was saying a number of things to the people of Barbados. It was saying, first of all, that we acknowledge that we are in a state of economic crisis, and that must be stressed over and over again. It acknowledged the fact that we were already in a state of economic crisis, and further, that the indications were that it was likely to be a prolonged crisis. That was taken as given. It was also saying, however, that we rejected the concept that there was nothing that we could do about the situation and that we would simply have to await the resurgence of the international economy. This was one of those rationalizations that one was hearing from time to time from some of the most spineless sychophants within the last Administration. They were about to leave it up to the American syndrome.

Aside

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Not Senator Tull. He would not be in that category.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: What you are sharing out, give me some,)

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: They leave it up to the Americans – we wait for the international economy to recover and then all will be well. We rejected that, Mr. President.

We were also rejecting the strategy of economic development which was based on the use of vast public sector resources to construct major non-productive capital projects like the Central Bank and the new highway. We rejected that strategy for a number of reasons. One, we believe that that strategy mainly aims at providing short-term employment. As far as we were concerned, that was not good enough. We also recognized that that strategy would involve Government in massive increases in public debt, in both its external and domestic components. That, for us, is not acceptable either, for we recognised that that strategy would inevitably lead to a deterioration in our balance of payments and an increase in our fiscal deficit, while at the same time, not creating permanent jobs and diverting scarce resources away from the productive sector of the economy.

For all those reasons, we rejected that strategy as well. What we did was offer Barbadians some hope. We offered them a rational, humane and workable way out of the economic morass that we found ourselves in. You see, Mr. President, we analyse the state of the economy. We fully realize that there were many external economic factors impinging on our economy, factors that we had no control over, and there is little that we can do about it. But we also recognize that there were a number of domestic factors which we were capable of identifying and remedying, and the single most important domestic

factor that we identified as adversely effecting our economy was over taxation. We believe that over the ten year reign of the Barbados Labour Party, taxes had been increased to an inordinately and unjustifiably high level. We identified that as a severe defect and we went about seeking to remedy it.

We remedied it by our new fiscal arrangements as outlined, first, in the reply to the first Budget of 1986; secondly, in the manifesto; thirdly, in the Throne Speech, and then, finally, in our own Budget of 1986. In that programme we reduced Personal Income Tax – I do not want to go into that in detail, that is an old story by now – and we sought to stimulate the demand for goods and services by the fiscal measures. We sought to ease the tax burden on businesses and we sought to import into the whole tax system of Barbados, for perhaps the first time, a truly scientific and humanitarian principle of Personal Income Tax taxation. This was when we arrived at a minimum figure for personal taxation of $15 000 based on what we identified as the basic minimum living needs of the average Barbadian. We recognise that the average man would require at least $289 per week to live on as a minimum, and therefore, we structured our tax proposals around that. The results that we were aiming at were a strengthening of the economy, the creation of employment, and the improvement of living standards.
10.40 a.m.

Mr. President, as I said, the tax measures are well known. I do not really want to go into them. We know about the increases and deductions, the increases in family allowances, the reductions in Personal Income Tax, reductions in Corporation Tax, Withholding Tax and Land Tax. Basically, we were easing the tax burden on all sections of the Barbadian population. Since then the Opposition have sought to criticise those tax measures, – and over and over again we keep on hearing the same criticisms, usually in the manner that Senator Miller put them forward yesterday, unsubstantiated, no facts, no figures, just wild and wooly allegations – what I would like to do now is take a look at the three or four major criticisms that have been made and analyse those criticisms. As I have said, these Estimates really must be seen within the context of that total programme, they cannot be seen in isolation. They must be seen as part and parcel of that total process that began May 28 last year.

The first major criticism that was made was that Government would impair its capacity to deliver the quantity and quality of services it now provides. That allegation was made yesterday again. But, Mr. President, about nine months have since passed, and there is absolutely no evidence of that.

There has been a modest reduction in capital spending. We made it known all along that we would be instituting modest cuts in capital spending. We thought that that was essential to the health of the Barbadian economy at this particular time. But we also made the point that there would be no more diversion of our scarce capital to non-productive prestige projects like the Central Bank, and I have no qualms about identifying the Central Bank as a prestige project that is not making the optimum use of our scarce resources.

We also stressed that we would be instituting a rigid and strict programme of the control of our state enterprises, that we were not any longer going to countenance the massive losses that enterprises like the Arawak Cement Plant, Transport Board, Heywoods and Caribbean Airways had been sustaining.

There was no suggestion that there will be any reduction in the quantity or quality of Government services. We were saying that we were going to institute a more rigid and more controlled programme of management of Government finances, that we were going to cut out wastage, that we were going to reduce the losses in state enterprises, that we were, generally, going to tighten up and that we were going to move away from the programme of using public sector resources on non-productive prestige projects that drain a lot of the scarce resources of Barbados. I challenge the Opposition to show me where over these nine months there has been any reduction in the quantity of Government services to the people of Barbados. There is no evidence of that, Mr. President!

Secondly, the criticism was made that the fiscal measures will increase the gap between the haves and have nots, in Barbados. This in itself is a ludicrous argument. It is true that there will be more disposable income, but there will be more disposable income for all sectors of the Barbadian population, and if companies or corporations receive benefits, this does not mean *ipso facto* that their employees will not share in those benefits.

In any event, Mr. President, it really strikes me as strange and, to use a Trinidadian term, very "bold-face" to hear that type of criticism being made by Senator Miller yesterday, that we were giving back this money to the clique of major shareholders in Barbados, the companies in Barbados with the 600 clique. It really struck me as strange coming from the mouth of the Barbados Labour Party – the same party that during the election campaigned and went about with slogans like, if you are white, red, or brown the DLP will cut you down,' and this whole racist campaign slanted at the Democratic Labour Party. It strikes me as very strange that now after accusing us of being all this racist,

despising white people, brown people and red people, they now come and tell us that we are now the friends of the white people and the brown middle class people. The argument does not sound right. The same party that Don Blackman felt constrained to leave because of what he termed "white shadows" now makes this type of criticism! The same party that gave the chairmanship of so many of the pivotal statutory boards in this country to big Barbadian businessmen and felt satisfied in doing that could come now and make this type of criticism! It is very strange, Mr. President, really.

This reminds me of the situation in the United States of America where, for example, Richard Nixon, a Republican President, was able to institute diplomatic relations with Communist China, whereas his democratic predecessors would never have felt secure enough to do that. Similarly, the Democratic Labour Party in the 1960s felt constrained to go and escalate the war in Viet Nam because of the pressure of public opinion in the United States. You see, in the United States the Republic Party has such a reputation for being anti-communist that they are able to go further in terms of making concessions to the Communists than the Democratic Party, which has a reputation of being soft on the Communists. Because of that reputation of being soft, the Democrats in the United States of America feel constrained to always be aggressive towards the Communists, and had to go into Viet Nam.

10.50 a.m.

Richard Nixon, had the reputation as a cold warrior, nobody could question his cold warrior credentials, and because nobody could question Nixon's cold warrior credentials, he was able to establish relations with Communist China and nobody criticised him for selling out to the Communists or anything like that. If a democratic President had done it, he would have been criticised for being too soft on the Communists. He could not do it.

A similar thing operates in Barbados with these tax concessions. The Barbados Labour Party, because of their well known support for big business, for the merchant class, would never feel that they are able to institute the type of tax measures that we did in May of last year, whereas the Democratic Labour Party, with the identification with the black masses of Barbados, is able to do that and have its credibility still intact.

We really make no apologies for having given tax relief to corporations in Barbados. We recognise that a particular situation existed in Barbados and that that particular situation merited that particular type of strategy. We were firmly convinced that, it had nothing to do with giving money to any clique of 600 in Bridgetown. Our reputation is too well established for that type of criticism to have any validity. We recognised that we had a particular problem to face, that of over taxation, and this was the strategy that we were employing, and we were able to employ it because, as I said, our reputation as friend and supporter of the working class in Barbados was so intact.

The other criticism that was made was that the fiscal measures would put our balance of payments in jeopardy by spending increased disposable income on foreign produced consumer goods; that the tax measures, by leaving more money in the hands of the average Barbadian, would encourage people to spend more money on consumer items from abroad and therefore cause foreign exchange to leave the country.

There is some merit in that argument. You cannot gainsay that, but it has been overstated. For example, Mr. Owen Arthur, the M.P. for St. Peter, spoke about the country being 18 months away from destruction. The whole criticism has been grossly overstated. There is that possibility that if you leave more disposable income in the hands of people that there may be a tendency to buy consumer durables and therefore foreign exchange leaves the country, but eight or nine months have passed since the Budget and there has been no significant evidence of this. So this exaggerated criticism about Barbados being 18 months from destruction because Barbadians would be buying consumer durables and sending all the foreign exchange out of the island has not been substantiated.

What we, the Democratic Labour Party, will say to the people of Barbados, is that we have to have some faith in each other. We will do our part, but we cannot do it all – you must help us along the way, too, and we must have faith in you. Government has done its bit and we now look to the private sector in Barbados, the commercial sector, the manufacturers, the ordinary Barbadian consumer to do their part as well.

The concerns that were raised about people going to Margarita and Venezuela to buy consumer items are well taken. Barbadian people must realise that if we are serious about developing this country, and the Democratic Labour Party has shown us a policy that is workable, all of us must pull our weight and that that type of practice must be stamped out. In fact, Barbadians should voluntarily, in their own self-interest, give up those practices.

The point was made by Minister Evelyn Greaves in the House of Assembly that the commercial sector now has a duty to respond positively to the fiscal benefits given to them by the Democratic Labour Party. They must now respond by supporting our local manufacturers. Mr. Greaves made the point that too many of them seem loath to go into any type of productive activity and merely seem content to remain importers of foreign

goods, and this is not good enough. They must recognise that we were in crisis, the Government has given us a workable policy for getting ourselves out of this economic mess, but the Government cannot do it alone, everybody must lend their hands to the wheel.

The point that Senator Phillips made about businessmen in Barbados now having a special duty to make sure that they pay their Corporation Tax, that they pay their customs duties, that they pay their PAYE and the National Insurance, that point must also be emphasised and stressed. Government has given you that tax relief, you now have to reciprocate. If you had a duty before to do these things, your duty is even greater today, because Government has given you the ease in the Corporation Tax and the personal Income Tax. It is now for you to reciprocate.

I know I have very little time left. I just want to say that the DLP need never feel apprehension about taking the people of Barbados into their confidence. This is how Government has to function from now on. This nonsense about a Government being some great figures up there sending down orders from on high and Government policy being too abstruse for the average citizen to understand or to get involved in has to cease. We need never feel apprehensive about telling the people exactly as it is. Barbados was in crisis. We are not out of the crisis yet. We do not need to feel that we have to butter up people and tell them that things are better than they actually are. Let people know the position and tell them we have taken the first step and we expect that if you have any desire to see Barbados progress, you will reciprocate and that we will work together, all classes, business people, average man, for the better of Barbados.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, I would like to deal with a few aspects of tourism. In the Estimates of Expenditure on page 4, there is a Unit of State Enterprises, Subhead 3. We find that this unit is responsible for the Tourism Investment Corporation, the Arawak Cement Plant, Barbados Mills Limited and its subsidiaries. On page 7(F), Subhead 11, the Tourism Investment Corporation is responsible for the Dover Convention Centre, and this has a grant of $544 904, I presume for the Dover Convention Centre. Then on page 8, we have Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation being provided with $2 500 001 to refurbish the Hilton Hotel and renovate and extend the Dover Convention Centre. There is also a token provision for Durants Golf Course, which, I presume, that the extra dollar is for.
11.00 a.m.

I believe, Sir, that Heywoods and the Hilton Hotel are under this Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation. I do not know if the Tourism Investment Corporation has to report to the Unit of State Enterprises and if the financial statements ever get past this unit, but I have never seen any revenue from the Hilton as we used to see in the Estimates formerly, that is, before it disappeared in the Tourism Investment Corporation. The only revenue that can be seen from any of these is the sum of $100, which gives the impression that this is only a token to keep it on the Barbados account and let Hilton International know that the Hilton belongs to Barbados and not to them.

I do not know if any Senator has ever seen, but I have never seen a financial report from this Tourism Investment Corporation. We cannot hear a whisper of what Heywoods Hotel is doing financially, other than that, now and again, it is referred to as a liability. We would like to know how big a liability it is. We have heard that the cement plant is a liability that will cost the country $98 million by the end of 1987, and it cost them over $100 million of Barbados money, nothing to do with Trinidad money, to put the cement plant there. But, Sir, Heywoods, the Hilton and Dover Convention Centre must be worth over Bds$100 million at today's money values, and yet I have never been able to hear how much revenue we are getting from them, two of the island's top hotels. Is it that there is no revenue, so that they do not bother to tell us, or if there is revenue? We would like to know.

Sir, the ballroom at the old Marine House has an estimated revenue of $23 000. It seems as if that old ball room is doing a lot better than the $100 million invested in the other things. Perhaps, Sir, we could be told something about this Tourism Investment Corporation, because I have heard nothing of how well it has been performing in the past.

Sir, Pannell, Kerr, Forster has done a survey on the island's hotels, a comparison of hotels in the islands and other areas, and I am confident that the Government has had a copy of that report. It is dismal reading and shows the sad plight of the hotels on which our tourist earnings depend. These earnings represent the major portion of the foreign currency of this country.

Senator Miller said that she wondered how well this winter season was doing. Mr. President, with my limited knowledge of the hotels, every year we hear that this tourist season is going to be a bumper tourist season. This year the bumper part of it has passed, because the hotels, now in March, which is one of the best months in the tourist season, have had to cut their rates. Whether they have had to cut their rates or not, they have cut their rates for occupancy, so the earnings from the hotel industry in March which was always a top month, are going to be extremely disappointing.

The tourist industry is extremely important to this country. It employs a lot of people and it earns a lot of foreign currency, but I think it is going to be very disappointing this year.

I notice that on page 46, there is provision for a purchase of equity by Government in commercial ventures, of $21 725 385 – Subhead 3. The note says, "a cement plant". Could we be told if that cement plant is Arawak. Is there another? I would like to know, if we do not have enough cement plant in Arawak and we are now investing in another.

Sir, I would like to turn to agriculture, another earner of foreign currency. Since 1981, every year the industry was told by Government to go ahead and cultivate the fields and overhaul their factories and Government would provide the finances to keep the industry going. Government, the producers and the general public were aware that the industry was losing large sums of money. Some 6 000 jobs, the dependents of those workers who have those 6 000 jobs and about $75 million in foreign currency hinged on the industry, so the Government had to ensure the continuation of the industry for the benefit of the country, not for the benefit of the owners.

I would like to make that clear. There is no way that the Government supported this to keep the owners going. It was a case of the Government supporting the industry to keep the industry going for the benefit of the country. It kept down the cost of living, it provided 6 000 jobs and for the dependents of these workers, and it provided $75 million in foreign currency which was needed to service the foreign debt and to provide foreign currency for the commercial houses in this country to import goods for the use of the population in this country.

11.10 a.m.

This was done, Sir, at the expense of the owners of the industry, because the losses were debited to the accounts of the owners. The industry could have closed down when those losses commenced. Any prudent businessman who found that he had losses, and on examination of that business found that it was beyond his control to correct the losses, would close the business down. Sir, if this had been done, if the industry had been closed, the estates would still belong to the owners, although they would be in an abandoned condition today.

But Mr. President, the Government could not afford to allow this to happen. The Government could not allow the industry to close with 6 000 jobs and $75 million in foreign currency at stake. So the industry was continued for the welfare of Barbados in order to retain the jobs and to get the foreign currency, both of which the country could not afford to lose, and the owners equity was used with the result that most, if not all, has been already used, and I repeat, not for the benefit of the owners, but for the good of the country.

Now we hear that there must be a change of ownership of the land, Mr. President. To put it mildly, that would be immoral, if not dishonest. The owners' equity was used for the good of this country.

Let us talk about the new owners of the land. A calypsonian said he wants a plantation to manage or mismanage, I do not know which, but he is not prepared to put money in it. The calypsonian has enough sense to know that it would be foolish for anybody to go and say he is going to put money in land today when that is being used for the good of the country and at the expense of whoever puts the money in it.

Sir, the Government adviser. The Government had an adviser, and in 1981–82 he advised a target of 150 000 tonnes of sugar, because he said that by 1985 prices would be good and the industry would be in a position to take advantage of these good prices. The year 1985 was abysmal. The target was later dropped to 125 000 tonnes, and today it stands at 90 000 tonnes.

The same adviser was in the vanguard of a campaign about the inefficiency of the industry, bad management, this, that and the next. Sir, there are degrees of efficiency and inefficiency in the legal profession, the medical profession and in commercial houses. All of them are not top efficient. In sugar and whatever else there is, there are a few incompetents in all. I mean, you have the bad doctors burying the patients. In the main, Sir, I feel that in all of these professions we have got good people and they cannot be beaten on a hill.

But let us look at this myth of incompetence or inefficiency. I would like to deal with it, if I can, once and for all and let us get it over with. The true reason for the present indebtedness of the industry was the rising value of the US dollar, and consequently the Barbados dollar. In 1980, the price paid by the EEC gave the industry approximately Bds$900 per tonne, and that price, with a 23.5 per cent increase during the period up to 1985, had fallen to Bds$540 per tonne. This was due, as I said, to the United States dollar going up, and taking the Barbados dollar with it, against the average of the basket of currencies of the European countries, which determines the price which our industry receives. If the industry received money like the industry in Jamaica, Guyana and even Trinidad – I think there are two Barbados dollars to the American dollar and very nearly five Jamaican dollars to the US dollar – the industry in this country would be receiving $200 million a year, and instead of anybody talking about giving the industry support, it would be supporting somebody else.

Sir, the people who mooted this idea of incompetence, know, and it is well known, that it is the most competent sugar industry in the area by far. We are above any of the others, but the others are receiving, as I said, five and a half dollars when we are receiving $2.00. And, Sir, nothing has taken place to reduce the cost of wages and salaries or supplies that would be necessary to run the industry. In other words, Sir, the critics of the industry used the method that it is better to attack and that attack forms a better form of defence; better attack first the competence of the industry.

The point I wish to make in closing, Sir, is that this industry is another major earner of foreign currency which is in serious trouble through no fault of its own. Methods must be found whereby the country can return the support that the industry has given it. The industry has given the country support; not the country has given the industry support. That is something that has been a misconception in people's minds. Methods must be found whereby the country can return the support the industry has given it, I am sure that some day in the not too distant future this industry will return to profitability, but it will not be in a position to repay debts of $200 million or more with interest accruing on them.

11.20 a.m.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, I would like to think of the year 1986 as a year of revival. Ever since the political, economic and social rebirth of this country on May 28, the forces of backwardness see it as their role to hold back the people and to attack our institutions. The Opposition and Press would have us believe that 1986 has been a year of doom and gloom. Every day they tell us that the imminent collapse of our foreign reserves is at hand and that the Government finances is in total disarray. My role today, is to try to present some kind of truth to this Chamber, and in doing so, I should like to make the point that the institution charged with the statistical information in this country is the Government Statistical Services. The only bit of information by way of statistics which that institution does not handle is the balance of payments, which statistics are provided by the Central Bank of this country. I say so, Sir, because I want to use that as the measure so that no one would be in any doubt whatsoever, and that we would be able to verify figures issued from those sources.

We must know the truth, Sir. I remember Pilate saying, "What then is truth?" And would not wait for an answer. If you examine the year 1985, you would discover that the year 1986 was a far better year for Barbados than the year 1985 in almost every respect. In 1986, all sectors of the economy, except non-sugar agriculture, were in a growth situation. As a matter of fact, the economy grew by five per cent in the year 1986. If I were to compare the figures for the two years 1985 and 1986, you will see that in the year 1985, for sugar we had – .2%, in 1986, 11.1%; manufacturing, in 1985 – 9.5%; in 1986, 7.9%; the construction industry in 1985, – 2.8%; in 1986, 7.1%; tourism – 3.0% in 1985; in 1986, 3.5%; in mining and quarrying, in 1985 +7.4%; in 1986, 5.5%.

Examine the facts, Mr. President, forget the impressions! Nineteen eighty-five was a year of contractions while 1986 was a year of expansion in every respect as far as the economy of Barbados is concerned. And the people's aspirations, Sir, if I may score a political point, were also expanded when the pendulum stopped at 24 to 3!

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

SENATOR A. MORRISON: The prophets of doom have been saying that there are no foreign reserves in this country. Let them now contradict the figure that we have. I should like to tell this Honourable Chamber that in this month in March, on March 10, 1987, our foreign reserves now stand at a figure of $294 million. At December 31 last year, the foreign reserves of Barbados stood at $285.5 million. With foreign reserves at $294 million in the month of March, this is more than adequate to pay for four months of expenditure and imports.

We have other people who tell us about our foreign reserves position, and they hope, in talking about we have no foreign reserves, that they would be able to scare away people from making investments in this country, especially foreign investors. They also hope that local people would take their money out of this country. But the people must know the truth. I should like to say, Mr. President, that whatever foreign reserves problems they might talk about with the Democratic Labour Party Government, and whatever foreign reserves problems we are experiencing today, they were created by the previous Administration. The spate of irresponsible borrowing has left this Government with an inescapable burden. You must understand that. The amount of borrowings that went on in the previous ten years has left this Government with a debt burden legacy which we cannot, as a Government of this country, turn our backs on.

I refer to the debt profile of our country which we have inherited. If you were to examine how we are going to service that debt, you will see that our external debt payment for the year 1986 is $186.1 million; in 1987, $219.2 million; in 1988, $175.2 million; in 1989, $148.2 million; in the year of Grace 1990, $209.2 million. We took over a country whose future was very soundly and very well mortgaged. We have been like the son of a cavalier businessman who had enough money, and we find ourselves now having to pay off that mortgage, and it

does not leave us any choice, because we are a responsible Government.
11.30 a.m.

The fact is that the Minister of Finance has got to borrow money to service the debt burden created for us by the Barbados Labour Party Administration. As a matter of fact, Sir, since we have come into power and since we have assumed the office of the Government to administer this country, the Government has borrowed $105 million from external sources. But in that same period, we have paid out $176 million as foreign debt service. Can you imagine that, Sir? We have paid out $176 million as foreign debt service, but we have only borrowed $105 million. You hear a lot of talk in here about we are borrowing, too. We have got to borrow. These are the facts. Let the critics dispute these facts with verifiable information from the statistical people in this country.

We have heard a lot of cry about the fiscal deficit. I wish all Senators, and the whole of Barbados, to know that this Government does not apologise for its introducing a fiscal policy which is generating a rebirth in our country. Today in Barbados, as Senator Comissiong has said, it is a fact that it is impossible to purchase shares in any of the large firms in Barbados. That is what our fiscal policy has done for this country. We have also restored the incentive in people to work, save, and invest. In essence, Sir, we are rebuilding the foundations, which we so securely laid for our progress, which we had established in the years 1961 to 1976 in this country.

Sir, I will make one concession to the Opposition in regard to our capital development programme. That is, in truth and in fact, Sir, a source of difficulty to this Government. When it comes to our Capital Account, the Government found a large number of projects, capital works, in progress. It would have been wasteful for a Government like my Government, and also irresponsible of the Government to which I belong, to have stopped all those capital works when we came into power. As a result, we extended the life of some works and we put some on hold. That is a very fair thing to do. We had to carry on capital works that had been instituted by the other party, because, as I say, it would be very wasteful and irresponsible of a Government in this day to have stopped or to have done away with all those works.

I would say, Sir, that therein is the essence of good Government. We are not just doing things because we are spiteful. They have done some good jobs and we carry them on. But I challenge every Senator to examine the political rhythm of the Government financing in all the years when it comes to an election year. Get that straight, Sir. In every election year we get a lot of expenditure which probably will have to be thought out, and 1986 was no different from 1951, nor 1956, I submit to you, Sir.

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: If you are an unbiased observer of this political rhythm, you have got to address yourself to the facts.

On the fiscal policy of this country, we should be able to congratulate the Skipper on a very successful beginning to our new financial programme. I think we should compliment our Prime Minister for having a first class beginning, because what they do not realise is that this is our first Estimates. We have not brought Estimates in here before. The Estimates that they talk about was their thing. If you inflate your Estimates in an election year to suit what you want, you know what I mean, then you cannot say we are cutting back. We are not cutting back anything. It is now going back to reality!

Applause.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I believe that Senator Smith will be able to talk about that. This is our first Estimates. We have not discussed Estimates in here before, so we cannot cut back anything. We are just getting things back into shape, or back together. I believe that Senator Smith might be able to expand on that.

There was another point that disturbed me yesterday, where there was some report, as Senator Comissiong adverted, about the commercial classes, to the extent that they feel that there is no money in this country and that our financial resources are so bad that people cannot get paid. I would like to really exhort the Opposition to help us, because all of those commercial people owe, I believe, the Income Tax Department over $30 million. I know for sure they owe the Severance Fund in this country over $10 million and they also owe the contributions paid by people working in their several industries, money taken out and not paid into the Insurance Fund. I would like the Opposition to help us in this respect. People expect Government to perform the things they want Government to do, but they also have a duty to the Government to pay their taxes.

Asides.
11.40 a.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order. Senator Smith and Senator Miller, Senator Morrison is addressing the Chamber. Your voices are louder than his.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, it was a very good aside as far as I am concerned, because, if Senator Miller will remember, in the period leading up to the last General Election we had been hearing about all kinds of people and firms going into receivership. That

was something like how we have house fires now, Sir. They had more receiverships in that time than we ever heard about in all the history of the business people in this country, so a Government like us which in Opposition was very concerned about all these people going into receivership, wanted to ease the burden. You might argue that we should not reduce it by 10 per cent, we should have gone, say to 40 per cent, but the situation was so grave in those days – every day somebody else was going into receivership – that we figured that by the time we got into power there would not be anybody at all doing business in Barbados. As a result of that, we decided to cut 10 per cent off the Corporation Tax.

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: If we were wrong at that time, we could not be seen to be wrong, because it was a desperate situation, Sir, and we had to use desperate measures to come to grips with the situation, because we did not want the whole fabric of the business community to go down. We did not want to toil all night and, when we had won the Government, caught nothing. This is how it was.

Sir, I would like to make a few remarks about agriculture. Sugar is, and has always been, a very big problem in this country. We have had all kinds of arguments about sugar production, agriculture, this and that.

I believe that both parties have made a contribution at different times to the production of sugar in this country. They say that we did not want to have sugar in Barbados, but that is not true. We have always advocated in our policies in the 1970s that we would have an amount of acreage devoted to sugar while we pursued our agricultural diversification policy. The Prime Minister is very badly reported sometimes as being against sugar. That is not so. I have said in this Chamber already that the Prime Minister is the only member of this Legislature – Senate and House of Assembly – who went into a canefield and cut canes with me.

(Aside: SENATOR B. A. MILLER: For five minutes?)

SENATOR A. MORRISON: No, he cut for half an hour.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Despite all that talk, we are not averse to sugar. I think Senator Ward would be able to support my argument on this, that in the days of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, we did not come out openly and say we were supporting sugar, but there were numerous lockups in that bank for years. When they did not get a good return for their production, the money went over to the next year, and the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank carried a lot of brunt in those days under the Democratic Labour Party Government. So we have actually supported sugar from the beginning up to this day.

Aside.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Do not be carried away by the cane blade speech.

That bank was given the permission to lend money for equipment in those days, and he can bear me out on that. I argued at the time, when I was Minister of Agriculture, that there was too much equipment in this country, because every plantation wanted to be heavily capitalised in equipment, and when the crop was finished and their lands were ploughed, the equipment lay idle in this country. I think we had bought too much equipment. But I want to make the point that the Democratic Labour Party has always been in the forefront of trying to support sugar.

When we had 62 000 acres of arable land in this country, we said that we would devote 40 000 acres to sugar cane, or 39 000, something like that. We had been doing some very good work on the varieties of sugar cane production over at Groves, and we kept them up to date. We financed that and they came up with some very good varieties in those days, and we said that if we got good varieties in any good rainfall year, we could have produced 160 000 tonnes. But something went wrong in those days, and when estates started to be subdivided into four acre lots and two acre lots, I saw the demise of Searles Factory, which hurt my heart, as a Christ Church boy. The argument was in those days that we had taken a lot of acres out of agriculture and that you would see the sea rocks appear in Christ Church.

Aside

SENATOR A. MORRISON: That was a comment made by the Sugar Producers' Association at the time, and that there was no need to keep Searles. At that time Searles was the most efficient factory in Barbados. When Searles was shut down, it hurt my heart. Searles used to be more efficient than Bulkeley and all of them put together. Any bad year that Bulkeley had, they used to take the money from Searles and subsidise Bulkeley Factory, and they took all of Searles' machinery to the factory down there in St. Peter, Haymans, and then it would not work properly. They said that Searles did not have any water, but even then we had water at Kingsland. There was a water well at Kingsland, not too far away from Searles. They said, "We do not want that." There

was a water well at Fair View, St. Patricks, next door to Searles. They still did not want that.

The attitude of the Sugar Producers' Association in those days was that we were trying to kill sugar. No such thing! It was just a misinterpretation of their idea of what we were doing, because we had already known that we could grow sugar on 40 000 acres of land and get the amount of tons that we wanted.

Today, Sir, they are now saying that, because of the market conditions, we must not over produce. They only want 30 000 acres now, because the idea is to grow less now. That has come now full circle. So it is no question now that we put down agriculture. They are now saying, all who support agriculture, that we only need 30 000 acres of land to grow the sugar that we want in order not to put ourselves in a bad position on the world market and in relation to the European community.

My point is this, Sir. We had done all the research based on our policy at that time. We had a policy for agriculture. Most of the research on the production of vegetables was done in the 1970s by a man called George Evis from the Organisation of American States. That is how we knew we could grow carrots. We had a proficiency in the Caribbean of producing carrots in those days. We were also self-sufficient in chicken production. In those days we grew peanuts for the first time. We grew white potatoes for the first time.
11.50 a.m.

When we had done all the research on those matters and we turned it over to the private sector, it just went bum. It is only in recent years that the same plantations have seen it fit to grow vegetables, and now they come on with vegetables they kill the whole market, because the pioneers of the vegetable production in this country, the small farmers, have been swamped by the large scale production of plantations. Years ago, when we were pursuing that policy, no plantation would grow vegetables – they were so secure in the fact that when you grew sugar, you knew you had the returns. They did not see that a time would come when sugar would no longer be king. But they have fallen in line now, and it is a good thing, because we need diversification of agriculture at this stage.

We had a project agreed to by the Caribbean Development Bank, the Spring Hall Land Lease Project, which was the best project ever formulated in this country for small farmers. Then came the pundit in agriculture at the time, when the Barbados Labour Party came into power, because Bolden knew everything about agriculture. He waited three years after we lost power before he started to implement that scheme at Spring Hall, and that is why we are at the point we are at now. If he had carried on from where I left off when we left Government, our agriculture would be in good trim today. It was a good project. Eventually they had to go on with it.

In Gibbons up there in Christ Church, we had organised a scheme to irrigate 200 acres, using four wells instead of a proliferation of wells, and have a comprehensive scheme to provide irrigation pipes, agronomical services, manure and even the planting material, in an effort to reduce the cost of vegetables in this country. When they got in power, Mr. President, that scheme laid dead for about two years. Up to this day, that scheme has not got off the ground to anybody's satisfaction, but we could have grown all the vegetables in this country in the same Gibbons area up there. It is a fertile valley.

Sir, we had done all the research on a thing called confith. It hurt my heart when, two weeks ago, I heard that the Canadians are setting up a confith plant in Venezuela. All the work on animal feed from sugar cane had been done here in Barbados. All the work on confith was done here for eight years, and I can now hear, that the Venezuelans are putting up a plant where you can get cheap animal feed from sugar cane, with the technology that was developed here in this country! When they got into power, they did not do anything about it anymore.

We had the instant yam that we developed up there in Wildey, produced from yam flakes, which preserved the life of the yam. You do not hear anything about instant yam now.

I have just mentioned these things to just let you know that we were not sleeping when we were in Government. We had done a lot of research, and we found out that there were commercial products. We gave them to the private people and nothing more was heard of it.

Sir, I would like to say just a few words about the Ministry of Transport and Works. I thought I would have heard Senators being concerned about the provision in the Estimates for Transport and Works. We will discover from those Estimates that most of the money you see voted for Transport and Works will be used for salaries and things like that, but we have to carry on the ongoing projects like the West Coast to Airport Road and the Northern Access Road. We need to be able to carry on our road programme, because if there is one thing that was evident in the last five years, it was that the maintenance aspect of the roads in this country was totally neglected. We have been able in the last year, since we came into power, to resurface a few roads, and we intend as we go along to maintain the roads we have in a very good manner while we try to carry out the project with that big road, which we heard about yesterday, as Senator Blackman said, with these roundabouts. That is

not of our creation at all, but we have to live with it. I can understand Senator Blackman's concern about that road, and we will try to do something to alleviate the fears of Senator Blackman.

I think that the Government has to devote more funds to the construction of roads and making them better, because they have been left badly undone. We know that. We also have to push money into housing and into industry.

I think that despite the constraints mentioned by members, the Government is very well aware of its obligations to take this country a step forward in providing the social amenities which we would like to have. I cannot prophesy what will happen in the year 1987. You know the economists only talk after things have happened, they do not talk before, so I would not venture even to anticipate in this area. Even if I anticipate, that would be against the rules, so I would not want to anticipate the measures that the Minister of Finance will bring about later on in his Budget Speech to balance his Budget and to give us the incentive to go forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR P. Y. FORDE: Mr. President, the debate thus far has focussed generally on areas on which public funds will be disbursed over the next financial year. A number of honourable Senators have made able contributions on the economic areas, such as finance, trade and industry, and the prospects for Barbados over the next year, and Foreign Affairs and Education have received attention. I wish, Mr. President, to speak on one or two matters which, occasionally, get swept under the carpet, because policy makers tend to give the impression that only hard economic factors touch and concern the lives of ordinary people.
12.00 noon.

As far as Appendix G in the Estimates is concerned, I must say that I have found it useful in terms of making a judgment of Government priorities. I hope that Appendix G will form part of the future Estimates. For example, the Child Care Board, which suffered a severe cut in the last Administration, will now receive approximately $800 000 less than it asked for, according to this Appendix G. This is a great disappointment. I cannot accept that the Defence Board can get the $16 million or $17 million which it asked for, when, as a former Chairman of the Child Care Board said recently, I think it was in November last year, children's homes are leaking, and that fridges and washing machines have not worked for years. One has only to visit some of these homes to see the level of dilapidation which has set in.

Far from a reduction in the subvention to the Child Care Board, there is a great need for expansion of its services. The Board has done some useful work in the area of child abuse, which is a major national problem. Senator Blackman made some suggestions yesterday as to how legislation can be approved, and I strongly support him. There is, for example, a need for comprehensive legislation to protect the rights of the child and to protect children from pornographic and other immoral and corrupt activities, and, of course, illegal drugs.

Mr. President, you will recall that I voiced my concern on this matter by way of a Parliamentary Question in this Chamber on November 5, 1986. I hope that answer will not be too long in coming, and that it will indicate that positive steps are being taken to answer my concern.

The question of abuse is by no means limited to children. It also extends to women in the society. As far as women are concerned, Mr. President, and here I touch on what is an economic problem, women have suffered greatly from the downturn in industrial activity especially in the closure of INTEL and other electronic firms. I make a case for the creation of employment opportunities for women especially unskilled women.

I note that the National Training Board has got what it asked for, some $3.5 million, and I hope that the young women of Barbados will get their fair share of this provision. Despite our economic difficulties, we must find resources to provide a better life not only for our young people, but for our elderly.

Mr. President, I spent many years as an Executive Council Member of the Barbados Family Planning Association. As honourable Senators know, the Family Planning Association not only seeks to advance the education of the country in family planning matters, but it was also established to maintain relationships with appropriate Government departments and national and international welfare organisations. We have found in the Barbados Family Planning Association that there is need for a conscious and concerted effort at integration of the various agencies, Government and non-governmental, engaged in providing social services. We need in Barbados to have a single Ministry of Social Services. The existence of so many agencies dealing with the particular subject of social services is often the cause of the confusion of officers, the agencies themselves, the general public and all of the clients who use these services. Agencies have failed to collaborate in a meaningful way because of departmental and professional jealousies, among other reasons. It is clear from an examination of the Estimates before this Chamber that Government does not have the resources to have this continued duplication of work within social service agencies.

I now turn, Mr. President, to the subject of the handicapped, or rather the handy-capable, which is very dear to my heart. This week, as honourable Senators

know, is being observed as the Week of the Disabled, when mentally and physically challenged people are being highlighted. The heart of a country is usually judged by the treatment of its less fortunate citizens. The record in Barbados, while not an excellent one, has improved in recent years. There are, I believe, less than ten special schools for the handicapped children of Barbados, and no sheltered workshop for the young adults when they leave school. These persons are literally queuing up for very limited space.

Mr. President, I would like to suggest that special class rooms be set up or allocated in the existing primary schools to ease the pressure for places. This is an expensive exercise, and teachers need to be specially trained, but the problem is an urgent one, and the waiting lists are long. A start needs to be made. Perhaps that start can come with the new primary schools which are now to be built, and which, I understand, are to amalgamate some 21 existing primary schools. It would be a good opportunity for Government to send a signal that it has a progressive attitude towards the handicapped.

I think, too, that we should give more consideration to handicapped adults, especially in public places. We can at least begin to follow the lead of the developed countries if we are to be regarded as a caring society. It would be remiss of me not to mention that the new Central Bank at Church Village has made provision for handicapped people by building a ramp for those in wheelchairs attending the Frank Collymore Recital Hall or doing business at the bank. It is part of the vision of this important national institution which has been so ably led by Dr. Courtenay Blackman over the last 15 years.
12.10 p.m.

My final point, Mr. President, relates to the problem of illegal drugs. Concern has been voiced by Senators here and those in the Other Place. I am satisfied that successive Governments have tried to institute a plan of action. Clearly, much more can be done by way of education, legislation, detection and rehabilitation. I get the feeling, however, that too much energy is dissipated by unproven allegations, charges and counter-charges as to who is responsible for the drug epidemic, which we all know is not limited to Barbados. We need action. We hear of big fish and little fish, but we seem to be toiling all day and all night and catching nothing. We need to bring the perpetrators to justice. Put simply, Mr. President, we need less talk and more action.

Thank you.

Applause

(Aside: Hear, hear, hear!)

(Aside: Very good.)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, ...

(*Aside*: Senator L. R. TULL: Do not spoil it!)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: .....yesterday an attempt was made to make a distinction between a parliamentarian and a politician. The myth of that argument has been put to rest today. We heard the voice of one from the planter class, an exponent in support of sugar, and we heard the voice in an erudite manner defending the position of the working class. I do not want to go too far on that, but it indicates the perspectives of people from different strata of the society. And it is important that when the arguments are advanced and they appear, on the surface level, to be moving towards the same objective, sometimes the latent ends are more important to be observed.

I am fully aware that we have to deal with the Appropriation Bill, and it deals with statistics, but the restrictions that are on the Senate on this matter give us little scope to venture in detailed form on this particular issue. I believe that the history of this restriction goes back to a British convention when their House of Commons was placed under strong pressure by the House of Lords on that occasion in dealing with financial matters, and the Liberal Government found it imperative to return to the electorate on that occasion to be given the mandate to restrict the powers of the House of Lords. Therefore, Mr. President, I am not going to deal, like some other persons did, with the economic aspect of the matter, because I am not paranoid with statistics.

(*Aside:* Senator B. A. MILLER: You are an accountant, man.)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I will deal with the sociological aspect, and I will go on further because Senator Miller has given me the inspiration to go on a little further. I will go on further.

Laughter.

Applause.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: The attitude of some people in this country is tantamount to that which makes the distinction between Marcus Mosiah Garvey and Dr. W. E. B. DuBois. I believe that Marcus Garvey must feel upset in his grave today, 50 years after walking the soil of this country and 100 years after his birth, when the philosophy that he had attempted to instill in the hearts of the working class black people in this country has been totally eroded. There are people in many political forums who are attempting to roll the clock back. It will not happen. We are going to stay on our full feet and we are going to fight it.

I have heard Members in this Chamber copying from books and delivering the same type of speeches that were made in the British Parliament when a man by the name of Stanley was fighting to introduce education to the people of this country. Stanley said then, in his arrogance, and obviously it appeared then that he was genuine in his deliverance, that he was going to give us habits and imbue us with feeling in order that we would conduct our own affairs. Today we are struggling with people who are trying to instill and enforce upon us methods of imperialism and bring about a reversal of the democratisation of our educational system which the Honourable Errol Barrow introduced in this country in 1961.

(*Aside*; Senator B. A. MILLER: Come back here a little more. You are not doing the Don Blackman stance right.)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: You would do Mrs. Thatcher.

I do not want to be caught up in trying to deal with the rebuttal, Sir, but I would believe that when we hear voices echoing meaninglessly in some forums, and I wish I could say this forum, and trying to couch the language in such a way as to give the impression that what was said some time ago in the public domain, that people should be made to pay for their tertiary education, it is time for me to arrest those statements and denounce them vehemently.

The statement that was made here yesterday is a clarification to rebut the ramification in the public domain, because serious charges were levelled at the attack on democracy when a Member of this Chamber said that people should be made to pay for secondary education in this country. Yesterday, the impression was given that there would be a method in which compensation would be had from those students after spending their tuition period at the university. That was not the initial stand. We, in our drive forward in education, cannot allow this type of encumbrance to put us back.

Sir, there is a way of advancing a defence before these attacks are made. Sometimes there are persons who come in here and refer to people as neophytes, pseudo-intellectuals and everything. But I am aware that I cannot call anybody by any pejorative name in here. But the Afro-Saxon is a strange man, moving on two legs, no clear thought, confused. One morning he is saying A, the next morning he is saying B.
12.20 p.m.

This Government, in its manifesto, has committed itself to free secondary and tertiary education. We do not have to come here and use catch phrases about equity of education, equality of education and democratisation of education and echo all through the Chambers about remedial, remedial over and over again, and then contradict the principle. It makes me laugh. He is saying that at the pre-primary, primary, secondary, and tertiary levels we are having problems with reading. Then he comes back and says to us that he cannot understand why we are having this particular course at the University of the West Indies in the use of English. You could teach it at the University of the West Indies or at the Community College. The important thing is that the working class people in Barbados receive the kind of tuition that Errol Walton Barrow has given to them. That is a clear example. That is why I have to look not at the surface level, but to go underneath.

Before I explain to you the position of this party our position in relation to education, I would like to make the point that, with all restrictions in this area, some great contributions were made. Yesterday, Senator Phillips made a good contribution – a great proposal was made there. Today we were treated to a discourse by Senator Comissiong and one by Senator Morrison, and from the short contribution made yesterday from Senator Wickham, for whom I have great respect, I have great respect for his suggestion in the area of allowing the public to have access to the material of the Richard B. Moore Library. I know you are waiting Senator Jones.

Let me shift now to the progressive policies of the Democratic Labour Party. The Barbados Labour Party was in power for 10 years. I think that Senator Shorey....

At this stage certain remarks made by Senator T. A. PRESCOD were ordered by Mr. PRESIDENT to be expunged from the record.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, our pre-primary education has been neglected for quite a while. Many young children from poor, destitute, working class backgrounds were denied the opportunity to move into the mainstream of things in the area of education. Our policy is not based on any public works programme, it does not deal with simple erections or non-productive acts. We looked at the philosophy, the conceptionalisation and the methods, and we recognized that if you build 1 000 schools, you still must understand that we have a duty to those children between ages 3 – 5 to bring them into the mainstream of things. Many children from more affluent, more successful homes have that opportunity to move in, and these great Ministers who pat themselves on their backs and claim that they were responsible for charting new directions in education did not recognise the need to allow children like me to have the opportunity to start at age 2, so that by the time they reached the age of 11, they would have served the same duration period at the pre-primary and primary levels as those children from an affluent home. This Government has already started to extend the opportunities for children to go into school at that early age.
12.30 p.m.

The adult educational programme is going to be reintroduced.

Aside

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: The measurement of money is not the only way of doing things. You know that. What are you arguing about? You cut back the welfare programme at one time, and you were not arguing about cost being the determining factor of efficiency.

The adult education programme is going to be introduced, and those persons who were not fortunate to excel in their early ages will be given the opportunity to go back to school. They will be also given the opportunity to add to those subjects that they are already in possession of, and this will enable them to meet the changes in the standard of education and the demands in this contemporary industrial world.

The Head Teachers of all senior schools will be on special courses – I believe that they have started – though I think that the senior schools will be phased out and the students from senior schools will be incorporated into our secondary system.

The Skills Training Programme was introduced, Senator Miller said, by the Barbados Labour Party. But there is a change from the Ministry of Labour – now it falls under the umbrella of the Ministry of Education. The main reason is not because of any philosophical variation, but because of a different method in carrying on this particular programme. This will allow students, male and female, to get the opportunity to advance their vocational and technical training so that they will be able to meet the demands of the changes in the industrial world. So employers can feel comfortable that they will not be saddled with the difficulties of incompetent people moving from the school system into the position of work. That transition period will be smoothly taken care of by the methods that are handled by the Ministry of Education.

I am going to touch briefly on the area of housing. A lot of emphasis was placed yesterday on rent collecting. Somebody advanced the argument that the employers should deduct the money from the wages or salaries of employees. I wish that same voice could be used to urge the business sector to honour their obligations to the state in the form of National Insurance and taxes, and in the same adamant manner in which he requests the paying up of the arrears of rent, I would be happy if he would have seen the difficulties in the same light as the business sector should be seeing their commitment to the Government in relation to taxation, National Insurance and so on.

I believe that the remark was made in a genuine way, but it just shows sometimes that you have a tendency of looking at your own interests. You see, politics is the pursuit of one's interest and you have a tendency of keeping along a certain line.

(*Aside*: Senator L. R. TULL: Whose definition is that? The DLP's?)

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: We have a great struggle ahead of us, we have great difficulties in the area of land and in the area of housing. It goes back way to 1840, when we were having difficulties with the Master and Servants Act. We were struggling from living in the clustered huts on the rab lands of the plantation and dreaming about a future of owning a house and being given more liberty in our post-emancipation period.

I believe that the first free estates owned by black people were in Rock Hall, Arthur Seat and Redmans Village. Black people began to take root inside the society then, for the first time they began to have the feeling of owning a house, not owning land. While we were living on the estates, we had to pledge to give our labour back to the plantocracy as compensation for rent. Thank God, that situation no longer exists. As time went on, we began to make our inroads. Dr. Dann from the UWI Institute of Research has indicated that about 80 to 85% of the people in Barbados, families, now own houses, but it is in no way an indication of the quality of houses that working class people live in, so we have to keep fighting.

Aside.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: That is in the programme, do not worry about that.

The only way that we can bring a solution to this position of landlessness – that is the way we describe it – is if the state takes the initiative in purchasing lands at a reasonable price – not at the price that we have seen land being purchased at, which was once described as being confiscated – to give some satisfaction to the vendor, the landlord. It means that the sites and services programme must be resuscitated and expanded to assist ordinary people or whose desires there are to have their own homes. For those who cannot afford to purchase their own homes, it means that the state has an additional responsibility to provide housing estates at a reasonable rent for those persons to enjoy a comfortable standard of living in an environment that is suitable for their habitation.

12.40 p.m.

We cannot fall victims to the trap of ignorance of seeing the economy contracting and placing people out of employment and then advance an argument that the persons should be put out of their houses because they did

not pay rent. Now, listen carefully. I would never advocate that persons should live in the Government's housing estate and do not pay rent. That must be made clear. What I am saying is that the state has a different objective. The conceptualisation of the old landlord, which is based off the capitalist principles of having maximum returns, considered as profits, cannot be applied to any state institution like the National Housing Welfare. Our responsibility is to provide houses for those persons who cannot provide houses for themselves. Therefore, I am recommending that the Government introduce a basic social worker programme in training the rent collectors to deal with the situation as they go along, and to return a rational and accurate report to the National Housing Corporation so that we can determine what is genuine from what is not.

It will be very much like the situation at the Welfare Department, because I believe that there is a number of persons, and if we had to take the system right through, it means that we will be placing thousands of persons on the streets of Barbados. So it would be a bit unreasonable for us not to carry out a scientific study and just do like the previous regime, simply peeping through your window and seeing if there is a video set or a stereo set, and then evicting you the following week as long as you have rent arrears, or even go further and expose people to the electronic media and have them across the television screens as an incentive for urging people to pay their rents.

Mr. President, I know that the Government has a number of persons on this side who are willing to expand on other areas of Government. I believe, that on the basis of substance, I have made my contribution to this Honourable Chamber, and I would hope that, as the debate goes along, we will be treated and offered dialogue of substance that we can all ponder on the merits of the contributions in order to take this country forward. On that position that I rest my firm support for this Appropriation Bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I think this may be a convenient moment for us to have a break. In moving the suspension for an hour, I would like to offer this suggestion to Senators, if it meets their approval, that later in the afternoon, when we hear that tea is ready, Senators could go out and have what refreshment they wish while the debate continues. That would be more convenient than breaking the session, if it is agreeable.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Is this agreeable?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for an hour.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This session is now suspended for one hour.

12.50 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is resumed.

SENATOR REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I am afraid that I am not an economist and I do not know a lot about figures and money and will not be talking very much on that. We have businessmen here who can do that much better than I can. But, Mr. President, I have listened very attentively to the debates on both sides of the House and have gained quite a lot of information on the management of some departments of Government, but I have not really gained much insight into how the estimated revenue will be achieved. We are supposed to reach in excess of $698 million, and I would like to know how we are going to reach that. The Budget will explain that, I suppose.

The Minister of the Public Service gave us a resume of the functions of that Ministry and what it hopes to achieve in the future. I would say that he did it, in a very erudite manner as well, but I do not think he came to grips with debating the Estimates as we have them here. Perhaps it was deliberate, perhaps he decided not to debate them in that way, but I am sure that in his reply he will deal in some detail with certain points that have been raised by various members on this floor, for as taxpayers we all need to know what is the state of our economy. We have to continue to press for an answer to that question, what is the state of the economy in Barbados?

Mr. President, I have heard a lot of talk about the Arawak Cement Plant, and it has come in for a lot of adverse criticism. I must say I was very impressed by what Senator Phillips had to say about the Arawak Cement Plant, but at least I find it almost impossible to believe that any institution that cost over $200 million could become almost a white elephant in a matter of two to three years. That really surprises me and I do not believe that that is correct.

When they put the plant down, we were told that they had engineers of the highest calibre, they had managers who had had tremendous experience in other fields in other parts of the world, and from all reports, we expected everything to be going wonderfully well. It is a joint venture between two Governments. It is not only Barbados, it is Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, and I do not see why it should just be allowed to run to

ruin, so to speak, after costing a matter of $200 million. I do not think we have ever had anything in Barbados that cost that amount of money, and, therefore, I feel that there must be something inherently wrong with it. You cannot say it is due to incompetence, because, as I have already said, the engineers were of the highest calibre and the managers had a lot of experience. We have to look to some other reasons. As Trinidad and Tobago has an interest in it, I do not see how they can sit back and allow it to go the way of all flesh either. What I would suggest is that there must be a means and a way of bringing it back to some kind of viability and making it a viable enterprise.

I remember that at one time the Pine Hill Dairy was not doing well, it was losing money every year. They changed the management, and in a few years' time they were making a profit. I do not know what the managers are like at the Arawak Cement Plant, but I am saying it must be necessary to change something down there, and if they can change something down there, we should be doing fairly well.

Another thing is that we have to remember the economy of Trinidad. At one time the Trinidad economy had billions of dollars. I read in the newspapers about a year ago where somebody had made an analysis of the economy of Trinidad and showed that in a matter of five to seven years the economy moved from billions of dollars to just a few million, and only yesterday we heard that Trinidad is borrowing money from the IMF. So whereas Trinidad had promised to buy quite a lot of cement from Barbados, perhaps what happened is that they were not so well placed when the factory was ready to produce, and we would have lost some of our sales there.

What about the other countries in the CARICOM? How did they support it? Did they really put their all into helping with this cement plant?

I do feel, Sir, that something can be done to save that Arawak Cement Plant. I do not know if any of you have visited it. I have been there and seen the place, and it is fantastic. The building is something else. I do not know if to call it too fantastic, but, to me, it should be something that we should all be proud of. I feel that if sufficient attention is given to it by both Governments, we can save it from becoming a disaster, and I feel that this is what we should be striving to do. Negative thinking never gets you anywhere, and if we all feel it cannot succeed, it will not succeed, but if we believe that it will be able to succeed, we have got to be able to make it do.

Another little thing I would like to talk about, another aspect of the Estimates, is the Child Care Board. That was spoken of already, but I was really very hurt when I saw that the Child Care Board would be getting $800 000 less than they had been asking for, because we know the wonderful work that the Child Care Board does. We know the number of children that they have saved from sex abuse and from molestation, and, as Senator Blackman said, and I agree with him 100 per cent, if these children were made wards of the court, then the parent would not be able to get hold of them as they can now do. So I am very sorry that we cannot find a little more money to give to the Child Care Board, because we certainly need to do something for that agency.

When we come to housing, I notice that the vote has also been cut a little, but, as someone said, housing is next to food. You want food and shelter, and if you have the food and no shelter, you still have not got anything. We are hoping that this Government will be able to help to find some more housing for those who are now without homes.

I want to pass on to the Defence Force. I for one am pleased – I do not know who else is pleased – that the Defence Force got the vote they asked for, because I think they are doing a very good job in this country. The Defence Force is not really a military organisation. As a defence force, the training is specifically aimed at enabling its members to come to the aid of the civil power. That is what you mean by a defence force. If it was a military organisation, it would be called an army. Its main purpose is to come to the aid of the civil power.

I remember that some years ago, there was talk of young boys and girls going to the Defence Force for training, and quite a few people were up in arms about that and felt that they were training them to become soldiers. I feel that it would be a wonderful thing if you got young people trained by the members of the Defence Force, because we would have some disciplined people in our midst and we need discipline in our midst. Those are my views, I do not mind who agrees with them.

I observe that we are expected to have an estimated expenditure of $711 million. That seems a mammoth amount, but I would not mind if it were $715 million, if the extra $4 million could be used to heighten the security at the airport and the seaport, because I think that one of the worst things facing Barbados now is the drug problem. We certainly have got to watch that. I feel, Sir, that if we can improve the security at the airport and at the harbour, where we know that certain drugs come in in containers – just last week we heard of a container having quite a number of pounds of marijuana and nobody seems to know who it was for – this would be a way of doing something about that.

I was pleased to see that the Prime Minister suggested that members of the Defence Force should be put at the Grantley Adams Airport to help in stopping a lot of these drugs from being off-loaded there. I think that is a good idea, and we should have some of them down at the Port, too. And there is nothing wrong with our trying to get some of these very well-trained dogs that can sniff cocaine and various things. We have got to do something to eradicate this terrible drug menace we have in this country. It used to be felt that Barbados would not be affected with drugs in the way other countries have been affected with them. But I want to say that anything that happens anywhere else can happen in Barbados. It is no point our hiding our heads in the sand like ostriches. We know that drugs are a problem.
2.00 p.m.

I was told by a headteacher of a primary school in this country that children of eight and ten years in his school are bringing drugs into the school to sell. He had to call some parents in and talk to them about that and the parents said they had given them these drugs to sell. A headteacher in this country told me that. But it is not only in the primary schools, it is in the secondary schools and right through the whole gamut of society. I feel that if we are interested in our country, this is one of the greatest curses that we have to deal with, the illicit drugs that are being given to the young boys and young girls, and older ones, too. If we do not do something about that, Mr. President, I feel that in a very short while we shall be producing zombies and not humans.

That is all I have to say.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. President, when I first looked at these Estimates, I had some difficulty in reconciling the Approved Estimates of Revenue for the year 1986–87, with the Revised Estimates until it was pointed out to me that the Estimates that were approved by the last Administration, approved in March of last year, and the Revised Estimates really reflect what is the expectation for the current year.

I mention that because there has been a significant difference. The Approved Estimates were $704 million and the Revised Estimates $640 million. Of course, the very big difference in that is the substantial drop in taxes on profits and income, some $61 million. However, the $640 million being the Revised Estimates compares very closely with the Estimates for the previous year, 1985–86, of $648 million. So for the two years, 1985–86 and 1986–87, it would be very, very close, as far as the Estimates are concerned.

I notice that in the Estimates, the expectation is that the revenue for the year 1987–88 would be some $698 071 077. This is quite a jump on what the expectation is for the year under review 1986–87, which is almost $640 000 000 and it seems to me that it assumes that there will be a significant expansion in the economy, or that there would be new taxes introduced. I know it has been said that no increase in personal Income Tax is contemplated, so I am just wondering whether other forms of taxation are being contemplated, because I do not see how inflation will make any significant impact on getting the revenue up to $698 million from $640 million in the current year. Inflation may increase slightly because we remain tied to the American dollar and that dollar has floated downwards in relation to the European and Japanese currencies, and as a result of that, the cost of the cars and other products which we import from Japan and Europe will be more. But it seems to me that the assumption in these Estimates is that there will be both an expansion in the economy, and I will deal with that later when I come to the productive sectors, and that there would be new types of taxation, other than increases in personal Income Tax to be introduced.

In the Budget of July of last year, there were significant reductions in the levels of Corporation Tax and personal Income Tax, and it was a very bold move on the part of the Government. Apart from fulfilling an election promise, it was a very bold move, in my opinion, to release the economic and commercial energies of the private sector and the citizens of this country. It may have been a bit too much too soon, but I still commend the Government on the move that it took in challenging the citizens of this country to take a greater responsibility for the economic stability and growth, rather than having that responsibility reside with Government alone.

Taxation, as we know, is the means that any Government has of raising revenue to meet its expenditures. Until fairly recent times, taxation in many countries was seen as a redistribution of wealth. That may have had its place in times past, but in the modern world, which has become so very highly competitive, taxation not only has to provide the revenue that Government requires, it also has to be an incentive for the creation of new wealth for a country. I believe this is what the Government attempted to do last year in reducing the levels of taxation to release the energies to which I have referred.

Other Senators have spoken about collection, and I endorse them wholeheartedly. The departments of Inland Revenue and Customs, in particular, are the two main revenue earning departments of Government. No effort should be spared in strengthening the workings and the inspection functions of those departments to ensure that the taxes that are due to the Government are collected.

I also support the views expressed by other Senators that companies that owe the Government amounts with respect to Pay As You Earn or National Insurance, or whose corporate taxes are in arrears, should

be pressured by the relevant authorities to ensure that that Government gets what it is entitled to.

Applause.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: I suppose that in any community, Mr. President, there has always been, being imperfect mortals as we are, and there will always be some level of tax evasion. But I believe there are acceptable limits or levels, and I feel very strongly on strengthening the two departments of Inland Revenue and Customs, because I believe we in this community may be very close to that level of acceptable threshold. If this is allowed to go unchecked, it will be a tremendous disincentive to the decent, honest, hardworking people of this community who want to make their contribution and see that justice is done and everybody pays his fair share.

I should like to turn, while still dealing with revenue, to illegal drugs. You may wonder, Sir, what is the relevance? I am pleased to see that there has been a sustained effort in getting after the pushers and traffickers and whoever is dealing in illegal drugs. I recognise, of course that, primarily, it is a social disease, it is a scourge. But it has other implications, because if persons see that it is worth their risk to get involved in this illicit trade and find themselves in a position where they can make extremely easy tax free money, it may be difficult for them to resist the temptation. Not only will it be an injustice to them, it will be an injustice to the rest of the members of our society who are working hard and paying their fair share, and they can only become frustrated when they see others making very big fortunes out of the illegal drug trade. So not only will illegal drugs affect the physical and social health of the nation, it will also affect the Treasury if it is allowed to go unchecked.
2.10 p.m.

If I may turn to the Current Expenditure, the Revised Estimates are also significantly less than the Approved Estimates, by some $40 million, but again fairly close to the $663 million that was spent in the fiscal year 1985–1986. So when one looks at the Revenue and the Expenditure for the two years, 1985–86 actual and the revised – and 1986–1987, the two years appear to be quite similar.

I recognise that attempts have been made to maintain the social services, and I also recognise that attempts have been made to control expenditure, because with a declining revenue, or revenue less than what was expected, if expenditure was not also controlled, the deficit would have reached an unacceptable level. I will have more to say about controlling expenditure later.

Mr. President, I turn to the productive sectors, and I am going to be touching on tourism, agriculture, manufacturing and the offshore financial services. In every case, I take it that the objective is to earn more foreign exchange and to create higher levels of employment, or reduce the present unsatisfactory level of unemployment.

If I may start with tourism, last October there was a symposium held in the Frank Collymore Hall, where representatives from all the private sector organizations – Small Business Association, Chamber of Commerce, Hotel Association, Manufacturers Association, Barbados Workers Union, and there may be one or two others I have omitted – met. It was decided at that meeting that, in the short run at least, the development of tourism had to be the No. 1 priority of the private sector. This is not to say that the other productive sectors were unimportant, but it did recognise the existing problems with manufacturing within CARICOM which could not be solved in the short term and similarly with agriculture.

In the tourism sector, we have nearly 14 000 hotel beds in a hotel plant that covers the range from luxury to small guest houses but there was something wrong with the marketing of our hotels, and many of them were in need of refurbishment. They had allowed their plant, equipment and furniture to run down.

You may wonder, Sir, why there had been this decline in standards, in the levels of service and the standards of facilities. I will quote some figures here from a report, which was referred to earlier today, done by a professional firm of chartered accountants, in which it said that internationally, hotels earned a net operating profit of 26 per cent of revenue. By net operating profit, I mean before the fixed charges of interest, depreciation, insurance, and property taxes – 26 per cent internationally. In the Caribbean, the corresponding figure is 16 per cent – 10 points less. In Barbados, it has only been six per cent, which highlights two things – our marketing had to be improved, and secondly, hotels had to generate more profits with which to refurbish their existing facilities.

It was against that background and after extensive consultation, that most of the public companies in this island got together and decided that they would make a voluntary – I stress voluntary – contribution of 3 per cent of their pre-tax profits to a fund. This is expected to realize some $3 million a year for each of the next three years. The purpose of this fund was not to replace what the Board of Tourism was doing, or what the Barbados Hotel Association's members are doing. It was to supplement and enhance their efforts especially aiming at the summer markets. That company, to be called the Tourism Promotions Corporation, is now in formation, and although it might be too late to have much impact on this coming summer, work is already being done on next winter, and summer for next year.

I readily admit that the reduction in the Corporation Tax from 45 per cent to 35 per cent was an incentive for this voluntary action to be taken by public companies, and certain large private companies have also indicated that they would participate. It may be seen as enlightened self-interest, and I do not apologise for that. I think, though, Sir, that it is really the private sector meeting the challenge thrown to it by the Government and discharging its social responsibility.

I noticed that Grants to the Board of Tourism amounted to just slightly in excess of $14 million in 1986–87, and that in the Estimates the figure provided is $15 400 000. That is a 9.3 per cent increase. If there was any area I was going to ask for an increase for, it would be in this area, even though I understand fully well the points that have been made so very well by other Senators in regard to the Child Care Board and other sectors of the social services. But I would not make that recommendation at this stage, because I recognise the need to control expenditure.

I am hoping that the $3 million that the private sector will provide will go a long way and that 90 per cent or 95 per cent will go into promotion, because one of the problems with the Government's budget, or the Board of Tourism's budget, is that out of $14 million allocated to it, I am told that approximately only $4 million goes into promotion, and the rest goes into administration and overheads. If that is correct, that needs examining.

Mr. President, the cost of marketing is high, but the competition for visitors to this island is severe. I am sure all of us who have been to New York, Washington or Toronto have seen the advertising on the TV screens daily. Right now we are doing none of this for Barbados. I was told, and I was shocked when I heard it, that a 30-second filmed ad for TV that would compete with what other countries in the region are doing would cost in the vicinity of Bds. $400 000. That is nothing to do with air time. So we are in a very competitive market, and we have to realise it. 2.20 p.m.

Marketing in this sense would not only be just promoting our product abroad, it must also include training at home. Tourism is a service industry, and we have to make visitors to our shores feel welcome, and that starts from the minute they leave the plane until the time they embark to go back home. We have a very big educational job to do, and I would have thought that we could do better, whether we are using TV, through the Government Information Service, newspaper, radio, whatever, but there are 250 000 of us in the tourist industry.

If I may turn to manufacturing, I believe we are all aware of the problems that this sector has had in recent times, because our manufacturing was primarily geared, first of all, to import substitution in Barbados and then at the CARICOM market, more particularly Trinidad and Tobago . I believe we are all familiar with the problems that our sister territories within the Caribbean have had. When oil was $25 to $30 a barrel, Trinidad and Tobago was booming. Oil has gone down to as low as $10, today I think it is between $15 to $18 a barrel, but that has had a very significant effect on their revenues. In fact, it has forced them to devalue their currency from TT $2.40 to the U.S. dollar, and it is now $3.60. Jamaica today is at $5.50 to the U.S. dollar and Guyana $10 to the U.S. dollar. All this will have an effect on our competitive position as we try to penetrate further into the CARICOM markets. And, of course, apart from the difference in the valuations of currencies, there are the non-tariff barriers that still exist as each territory tends to protect its own national interest.

We need new investment. I can see local investors wanting to go into industries to supply the local market where we are talking mainly of import substitution. I would recommend that they concentrate solely on that market if they are operating by themselves. For anyone looking to get into exports, I would strongly recommend a joint venture, with the partner having the marketing expertise in the markets that we are trying to service. Of course, we still need to replace the enclave industries like Intel, CORCOM, Playtex, that were here and created between 1 000 and 1 500 jobs. They have left and we have not been able to replace those jobs.

But before we get this new investment, we must be very honest with ourselves and recognise that there is the perception that in this island, we are a high cost producer. We may not like to hear it, we may not like to think it, but ask anyone coming from abroad, as I have had experience with some of them. The first thing they do is to look at our cost, convert it to the U.S. equivalent, the Sterling equivalent or the Canadian dollar equivalent, and then make comparisons throughout the region. They say that in the Dominican Republic they can do this at such and such a cost, in Haiti they can do that at such and such a cost, or in the Far East – Hong Kong, Singapore – they can do it, and we always come out at the wrong end of the scale.

I say this, Sir, because we need to examine and reduce our costs. In no way am I suggesting that we need to reduce our standard of living. I believe we have worked hard to reach present levels, and we should do all within our power to retain and improve on those levels for everyone, but let us not assume that that will happen automatically. As I mentioned earlier, we are living in a very, very competitive world, and unless we can produce for the top end of the market where there is a high value added component, and use the latest technology and reduce our costs, whether it be utilities, total labour costs, whatever, we may find ourselves drifting back to lower levels of living that obtains in some of the other

countries that I have mentioned. I do not want to see it. Let us make sure it does not happen.

So many of our attempts at manufacturing, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, start off with an idea that someone wants to produce something, and there is nothing wrong with that, but before the idea is tested in the market, the would-be manufacturer goes ahead and finds very often that he is producing something that is not wanted. The style is wrong, the colour is wrong, the price is wrong or there is a combination of errors along the way. I do not know why it is we find it difficult to start with the market and work backwards, rather than start with the idea of a product and work forwards. We are making this mistake over and over again, and I have made it myself, so no one has a monopoly on that weakness. I am just trying to share that experience and hope that the IDC and the other training bodies can assist good persons, keen in getting into manufacturing, to avoid that error.

While I am on the subject of competition within manufacturing, I have already touched on CARICOM, we are party to three other trading arrangements. There is the CBI, there is Lome and there is CARIBCAN. These really provide opportunities for our manufacturers to penetrate certain markets. CBI and Lome have really not been as successful to date as it was hoped that they would be, and we must recognise that in the developed countries, there are tremendous pressures to protect their own markets.

If I may speak of CBI in particular, only recently I was in Washington playing the American game of lobbying to see what could be done with regard to CBI and making sure that it does not get squeezed out as the Americans look at a new Trade Bill within their Congress. They are very concerned about the flood of products from the Far East going into the American market, and in their attempts to minimise the inflow of those products, they may so amend their legislation that we can be hurt by a ricochet. I am not suggesting it would aimed directly at us, so we have to make sure that what we have under CBI already remains intact and it can be improved. 2.30 p.m.

These are trading arrangements for us if we can penetrate those markets and all the internal lobbying efforts that exist within the developed countries. However, if our costs are not in line, a marketing opportunity only exists in theory, so I come back again, Sir, to the need and importance of our looking at our costs and being able to break them down between what is fixed and what is variable. I notice that the grant to the IDC has been increased by roughly $600 000. I think that a lot of that money could be well spent in helping local manufacturers to examine and identify their costs to see how they can reduce them so that they can become more competitive.

If I may turn to agriculture, this may seem like a presumption after the fine presentation by Senator Ward earlier today, but I would like to emphasise much of what he has already said. The sugar industry appears from time to time to be a convenient whipping boy, but, as he has said already, the basic problem has been the high value of the U.S. dollar, to which we are tied, and hence the low values of ECUs, in which we were paid for our products out of Europe.

Before we are critical of the sugar industry, let us recognise that the fundamentals have changed within that industry. Over the years the economists have pointed out cyclical movements, up, down, up, down, over five or six years, and you made enough in your good years that you could put aside to take care of your bad years. Today, we have a lot more subsidies to agriculture. It has almost become a worldwide phenomenon within developed countries. We see it in Europe, especially in France, and we see it in North America, because they recognized the value and the importance of agriculture to their respective economies. In addition to the subsidies, we are today faced with corn fructose as a sweetner, we are faced with the new artificial chemical sweetners. So the fundamentals have changed.

Sugar remains vital to our economy because it earns a significant amount of foreign exchange and there is very little leakage in that earning as a foreign exchange. I believe that in tourism, they estimate that almost 70 per cent of the foreign dollar earnings go back out to buy fuel, equipment, food and other services. I do not know the corresponding figure in sugar, but I suggest it would be under 20 per cent, probably closer to 10 per cent, so not only do we earn, but we retain what we earn. Then, of course, there is the employment of some 6 000 people and the dependents of those persons.

Another strong reason, Mr. President, is the agronomic reason. I have heard agronomists say that we cannot afford to neglect this industry. It is madness to think that we can replace it with cotton, because, given the nature of our soil, we must have a grass crop. We must have a cover, or it will blow away in time. And, of course, there is the environmental reason. If we had bush in the country, we would have no tourist industry.

I am not making a plea here for the sugar industry, but I think that every thinking Barbadian would recognise that times have changed. Conditions have changed, but we have to remain in agriculture, and the sugar industry will remain a very significant component of our agriculture.

Much has been said about crop diversification. I find it very easy to support that. We should be able to feed ourselves to a much greater extent than we presently do. But I have been shown rainfall patterns going back

over to the last 100 years, and again agronomists have pointed out to me that there is no regular pattern in our rainfall; therefore, it becomes extremely difficult to diversify our agriculture and to provide the fruits and vegetables that we need. They may be able to use some irrigation. I think that efforts are already being made in that direction, but right now we have a problem with water.

I do not believe that the production problems are insurmountable. The marketing problems are more difficult. I have had some experience with that because of my connection with the Caribbean Agricultural Trading Company, a subsidiary of the Caribbean Food Corporation, and the difficulty of shipping and of getting products to the metropolitan centres are quite horrendous. I am not saying they are impossible, but I think we speak of diversification, again, from a production bias rather than appreciating all the marketing problems involved.

Finally, in crop diversification, there is the problem of praedial larceny. Many a farmer has been totally discouraged. It is something, I know, the police are trying to correct. A solution has to be found, or we will not diversify our agriculture into fruit and vegetable crops to any significant degree.

I believe that earlier today it was Senator Ward who said he believed the sugar industry now owes the banks some $200 million – banks and bonds, $200 million – which is a very significant amount. No operation, whether it be in agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, given its equity base, can afford that amount of debt burden. I do not know the answers, Mr. President, but that industry has served us well and will continue to serve us well. Something has to be done with regard to the restructuring of the finances to relieve that tremendous debt burden that now exists.

If I may touch briefly on the offshore financial services, this is an area in which we are late comers – the Cayman Islands, Bermuda and the Bahamas, have long experience – but I think there is potential in this country for growth. We have the political stability, we have a competent workforce and we have the infrastructure.

Anything that can be done by the Government to assist the development of these offshore financial services, I would highly commend it.

There is one small item appearing in the Estimates which I should also like to comment on – the grant of $100 000 to the stock exchange. In the same way that I would like to see adult Barbadians owning their own homes, I would like to see more adult Barbadians owning shares in companies in this country. It will not happen overnight, because we do not have the mechanism, and the stock exchange will have to learn, but I hope that it will develop so that more Barbadians would have a stake and an interest in the business life of this community. I am very pleased to see that support is being given to the stock exchange, now in formation.

I will not comment on the social services, because that has been done by others far better qualified to deal with those matters than I am. I just want to issue a word of caution. Let us make sure we can distinguish between wants and needs. It is so easy to want – let us make sure we are identifying them as needs and then make sure that we can afford those needs.

I say this, not because of any unwillingness, Mr. President, to assist the social services or to expand them. I am saying this because I see no reason why our economy should expand at any dramatic rate over the next two to three years. With our best efforts, tourism can improve. Manufacturing is going to be more difficult, agriculture is going to be more difficult, and unless there is this expansion of the economy, there will not be the expansion in revenue. If there is no expansion in the revenue, we have to be very, very careful with our expenditure. So it is from the economic point of view, rather than from a lack of compassion, that I am saying that we have to be careful that we are able to afford what we perceive our needs to be.

2.40 p.m.

Mr. President, if I may turn now to the Capital Expenditure, according to the Estimates we have spent over $100 million each year since 1980 – 81, and the highest figure was $173 million in 1981 – 82. We are estimating that in the year 1987 – 88 we will spend $176 518 229.

I also want to look at the National Debt. In 1976, it was $258 million – these figures are taken from the Barbados Central Bank report – in 1981, it was $683 million, and at the end of 1986 it was $1 202 000 000, and throughout that period approximately 40 per cent of our National Debt has been denominated in foreign currency. I mention that because there is nothing magical in our currency being fixed to the US dollar at two dollars to one. I am not suggesting that we need a devaluation. I hope that the Minister of Finance can stick to his guns and keep our currency pegged at its present rate of two Barbados dollars to one US dollar, but that is not cast in concrete. Unless we manage our affairs very carefully, we will be forced into further borrowings, and the price of that may be a devaluation of our currency. Then the repayment of this 40 per cent of our National Debt becomes a lot more difficult, because that is already denominated in foreign currency.

According to the Estimates, Sir, the public debt servicing in 1987 – 88 would be $133 million, of which interest would be $74 million and amortisation payments would be $58 million. One hundred and thirty-three million dollars is 19 per cent of our estimated revenue of $698 million. You could argue that the repayment of principal is being bunched around this time but there will be relief later on, so if you just take the interest alone of $74 million, that represents 10.6 percent of the estimated revenue for 1987 – 88. I am not an economist, Sir, so I do not feel qualified to say where the danger level lies, but I can discern a trend, and the trend is up, and at some stage interest will constitute too high a proportion of our current revenue if we do not attempt to control our borrowings. I have no doubt that we need to borrow more money to service existing commitments, but just a word of caution: we cannot go on borrowing and postponing the day of reckoning.

As I look forward for the next year, with our best efforts tourism might improve slightly. I do not see any significant change in industry and agriculture, nor do I see any instant or quick solutions to the problems that we are facing within our productive sectors. I wish my comments could be different. I am not here trying to be a prophet of gloom and doom. Far from it, I say I am an optimist by nature. But given existing conditions within the Caribbean, within the world, I have to be a realist, and I see slight growth only over the next two to three years.

This will call for extremely sound management of our economy. Ours is a mixed, open, fragile economy. Of course, the final responsibility for this rests with Government, but I do not believe any Government has a monopoly on wisdom. I think it is incumbent on any Government to call on the trade unions and the various private sector organisations to learn from their knowledge, their experience and get the feedback, the suggestions and ideas from these sectors, because I see a trying time ahead. I think all Barbadians have to put their shoulders to the wheel. We have had to do this before, but times change. Maybe we never had to do it in a more formal way. We probably had this type of consultation privately in the past, but as our economy grows or becomes more sophisticated, we may have to institutionalise it in some form or other. I have no prescription how the various sectors within this small community, because we are only 250 000 people on our small rock, can put all our brains and our experience and our expertise together, but every sector must make a contribution. I do not think this is asking too much, Sir, and I am sure that this Government and any Government will find a willingness from each of these sectors to make their contribution for the common good.

Thank you.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. President, I rise to make my contribution to this Appropriation Bill, but before I do that, I must congratulate my colleague Senator Goddard for his wisdom and for such an able speech. I hope and pray that every Barbadian will take note, especially the politicians, particularly those who are in Opposition, because it is what you tell the people that makes the difference. This is our country, we are Barbadian people together. Are we going to make a go of it or are we going to go down the drain?

In the area of trade, and even in the area of the unions, we have seen a change, and this is heartening. This means that we in the private sector and the unions will be working together in the interest of this country.

Mr. President, I was fortunate to have been in the Lower House last week to listen to some of the debates, and I want to say that those debates were of a very high standard. I would say they were some of the best. They were made with dignity and decorum, and even the members of the Opposition made apologies when necessary, but I must give full credit to my Government for the cool, calm and informative manner in which they debated the Estimates.
2.50 p.m.

Applause.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Before I touch on what the Minister of Finance had to say, I should like to pass briefly over something that was said by Senator Goddard. He said the private sector must be prepared to make a worthwhile contribution. The private sector, I believe, through the Chamber of Commerce, has made a contribution of $3 million to assist in the promotion of the tourist industry. They must be commended. I will say the Chamber of Commerce – was it through the Chamber of Commerce, the whole body, employers, chamber, manufacturers? – the private sector group of persons, of which I am also a member. I should not be complimenting myself.

Laughter.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Another part that I must touch on before I go into my speech is what he said about those employers who are defaulters in regard to National Insurance contributions, Income Tax refunds and PAYE, which is Pay As You Earn, the returns which they often take from the workers and do not remit it to the Income Tax Department.

When it comes to National Insurance contributions, that is most disgraceful. When they have to dismiss people or lay them off, they cannot find the money to pay them, and the National Insurance Department often has

to pay that money. This is not fair to a country that has given so much to its people for quite a number of years, especially when you look at how we are grouped together, when you really look and see who make up the greater number of the population. Is it because of education? Is it part of the slavery days? What is it? What is it that makes some of us dishonest even to our own governments? What is behind the thinking of some of these people? We should be glad and proud to see where we have come from. Is it being independent? Do some people think because you hear we have gained independence that they are totally, completely independent and can do as they like? We still have a Government, we still have a country. I am sure that many of you, even if you have places that you can run to, would agree that this is one of the most beautiful spots in the world, and there are many persons who would be glad and willing, if it were for sale, to buy it.

I go back to the debate in the Lower House. The Minister of Finance gave the assurance that Government's image in the capital markets of the world had distinctly improved and that several offers were already being made available in the area of financing the fiscal deficit for the coming year. That shows that many overseas organisations and agencies have confidence in this Government, and it is good to know. There is a reason, and I am positive that that reason is none other than that the Leader is recognized worldwide, and his team will follow him.

Applause.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: An important point also made by the Minister was that if previously there had been smaller provisions of capital expenditure in Government Estimates, we, as a Government, would have been able to generate more and bring much needed relief to jobless persons. What I am trying to say is that because of the provisions which were made in the capital expenditure, we could not afford to generate more jobs, because the money was not there. There is no point saying you are going to generate the jobs and take on a lot of people to debush and people to do this without having the money to pay them. We have to manage properly.

It is indeed pathetic to hear in this Honourable Chamber such remarks from an Opposition stance that we are responsible for the high level of unemployment in this country. Why is it that some people block their memories in regard to true facts? Anyhow Senator Comissiong has given an able reply to the female Opposition Member, Senator Miller. Sometimes I wonder if she can truly call herself a Barbadian, because it is not right only to debate and be shouting and be carrying on. Let us talk sense. Let us get down – even if I am not talking sense – to the people's business. We come in here to do it. We are in here in the Senate, we are appointed and whoever we are appointed by, they expect us to do something. In the Lower House last week, all of us should have been there to hear the debates and hear the Opposition Members. I was proud and I was pleased, and I am sure that they intend to work with the Government. I hope that this will happen here.

(Aside: Senator B. A. MILLER: You still would not learn the facts of life.)

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Too old to learn the facts of life, honey!

Laughter

Aside

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Yes. At least we can work not together, but side by side, and we can make suggestions wherever possible. We are all Barbadian people and the country comes first, not the Opposition nor the Government.

I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I was going to suggest that maybe you all can carry that on outside.

Laughter

Mr. PRESIDENT: In the tea room it may be all right for that to go on. Just keep the debate on the level for the record's purposes.

Senator Miller, I want to make sure that you control yourself. Do not interrupt the speakers. I try to prevent them from interrupting you. I hope you will restrain yourself.

Continue.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: When she talked about bad financial conditions in the country and predicting that it will get worse, I was certainly amazed, for it is like spitting up in the air, and you know that when you spit up in the air, it comes back down, and hits you right in your face.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would not like you to use spit again; I find spit has been used too often. In the debate yesterday someone said that you should not put it into the pot that you are cooking in. I would like a different term to be used.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Well, taking the saliva out of the mouth on the tongue and throwing it up in the air, and it comes right back down and it hits you in the face with a plax. That is the sound it makes.

Laughter

3.00 p.m.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Can memories be so short? The previous Government had no idea whatsoever what management was all about. Management has to be serious when doing the people's business, it means knowing what you are about, especially dealing with money. You are dealing with financial matters. You have to know something about what you are doing. Even some of the civil servants who could have guided them were pushed aside and not given opportunities to function as they should. Talk is cheap but errors are very costly, and it will go down in history how in ten years' time the deficit of this country escalated from about $253 million to over $1.2 billion.

Aside.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: I said in just ten years – the National Debt.

I will briefly touch on housing. The housing situation has become very acute, for there are many persons, especially the young ones, who have entered the work force, become financially independent and would wish to rent Government houses, or even buy, but availability for such is scarce. Then there is the dire need for welfare homes or houses. The majority of persons who want some of these houses have been fire victims, and these fire victims are not only seeking houses, but often they are in need of basic household items.

I thought I would make a suggestion here, Mr. President, to the Minister who is responsible for Housing. I honestly think that the time has come when a serious study should be undertaken to determine the long term benefit of building wall houses instead of wooden houses, and these wall houses could be built with metal windows and fire-proof roofs. We have the sand and the stone and what it takes to make the concrete blocks, and we have the factories for making the metal windows as well as making the metal or formaclad for the roofs, and I am sure we could generate more employment in this area by building more wall houses and making them fire-proof houses. I am sure that people would appreciate them and there would be less fires in the community and we would not be working the firemen hard. I know they have to work, but oh, they really have had it recently.

Looking at employment, it appears to me that the first idea that often springs to mind for people who want employment is the Civil Service, or maybe I should say that they look for white collar jobs. Do you not think it is about time there is a different perception in the area of jobs? We cannot hope that people will go on looking to Government, the young people especially, the school leavers, to give them jobs. It is necessary that such young people come up with ideas, I mean have some sort of entrepreneurial spirit, think about something different that they can get into, and I am sure that they will be assisted by the Government.

There are some who may like artwork, and I think that those persons who want to get into artwork should be supported by their Barbadian people. We should buy their works of art and help them. There are others who can get into other areas like making shoes and different sort of things. I am not here to throw out suggestions, but this I would like to see, instead of some of them not working. I know there are quite a few of them now who are washing cars and selling things, nuts and such things. But I still feel that our people must have ideas. I do not know what it is, but they, more or less, are lacking in something, motivation, maybe from their parents or from their schools. I do not know what it is, but something is lacking.

Let us take a look at the Sanitation Service, for this is an area where, perhaps, some young people can go into. We can examine the service, which I am told by the Minister of Health will be upgraded, but very important is that on April 11 a training course will be instituted for all Supervisors to upgrade their knowledge in sanitation and all related health matters. Obviously, the result of the course will give an indication of who can go on to further training. I am of the opinion, though, that more young persons should seek these jobs, and if they take them, they should be given modern equipment, good trucks, and most important, they should be given very excellent salaries. Upgrade the thing! It is time we stop thinking that if you sweep the streets, it is a degrading job. Let people fight for those jobs and want them. Let us stop thinking that only people who get degrees are the ones that can bring home the salaries. We have to look at the other people too.

In this modern day, I feel that the collection of garbage should take place at night instead of during the day when traffic movement is impeded and the children have to go to school and people have to go to work. You see those garbage trucks blocking traffic and stopping people from getting to work on time. We must take a serious look at that. If it costs some more money to have night collection, I think we should do it.

I want to touch, Mr. President, on the Ministry of Health. Prior to May 21, 1986, in the Ministry of Health training was non-existent. The Registered Mental Nurse Training Course had been stopped for so long that there were very few qualified male mental nurses, and very often the male nurse wards had to be supervised by female staff nurses – a serious thing, you know. Do you want to tell me that you put females to supervise men? I mean to say, this is a psychiatric ward, and they

can hold onto women and actually choke them, rape them and do anything with them.
3.10 p.m.

Buildings were not maintained. All of the Government institutions were in a dilapidated condition, and I can swear and attest to this, whether it be the district hospitals or the cemetery chapel. Things were so bad at St. Thomas District Hospital that the roof fell in. Patients had to be removed to the St. Philip Hospital until repairs were completed. You can understand how it was moving the patients to St. Philip. Mr. President, I am repairing my roof now and it is no fun, so you can understand a roof falling in at a district hospital with patients.

Decisions were taken out of the hands of those in charge. For example, qualified nurses were replaced by untrained persons, and in one particular case, at the Holetown Clinic, a woman's whose only experience in a health institution was as a Cleaner was sent to relieve a District Nurse. Of course, she could not even dress wounds, far less perform the more technical nursing duties. Serious! Serious! You can see what some Ministers went in and found, especially in the area of health.

Health comes first in a nation. But the polyclinic system started overnight, just so, just so out of the bag. A hot flush, you know, came to the head and just so it started. There was no consultation with doctors or anybody, so no guidelines were set. Terms of contracts were not known by the doctors, and while the then Minister announced that the medicines were free for those under 16 and over 65 years of age, the thing was that whoever attended – when I say that, anybody that attended the clinic then – got their medicine free of cost. It was not the 16 or the 65, it was free for all. The situation of these clinics was chaotic, to say the very least. One man show!

What has taken place since 1986, May 28? Frequent meetings are now being held with Heads of Departments to see how these difficulties can be overcome. There is a meeting of these Heads every two months to review certain situations to see how they are working, and, of course, to look back and also to look ahead and to make plans for the future.

Training, which was non-existent, has restarted in earnest, and training is important, especially in health. A Registered Mental Nurse course has begun, thanks to the Minister of Education. He has accepted that the situation at the polyclinic hospital is so desperate that this course is not run by the Community College. About 24 persons are on it, and a number of nurses who under the BLP had not a chance – poor nurses – have been given a new lease on life.

The National Assistance course has also been started. The Geriatric Hospital will see extensive renovations starting in April. Approximately $2 million will be spent on that building. You know how that was, in a very dilapidated condition. Gone will be the days when the urine will be falling on the heads of the nurses. This happened – you are laughing – but there is concrete floor now being put in there. When the nurses used to be on the ground floor, the urine used to come down on their heads. The patients will have better facilities for bathing and everything. For those of them who can assist with doing things, it will be therapeutic for them, they will be getting therapy in that way.

Polyclinics. In order to place them on a correct footing, for those who work in these institutions there are some recommendations – we will have to ensure that the people of Barbados are given the best medical attention in the most efficient manner – about worker participation. This will be done in the polyclinics.

The Glebe Polyclinic will be opened at the beginning of April and patients will be attending that clinic from Monday, April 6.

The QEH definitely has a cleaner appearance. Even people have expressed that. It has been said in more than one quarter, and no effort will be spared in maintaining high standards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Casualty building should begin in the next few weeks. When that is completed, it is hoped that we will have better treatment in the department.

The Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners. The gap between the Association and the Ministry of Health has disappeared, thank God, and all should be grateful for this. My information is that this Minister will always consult, or always have dialogue with the Consultants, because previously there was none. The Minister now will talk on important issues. It should be noted that before it appears as though these doctors were being abused and insulted.

The Ambulance Service. Information about the Ambulance Service is that they recruited a qualified and experienced person to head that department so that the ambulance men can continue their training, thereby providing the quality of service expected of such an important operation. It appears as though the past Minister had picked a man for Ambulance Officer whose only qualification was selling nails over the counter. I am just telling you what I have heard – that this is how the Ministry of Health was running. You can imagine a Minister picking a man whose only qualification is selling nails over a counter to run an Ambulance Service.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. President, again I must refer to the debate in the Lower House. I was very fortunate to hear a speech given by the Member for Christ Church East, Mr. Bourne on fishing. It was an excellent speech, a master speech. He made some excellent suggestions, and I would like to add to his suggestions, because many school leavers who like the sea, could be given the opportunity to become dignified fishermen. When you all read the debates of the Lower House you will read what he said. It was a masterpiece, and the Government can take example. I am sure they will go well in the area of fishing. We have proper people there, Mr. President.

Some of these young school leavers can become dignified fishermen. We need large fishing vessels, proper fishing vessels, like the ones used by the Japanese, and we need to get those Japs out of our waters. They are fishing in our waters, and the member for Christ Church East will tell you the same. If we can do this for some of these young children, fish, which is one of the best and cheapest foods, and very rich in protein, would be able to be frozen and processed. What we cannot eat, we can sell overseas, or we can can. Some persons have already been doing a freezing job in packaging to sell to the supermarkets. This does not only apply to fish, but sea-eggs and shrimps as well. We should be able to go into that area. I am sure that it would alleviate some of the unemployment situation among the young people if they like the sea.

Looking at the area of distributive trade, there is need, in my opinion, for reform. I say this, because we cannot now export our labour like a few years ago, when you could take up men and send them to England, the United States and Canada. I believe that there were some domestics that we used to send out. Today most of those doors are closing, and the time is coming where they might be closed all together, and if you have people here and you cannot export them, it adds to the unemployment situation.

What we see much too often is a proliferation of the same businesses that are, supposedly in the eyes of those who follow the pattern, making money. They may see a supermarket down by Kensington, and the next thing you know, somebody is going to buy a piece of land next to you and open the same thing. We can only have so many types of businesses, because there are only 250 000 people to shop, and all of those 250 000 are not shoppers, because some are children.

The time has come when the Ministry responsible for this, I would say the Town and Country Planning people, should set a pattern and take a study of the number of persons and get some of the businesses away from the city. We have a lot of areas, like St. Joseph and St. John – stop some of the people from coming right down to the City. Other businesses would still prosper, but if you are getting everybody and everyone trying to kill the other one at selling, some of them not even making a profit, what happens? The Government and the Treasury suffer, because at the end of your fiscal year and you make the return, you are surprised to see that there is a loss, and it does not help you to be working, to be employing people, and to be making losses so often.

I would like to know where the foresight, imagination and entrepreneurial spirit is in the Barbadian. There was a saying when I was at school, "Follow pattern kills mulatto and gives him sore behind." My country will be getting sores on its behind if there is no foresight, and people will sell it if there is no vision. There is need for reform, and certain areas for shopping centres, as I said before, must be approved, and should be approved, by Town Planning, taking into consideration the size of the community.

The next area of concern is in the manufacturing area, where manufacturers, especially those in textiles and furniture, are finding it very, very difficult to export, even to their own Caribbean neighbours. Where things went wrong with CARICOM is that there was too much duplication in areas of manufacturing. Barbados has a flour mill, Trinidad has a flour mill. This body starts with that, everybody must follow, and it can only serve so many people. We should have gotten together and decided where we would place certain things in certain countries, and we should be selling to one another, instead of having problems, like the ones we now have with cement. Trinidad were partners with us. They had a cement plant. We cannot get the cement sold as we would like, and then we hear there is dumping in Puerto Rico. It is a whole mass of confusion. Where was the planning?

I say this, and I have no excuse to give anybody for saying it. If the Caribbean leaders had the wisdom to see that we as a group could have become self-sufficient and could have grown into a strong federation, today our country and its people would be a lot better off financially. But it is just like a man and a woman in a house – they are fighting for supremacy, and then the children start to grow. It does not seem as though we can get together, and our only salvation is the people in the Caribbean.

I have been given information by the Ministry of Trade with regards to the Barbados Export Promotion situation. The Corporation is examining the possibility of establishing a design centre which would assist in upgrading the quality and design of manufactured goods so that they can meet international standards. The manufacturers have been also receiving costing and pricing advice and general financial guidance through the attachment to the corporation of a chartered accountant, who is a Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation consultant. That was necessary. A further effort to assist with

extra-regional export promotion or penetration into markets has been the establishment of overseas representation in Puerto Rico on a part-time basis, and the continued development of the New York Office to effectively service the needs of Barbados. I am sure the Minister of External Affairs will know all about this.

3.30 p.m.

While touching on trade, I would like very much to congratulate the present Public Utilities Board. It is said to be one of the best ever selected. It is balanced in terms of expertise and know-how. Its deliberations are serious and not wasteful as in previous PUB exercises. Its decision on the Telephone Company was well-reasoned and sound in law, so much so that the High Court could find no fault with it. Therefore, we must give compliments to its chairman, members, legal advisers and consultants. The public of Barbados owe these persons a debt of gratitude for their work, and they can rest assured that the PUB, as presently constituted, will ensure that Barbadians are not taken advantage of. The previous Board seemed to have hardly had persons who were interested in the complaints of the small consumer. They were interested in holding frequent meetings, for which they were paid.

I must touch on the Barbados National Standards Institute. Their work is in the area of standards development, quality control and certification. They do testing to rectify consumer complaints and for comparison purposes and assist industries with product development to help them to take advantage of opportunities offered by the CBI, Lome III and CARICOM, and to compete favourably in external markets.

There is lots more that I can say about the BNSI, but I would wish to say it is about time that Barbados has an independent consumer body, organisation if you want to call it that, which can relate to the BNSI. We have so many charitable organisations in Barbados and not one of them can think that they should set up a consumer service to the public of Barbados. I am sure that the Minister of Trade would not only lend them support, but would give a subvention.

Speaking of a strong consumer body, I thought it would be remiss of me if I did not brush slightly on something to do with women, since I am a woman. Statistics show that women out-number men, but I want to see women walking beside men. We do not wish to walk ahead of the men, but beside them. It is good to be ambitious, successful, dedicated and strong physically, as I am, spiritually and mentally, but we should always bear in mind that we should be partners to our men folk. The men folk walked ahead of us for many years, and I think they are regretting it today, because the countries that are ruled by men have more problems that if we women were ruling the countries. With patience, we will some day soon stand side by side.

The reason why things are in disarray, too, is because you men never utilised women to the fullest. You kept women mostly as sex objects or house maids. But things are changing, and I am proud and happy to see a woman as an Acting Permanent Secretary, and I hope and pray that I will soon see her as a full-fledged Permanent Secretary. I hope it is not because of her sex that she will not become a Permanent Secretary.

We women are proud to see our women in the Senate. We have three appointed to the Senate and one elected to the Lower House. Also, one of our greatest women is representing us at the United Nations in the person of Dame Nita Barrow. Some day, I may be dead, but I feel that this country will have a female Governor-General and maybe a female Prime Minister, probably also a female President. We are not going to push our men into the back, we will walk side by side.

Sir, there is one little bit of advice I will give to my women folk, those who have children. The time has come when they have to realise that responsibility to their children comes first. Women may complain about the fathers of their children, but we brought them into the world. Why are they in drugs? Why are most of them on the streets and being neglected? Is it because women want to be fighting to get into the work force? Is it because of their financial troubles. I think the Government should make a study and see what is happening – this study can be done through the Ministry of Education – because our children are the future leaders; they are the ones who are going to take this nation forward in another 15 years, and some will be out of school soon.

3.40 p.m.

I know some of them are frustrated, but it hurts my heart when I see small children whom I knew in 1976 now involved in drugs. And there are adults who are making sure that they interfere with the minds of these children by putting drugs in their candy, or in their ice cream or lollipop. What is wrong in the name of the good God that some human beings want to destroy young minds, young minds that can be great minds for the future? What is wrong with our people? For the love of money?

It hurts my heart when I hear about little children. I actually cry. Recently there were quite a few at some of the high schools who got sick. It is hearsay that drugs were put into tamarind balls. Let us come to grips with what is happening in this society. If some of us, through hard work and dint of labour, acquired and achieved something, must those who do not want to work hard find the wrong way to get their money? There is nothing wrong with working hard. There is nothing wrong with being honest and doing an honest day's work.

People talk about unemployment. Unemployment my eye! There is work there. But how many people want to work even as carpenters, masons and painters? They do not want it. Even if they take it, they take your money at $60 a day or $50 a day, and they sit down on the job. Can this country move forward if the work force is like that. This is why I say the politicians must set the example. We, the people who are leading this country must set the example whenever necessary or possible.

I think the Minister of Education should have certain people within the schools looking at these young minds. The time has come when we have to save them.

The next situation we have in this country is the AIDS. They call it the plague.

Aside

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Virus or whatever it is. It is right here, promiscuity!

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think Senator, you should spend too much time on those matters. We appreciate it, but they are not really connected with the Head that you are dealing with. If they come within the purview of the area that you are dealing with, we do not mind, but it is difficult to encompass everything that has happened in all of the statements you make. It is better for you to stick to the area that you want to deal with or to the Head that you are debating.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Yes, Sir, thanks.

I am looking at it as a problem for the Ministry of Health where we will have to spend more money. We will have to spend money that we do not have. We have to spend money at the Mental Hospital in treating these children with the drugs. We have to spend money, and this is money that we have not voted here for, and it is going to increase. Where are we going to put them? We cannot leave them, we have to treat them, but the hospitals can only hold so many. We have to concern ourselves with these things. It all goes in appropriation for money, because the Government has to look for money. If we do not look for money, are you going to tell me that a lot of these children will be lost? And it is going to increase! Therefore, the time is now!

We seem to have our priorities wrong sometimes. I think our priorities should be in trying to help the Government in its fiscal policies and stop buying so many motor cars and so try and keep some of the foreign exchange. Some people do not have their priorities right. There are several areas, several things, and Mr. President, everything that I talk here, anything to do with the home, the family or the workplace, has some bearing on these fiscal matters.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I want to draw to your attention how you debate the issue.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: I am not quarrelling with you, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have to debate the issue within the context of the Head that you have drawn to the attention of the Senate. You cannot go all over and discuss everything in health – you will be dealing with health for the whole year. You have to deal with the Head. That is what I am drawing to your attention. You cannot expand it everlastingly.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: In closing, Mr. President, I hope that the sun will shine brighter for us, and I would like to see more out-patient service instead of various welfare services.

Education takes the biggest slice in the Estimates and Health takes quite a bit. These two are very, very important. The education of the children of this nation, even the adult education, should be looked at. But we cannot get money as free as people, or as much as the Government perhaps would like us to get it – I am speaking as a private sector person – because the position is that there is only so much in the kitty. And sugar is failing, and it is really failing, because, I do not mind what anybody may say, when you owe a lot of money and you are in big debt, the industry is just being propped up. But there is a reason for that. At least, work is being given to our people and we have to look at that situation.

We have to look seriously at what is happening in the community, what is happening to the children, where the adults are not lending their full support in the homes and not taking as much care as they should looking after their children. We have to watch even the movement with cars. We have to look in the area of even trade, if it is right for us to be opening all hours. There are so many things that we have to look at. Everything in this whole country, however you look at it, has something to do with the Appropriation Bill, because everything has to do with money, and we, the ones who are putting through taxes, will be responsible. You can go on borrowing, but you cannot borrow large sums forever, because some day some of the overseas agencies are going to say, "Sorry, we cannot help you any more."

Thank you.

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to deal with the major social problem in this community. Unemployment is one of the major social problems. With unemployment you get drug addiction, rape, teenage pregnancies, the increase in prostitution in this country, you get what is called lawlessness by our grandparents, people just walking around the streets,

and this concerns all of us. It is strange that some people do not understand that unemployment is not a single-faceted item. In other words, it does not concern a particular sector of the community. It must not be discussed in one forum, but in all fora. If we have so many people unemployed in a small developing country, those of us who used to be happy in our homes at night will not be able to sit and watch a television set, because those people who are out there on the streets, who want to steal, who want to rob, who want to break into your houses, are not going to allow you to be happy and peaceful after you come from a hard day's work. This must be noted significantly.
3.50 p.m.

I cannot see how people should concern themselves so much about the statistics. The fact is that we have unemployment in Barbados and it is at an alarming figure. To me, any percentage of unemployment is unemployment, and I want to see it curbed, and curbed immediately, or as soon as possible. That is very important.

Involved in this is the question of the woman's role. We have 43 per cent of the women in this country as heads of households. It means that when those women have five or six children, they are not working. The mother alone has to be responsible for the upkeep and the day-to-day running of that household.

Added to that, she might have had these children for some very irresponsible men, whom she has to take down to the courts. That is an area that I would like to see rectified, where women have to go to the court and get into this long line, there is total confusion, and then you suddenly hear there is no money there. I am wondering whether a cheque could not be sent to the women so that they are able to receive their monies just like the old age pensioners. I think that is the kind of thing we want to see in this day and age.

If you are talking about dignity, if you are talking about pride, if you are talking about higher levels of education, despite the fact that some people are talking about not agreeing with higher levels of education at the price that we pay now which is free, it means that we must do all in our power, as citizens of Barbados, to see that this unemployment figure is curbed. I have listened to several people and I have also listened to honourable Senators trying to debate the whole question of unemployment and the task force. The task force was to give an opportunity to all the people in Barbados, or as many as possible, to put in their five cents' worth, or their two cents' worth, and looking at the recommendations coming from the ordinary people in Barbados, I would say they are far more sound than many that come from the economists.

If we look at our old people in this society and listen to them carefully, we would see that my grandmother and your grandparents and so on were people who were the greatest economists of our time. I have an uncle who has 20 children and he has been able to give each one a spot of land. I do not know how he did it. He was never taken to court yet to support one of them, but he did it. He did it by buying a truck and then buying a cow, and then buying another truck, and then a piece of land, and this sort of thing. What I am saying is these are persons who can teach us where we are to go, and this is what the Unemployment Task Force sought to do, to get valuable information from all those persons out there who have been armed with the information, who went through the grind.

One headteacher said to me recently that her mother used to get up at 3 o'clock and plait her hair because she had to go to work in the field, and there were six of them – she was the only girl – in that family. Those are the kinds of people whom the task force sought to get information from, and I find it difficult to understand why anybody in Barbados could be so naive as to say that the task force serves no purpose. You are getting information from loyal sons and daughters of this independent country Barbados. We are either loyal sons and daughters or we are not, and if we are not and you do not like the cooking, keep out of the kitchen, because the heat will burn you very hard, and that burn may last for a long time.

I also cannot understand how people could be criticising the Minister. I should like to congratulate him, and I would like to say that, in his first tenure as a Minister, he has done something that will stand out in the annals of history in this country.

Applause.

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: Where praise should be given, it ought to be given, despite the fact who the person might be. You must realise, first, that we are Barbadians. This is what we must dwell in the minds of our children. Remind them of the National Anthem – "We loyal sons and daughters all do hereby make it known, these fields and hills beyond recall are now our very own." How can they be our own when we criticise everything that is done? Everything that is done is wrong, it is terrible, it is horrible!

Somebody mentioned that they talked with some Caribbean counterpart. Are you going to discuss your personal and domestic business of the country you love with somebody out there? Do you mean that you want to wash your dirty linen in public? We have to be very careful with this. Barbados has always been known to be

one of the outstanding countries in the Caribbean region. Barbados has been known to be a country where the greatest educators came from throughout the Caribbean region, and indeed these educators, in turn, have produced Prime Ministers of calibre. Why is it then that we must decry our country and our society? Let us remember that when we try to pull down, we are pulling down Barbados. This is the kind of advice I would like to throw out here today. Let us rather than pull down give some suggestions.

Mr. President, I should like to mention what I think will help us to get back on an even keel where unemployment is concerned. We know it is a problem, so there is no point not facing it head on. Let us look at some of the reasons why this is a problem. Somebody mentioned immigration. We no longer have people going to Canada, Aruba, Curacao, and to these various places where they worked for considerable sums of money and they were able to send some back here in order to help build up Barbados. In America, there are changes in the legal system that prevent people from being able to go straight to a job. A lot of them have to run around corners and so on, and they do not really get a job. They have to "shack-up", as the young people would say, with other people, and because of this, they are merely eking out an existence. This makes it extremely difficult for these people to send any money back to Barbados.

Then, what we have found is that as you educate a nation, it becomes less ignorant. There are going to be people who are going to like History, and if too many people like History, then you cannot find enough jobs for historians. There are going to be people who like English Language, but they do not want all English teachers. What we have to try to do is to utilise the counsellors and to create more jobs for counsellors within our schools and the various institutions of learning to help to guide the students. Let them understand what the past history of Barbados has been, the fact that we have been producers of the primary product and we were not involved in the technology.

4.00 p.m.

We were talking about sugar a while ago. Okay, we knew how to grow the sugar, but did anybody teach us anything else about the sugar? We always had to import the pan boilers. Did they teach us to do anything else with the sugar cane? To make board from it or anything of that sort?. Did they teach us anything to do with any of these primary products? Did they teach us to make the cocoa? Did they teach us to make the coffee? No! The answer is no! So we will find great difficulty in that the world has sort of gone along and left us with these kinds of developing technologies, and, therefore, we now at this stage have to be training our young people in these various skills, and training takes a long time. Training is not going to take a day nor a year, it will take years.

Also, in order to save money, we will have to be able to develop certain types of equipment. A lot of our elderly craftsmen have gone, they have died out. Soon from now you will not see a blacksmith, a tinsmith and those people who could have helped these younger people to learn a skill that could bring them money so that while they are unemployed they could still eke out an existence.

I see it that a sustained survey must be conducted to determine the skilled and non-skilled people among us. That is very essential. And let me put in semi-skilled, because that is another category of person – the person might not be able to do a lot of book work but that person can work with his or her hands. After that kind of survey is conducted, these people could be placed in the relevant categories – this is vitally important – so that you do not have the skilled mixed up with the non-skilled or the semi-skilled, and so that the skilled people can do a learn-as-you-earn programme.

There are many things that we need in Barbados. I see housewives in Europe sit down during the winter and put little leaves together, as long as they smell sweet, put them on a piece of heart-shaped cloth, put a little ribbon on it, and next thing it is called potpourri and they are selling that to put between their clothing. Then they make their little fudges and sweets and they box them out. I am not talking about people who do not have an income, so if those people can do that to swell their incomes, what more can our persons who are skilled do!

We have lots of people who can do things like crochet, straw work, tatting and knitting, but yet they are unemployed. We are going to get these people who have a skill together and we are going to, through an agency like the Industrial Development Corporation – it used to happen before, we started it and we can resuscitate it now – send around people in vans to collect work. This work was collected and properly inspected. They kept a Quality Control Officer on the van.

Before this is done, I will take the point that Senator Goddard mentioned, that we have always been thinking that we could market the person's skill before we market the product. That is vitally important. There is no point going out there saying 'IDC, come to me; we have crochet, we have this and we have that.' The IDC must be encouraged and also informed, because we have some well-informed people living in Barbados who could tell the IDC where they can find their niche in the market for certain products that we have from the skilled people. So, Mr. President, that is one of the suggestions that we have to be looking at, because that is vitally important if we are going to talk about getting these people back on stream into the world of work.

The whole handicraft industry must be looked at very seriously and see where we can utilise many of our

indigenous types of wood and also many of our indigenous crafts, especially the utilisation of coconut. I know about twelve different products that can be made from coconut, from the bark, from the skin, from the kernel, from the fresh coconut right through the line.

Asides.

SENATOR C. V. FRASER: Sugar cakes can be made also from the kernel, all kinds of sugar cakes, and children do love to buy sugar cakes, but not only children. I know that when some men come from America, the first thing they ask for is a black sugar cake. They do not want any fancy sugar cake, give me the good, old-time, black sugar cake. This can be a very thriving business. I know, because my mother made sugar cakes that helped to send me to school. I am a product of sugar cakes and pigs, and I am very proud of it. I used to take six of the sugar cakes to school and sell them, and my brother did the same thing. This is one of the things that I have not heard about, but I know how much money it could bring in, especially when the family from the country would send down the coconuts ready-shelled and all the little friends would come in and help grate the coconut on the old time graters.

These are things we really want to get back to, to show people that you do not necessarily have to have a job in an office to make money. The cottage industry type of operation is still viable, and there are still a lot of people in it. There are still quite a few dressmakers turning out some very beautiful dresses. I think they can increase that by turning out some sheets and pillow cases and things of this sort and get an outlet for them, but first of all you have to search for these outlets, which I do not think are difficult to find, because people always want sheets, people always want nice clothes to wear. There are a lot of ladies making these necklaces and so now, so that is another thing we can think of.

We have to think of all these things, and think of the things that are simple first. If you are noticing, I am not treading the road of difficult technology, because that is going to take time and money. I am treading the road of the simple things that you can make first and make your dollar. You would not have to be out stealing, or you would not have to be out interfering with anybody, but you will be getting your money and you could go to the supermarket on a Friday, buy your groceries like anybody else and feel that you are a man or woman, and we will not be creating an army of beggars.
4.10 p.m.

The thing I hate is that people stop me and ask for $5. They are going as high as that. They are not asking for a dollar now. The next thing, they will be ripping your pockets, so we all have to take this as a very serious concern. They will be taking more than $5, they will be taking whatever you have.

A businessman told me of an experience he had coming out of his store recently. He said that when he came out of the store, a boy was standing looking, as he said to me, "foolishy, foolishy". He said the boy did not look like anybody who wanted to steal or anything like that, but the moment he turned the key, the fellow rushed up to him and said: "You are a rich man, give me some money dey or I am going to put this knife in you." He said, "You will put a knife in me? For what? What have I done you?" He said, "But you understand I want some money?" And the man said he hustled out $10 fast out of his pocket.

If we do not cure this unemployment situation, it will reach the point where people will be coming out of their houses – I know it has even reached it already, but it will get worse – only to be attacked. There are a lot of women in this country who are living by themselves. Quite a lot of them living by themselves, and some of them are living in large houses. They will not go with their children. These are some of the things that the same unemployment brings on.

We can look at things like the banana bark and the coconut. In St. Kitts they use the banana bark very effectively, and if we want to look at something that all of us would like to get rid of, the monkey, in St. Kitts they use the monkey to make some beautiful hangings, if you were to see them. I hope that we will have a sort of an integration programme where we can learn from the people of St. Kitts/Nevis, or St. Christopher/Nevis how to catch them and how to utilise their skins. That is what is important, utilisation, and they are making money out of it, because in the tourist shops, they cost a fortune, because they are something of a speciality item and the tourists want them. We have to look at these things, too.

We have the wild cane. We have the clay. We have to look at making indigenous souvenirs. Why is it that every time we pick up a souvenir, it is made in China, "made in this place, made in the next place, never "made in Barbados."" What we can do to curb unemployment in this country is to get rid of this mentality, but it has to come about with a change in attitudes.

I know a certain man who markets sand, and his sand is selling, too, a certain Senator, and he is a sensible man, because he is marketing Barbadian sand and he is making money. I wish that other people out there would be just as sensible.

Asides

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: No. It is not Amory at all. It is who you think it is not. That is for you!

We should use our embassies abroad to help our skilled craftsmen and women. Earlier I saw somebody from the embassy in Washington here. When you visit the embassies, you hardly see things Barbadian, and I hope that, the next time I visit, that would have changed, that we are going to market the products of our young people, especially at all of our Missions abroad, work done from our indigenous materials, because I feel that would be a fillip. It would be advertising our products and it will, at the same time, help to get these people some money by people making the various orders.

We should also – coming now to the commercial sectors in Barbados – have mounted displays. I know one or two have done it, say, during a particular week, but I am not talking about during a specific week alone. I am talking about mounting permanent displays, in nice places in our stores, or in the show windows, so that people can see as they walk the streets what is being done here in Barbados by our skilled craftsmen and women.

We should also try to revive many of our dying industries. Many of the older people still have certain skills and techniques. Are we going to let them die with them?

I recall being President of the Friends of the St. Michael District Hospital for five years. I was able to get from those people a wealth of experience which was passed on to a number of young people who came in, and they taught them how to do these various crafts, crafts that were literally dying. There were men and women, and although we found the men a little lazier, nevertheless, they did their bit. These are some of the things we have to do, because you cannot get a bouche pan now. Thank God, I have mine still!

Asides

SENATOR C. V. FRASER: But bouches are needed at weddings and parties, and the hotels will give you a fortune for them these days. I know what I am talking about, because I am in that catering field, too, and if you can make them 300 or 400 bouches, you have some money. We need people to teach the younger people how to make the pans so that they can make their bouches, they can make their tartlets and their cookie cutters.

Asides

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: It depends on what you fill the case with. You can fill it with shrimp. The case has been made and the case is there and it has passed the test.

The next thing that we should do is to find out about all those young people who have gained skills from a lot of the voluntary groups which may not wish to come forward in an island-wide programme. You have some church groups which, when they invite you to an exhibition, for instance, the Pentecost and the Nazarene, exhibit some fantastic work that they sell among themselves and people in the villages, and they also take orders and things like that.

I do not know how many of you have seen the little gadget – it is made with soap inside – which you put inside your bathroom, and it has a handle. A lot of women now are making these, and making money – two for $25. That is not so bad for a week if you can make that.

We must look at the elderly in our community. The elderly in our community have been getting better care and getting medicines. They are living longer, and because of this, some of them find themselves without any work to do. Their grandchildren live very far away in these developed parks and so on and they remain in the villages. We think that this can be a great ease on the child care situation. Many of our workers get to work late and are absent because of having to get some place to take the child or having to take the child to the day care facility, and many of the senior citizens, who have cared for some of the most illustrious sons and daughters of our soil, can have their services utilised in the village atmosphere in taking care of the children. These parents would know that the children are well looked after, they are not in a house to be burnt up during the day, nobody is coming to interfere with them, because just as the grannies used to keep ten families' children, they would do the same thing, and I feel then that the Child Care Board, or Government or some agency should look at giving them a stipend which would swell their income. Their pensions cannot buy everything and this would be another way of employing your elderly, to train people and also to take care of the children of many of our young women who are at work today.
4.20 p.m.

These elderly people are great sources of stability and also respect. You know you cannot get away with any foolishness with senior citizens, they do not stand for it, and I think a lot more of our children would grow up more respectable citizens if we were to do such a thing. You can always tell the difference of a child who was brought up by a grandmother from a child who was brought up anyhow, because that grandmother only had to give a look and you did not carry out what you planned to do, you did not get into any mischief. She did not even have to flog you on many of the occasions.

I never liked putting forward ideas without something that will work. I like action, and I sincerely hope

that the Government will take this course, and I know from the Minister that he is planning very soundly to take a course like that to get people back into work.

Many young people have said to me that they like child care and they would like to assist in keeping children, since they are unemployed, and at the same time they can learn a skill from the senior citizens or the elderly person. I think this would help a lot of our young women who are unemployed, because we have said before that the whole question of teenage pregnancy is a big problem in our community, and this usually comes through unemployment.

As far as drugs are concerned, I have always wanted to see the police remain at the airport when it came to matters of emigration. I was very surprised when I saw laymen replace the police, but now I understand that we are going to have the Defence Force personnel there. I welcome some group like this which has had the training, because I have seen the little young people looking frightened when some gruff-voiced man talked to them, so you can imagine a real dope pusher who has all the say and the swing, passing through there and he talks to a young person with a rough voice. Immediately, that person tends to get afraid. Then the pusher might even mentioned the sort of people he knows in the community and that would frighten them more, because they feel they would lose their job. So I am happy about that move.

I am also happy about some of the little groups that are being formed as a result of the committee we have had on drug addiction. The committee worked very quietly. We have had members of the Parent-Teachers Association, the church, other women's groups, youth councils and others involved in that group. They are working in little groups in their own communities with some member of the law, who knows about drugs, involved in the group and who can show the parents the drugs, because one of the problems we have is that a lot of parents do not know the drugs.

They have never seen the drugs, so you can imagine a child going into a house with some crack or marijuana, and there are the pipes to smoke it made out of corn husk, and the parent does not know what this is all about. So parents have to be educated not only through the media, but in these little groups where they can ask their questions.

I should like to recommend that in every area we should have these groups where people can sit down and talk about the drug situation and do something constructive. If they see people snooping around, or if they see people passing little pieces of foil, they can call the police, because that is very important. They should not say, 'It is not my Johnnie, it is not my Mary.' Ask not for whom the bell tolls, it may be tolling for thee. I hope my time is not up. The bell is not tolling for me yet.

Mr. President, there is one area that I would like to touch on briefly, and that is the area of agriculture. Although some people are saying it would not get very far and all these sorts of things, I do not want to call anybody a prophet of doom, I want to say that we in Barbados have a special responsibility to ourselves and our children to see that they are well fed. We can do this either by trying to grow something around our houses, or, if we have not got land, in a can or something. Remember that food comes first, and if you are a lawyer, a doctor or whoever and you have not been fed, you cannot stand up to the rigorous strains and stresses of life.

I heard a lot of talk about sugar cane. At the time of the settlers, it was necessary to plant sugar cane in Barbados, because of the topography of this country. This country is a country on which any grass will grow, and one agriculturist has said to me that if you placed him in the middle of Barbados uninhabited, immediately you asked him what to plant, he would say grass, because grass does well in Barbados. But grass will not do well forever in economic terms, and that is something we have got to remember. Grass did well in economic terms over the years in Barbados, and that grass was sugar cane. That grass is no longer doing well in economic terms, and therefore we have to look at other crops.

Many of the farmers who used to grow sugar cane have gone out of sugar cane. They are planting egg plant, okras, sweet potatoes, watermelon, and a particular melon which we have seen taken on and is doing very well in the export trade is the tandew melon. Up to Sunday evening a whole lot of it went off by WARDAIR. We were in Orlando and they have had several orders, and every day it is going off. I think all that is left is what is remaining now at Bath. It is doing exceptionally well on the American, British and Canadian markets. It has tremendous potential.

4.30 p.m.

There is a plan to extract juice not only from that melon, but from other fruits in Barbados for local consumption, which would include hospitals, the School Meals Service and the ordinary consumer. I think that if we are going to get fresh juice rather than juice coming from a concentrate, we will be a lot healthier and a lot better. We have also been exporting Chinese yam, beans, the yard-long beans, and tomatoes. Mr President, I would like to say that that is a step in the right direction.

We hear people talking about somebody killing things. There was a plantation at Wildey in St. Michael. I do not know of anything that was tried out in agriculture that did not grow at that plantation. It is now

a housing area, it now has the Sanitation Authority in the centre of a developed area and no more food. Yet, some people are talking about food, and these are detractors. What I want to say is that we must look very carefully before we decide on areas and what we are going to do in that particular area.

Barbados has several soil types. You would be surprised to learn, if you walked in your own land and you took a sample, that you might find four or five different soil types on one spot of land. That is a fact. Every day they examine it in the laboratory and those persons who are involved in agriculture can tell you. So it does not mean because you pass and you see some land open that that is agricultural land. Sometimes that is a joke, because as soon as you start to dig you get nothing but rock, and nothing can grow there.

We have great expectations with our processing industries. We have many small people, like the Bajanne Producers, who are now doing dried fruit, and there is a new solar drier at the ADC where a lot more organisations will be able to get involved in this process of drying fruit.

When we look at the ridiculous food bill, we see that we have been importing $149.7 million of food, and I understand that, soon, we will see a higher figure. This has happened because some people have a mauby pocket, as would be said by a certain union boss, and a champagne taste. We must be careful that we do not import 37 brands of coffee, 26 brands of marmalade and 20 brands of ketchup, because that is foreign exchange. We have tomatoes now around almost all year. What do we need ketchup for? We can use the same tomatoes. What is wrong with our yams and sweet potatoes? Are we pretending that we do not know them any more? We were brought up on them and we are still living. Corn meal pap is still a good thing for the children, and not the baby foods from which, a study done in Canada proved, children get bigger livers. They are born with some huge livers and they soon die. We do not want that kind of situation to happen to our country, so we have to be selective.

I am afraid that Government will have to take some measures, which might not be popular, to put some of these food items on the negative list for a period and see what happens. They might have to ban some because some are really foolishness. With all the fresh parsley and thyme that we have about Barbados, I do not see why we must import it in a bottle. Then we have all these ladies now making seasoning. I think their seasoning tastes very good, and I see no reason why we should import any seasoning. I am not talking about wheat or anything that we cannot grow in Barbados, because that will be folly. We have to look at what we can produce, pork, chicken, and work on these things, and work until we get to the stage of perfection, Mr. President.

It is also very important to have retraining in the agricultural sector. A couple years ago, I worked with the extension department, and a few years after that I was surprised to learn that there were no extension officers. How are you going to service people? I am glad to see that extension officers are coming back on stream and that we are again going to be sending people to ECFI and ECIAF in Trinidad where they can be trained in agriculture, and in the most modern and productive techniques. There are many courses now coming on stream which will include marketing of produce and handling of the produce.

We have found that in the Caribbean region about some 50% to 60% of the produce is lost because of bad handling. We therefore are recommending that a number of young persons, farmers, too, get the training in handling and packaging of the produce from the field. This is very important, because field heat can destroy your product, especially if you are talking about exporting your product.

With all these things on stream, Mr. President, I see a shot in the arm for agriculture. We must remember, however, Sir, that the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. We have begun to take this one step since May last year.

We are trying. We are developing the technology. We are understanding the markets. We are understanding the ethnic groups who live in these various markets abroad and we are planning our agricultural production around this. I must say that the farmers are very happy to know that they can get a decent sum of money for a crop which they have worked very hard to bring on stream.

Mr. President, we must look at praedial larceny. This is something that concerns me very much. I understand that they have now moved to sugar cane, so do not think that you all are out of it. It is being sold at $1.50 per package or something like that. They cut it into small joints. So it is not only the vegetables that are being hit, the cane farmers are being hit as well.

I think we have to be very careful with what we buy, because many of these things have been sprayed, say, a day before, or two days before, and if we go and buy them, we might be poisoned. Some of the sprays have residual effects, they remain in your body for a long time and then you suddenly become very ill. This is a caution. We are looking at ways and means to alleviate this problem of praedial larceny. Some people thought about a receipt, that a person must show you a receipt proving that they brought from a particular plantation, but we still have to look at these things again, because we know there are people who can find loopholes in every law.

Mr. President, in closing, I should like to say that we, the women of Barbados, have some things that are still troubling us, and these are some loopholes in the laws of this country. One old gentleman who writes for the paper called me one day and said, "Do you know that there is a law on the Statute Book which says that a man may administer corporal punishment to his wife?" I said I did not know about that one, but that I would look it up. He thought immediately that this was the law that some men were looking at for beating their wives.
4.40 p.m.

There are many other laws there relating to women that we would like to see either removed or upgraded. We have submitted them – now when I say 'we,' I mean as an organization – to the Attorney General, and we hope to get some action on this. One of them is that cases of domestic violence and rape be tried in camera. We must think very seriously about this. I have done jury duty, and I have seen many, many women scoff at other women as though they were the villain and not the victim. Many rape cases have not been reported because of this same situation. Many will call you and tell you they have been raped. Did they report it to the police? They say, no because they are frighten for all the talk, and you find that they are genuinely afraid when you sit down and try to counsel them, and you then call the police and try to get some assistance for them. I think the sooner we get this change, the better.

Like Trinidad, where it is a law that a man can rape his wife, we must make that change. Many people do not think a man can rape his wife, but he can rape his wife.

So where there are any loop-holes or any laws affecting women, we strongly recommend to Government that they take speedy action. Women are the majority of voters in this country. Without the women, there would not be any Senators or Ministers, and there would not be any men in Parliament. The women have put the men there, and we deserve all that we are asking for, and even more.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Applause.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, the penultimate speaker, the lady Senator, kept me awake by the evangelical fervour of her contribution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But the last point was very interesting. It was very interesting.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: The last one put me to sleep, Sir!

I would like very quickly to deal with something the last speaker said. She made an interesting contribution on agriculture and the need to grow more food in this country. She talked about the development in non-sugar production and I want to thank her for that, Sir, because my recollection is that in 1976 tomatoes were being sold in Barbados at $4 a pound, and that is because cabbages, lettuces, carrots, and the same tomatoes were being imported into Barbados. Even sweet potatoes were imported! There was hardly any non-sugar agriculture in Barbados in 1976! Nowadays we are self-sufficient in all vegetables and, therefore, I have to applaud Senator Fraser for what is, in fact, a compliment to the Government from 1976 – 1986.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes, I like compliments. My whole speech will not deal with compliments, though.

Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Ever since we started yesterday morning, Mr. Deputy President, from the languorous and self-serving contribution made by Senator Lewis right up to the last few minutes, we have had a mixed bag. We have had some very good speeches. By and large, the Independent Senators all made very solid contributions to this debate, and in a way I envy them. I would like to be able to get up and make some philosophical musings and to do informed analyses of these serious issues, such as they have done. I do those things in other forums, but I am not here today to be involved in that kind of thing.

Senator Lewis made a very vacuous speech. He spent all his time dealing with self-justification for his job and the Ministry that he is in. At the end of it, Sir, I say that he has not proved any case, but I will deal more with Senator Lewis and his Ministry later on.

The highlight of this debate has been the outstanding contribution of Senator Miller. It was a speech of sustained brilliance. Do you know how I measure the quality of speeches in here, Sir? By how miserable Senator Boxill and Senator Smith get on! If they are quiet and keeping their cool, I know that we are not making any impact. But from the time they start to get miserable and interrupt, I know that the blows are landing exactly where we want them to land.

I came in this morning after young Senator Comissiong had spoken, so I did not get everything. I had to go and earn my living before I got here. But I understand that he has learned nothing with time. Senator Phillips made a good speech. I do not like to praise the Government, because they do so much foolishness that

the foolishness outweighs the good, but Senator Phillips has the maturity and a native common sense that I wish was a little more wide-spread in the Government benches.

Senator Comissiong, in his usual style of *ad hominem* contributions, attacked Senator Miller. He will not learn. He said that she made a number of wild and unsubstantiated allegations. He said, for instance, that what she had said about the Ministry of Finance had told Accounting Officers not to pay bills in their Ministries other than salaries, National Insurance contributions and levies was not true. And he is so incredibly naive that he relies on the Minister of Finance. He said that the Minister of Finance said that is totally false. Well, those of us who know the Minister of Finance knows that the truth is anathema to him. That is not just now, that is for his whole life, that is the way he is. So you do not take the Minister of Finance as any credible source when you are talking in here. I am challenging Senator Lewis to get up in here and say, as Senator Comissiong said, that the Ministry of Finance did not tell the Accounting Officers not to pay bills other than salaries, wages and the levies.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: They hold a lot of meetings. But the Minister of Finance, as I said, is a man who does not like the truth to come too near to him. He gets uncomfortable with it, Sir, very uncomfortable. I see how you are setting up your face, but we might as well tell the truth in here, Sir.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I heard Senator Comissiong saying that we are now experiencing rising employment and says that employment has increased since the DLP took over. I do not consider myself competent to judge that. How would I know? The only way I know is by reading the surveys of the Statistical Department and the Research Section of the Central Bank. They are the ones whose figures we go by, and they say that unemployment has risen. They say that it is 19.2 per cent at a time when there is usually peak employment in this country – tourism at its peak and the sugar crop going on – when most people are employed in this country.

One thing about Senator Comissiong – I am sorry he is not here – is that he admitted that the economy is in shambles. By saying that I give him a reprieve for the nonsense he talked before.

Aside

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You do not mind. You would not know. You would not understand anything anyway. He said that everybody knew that the economy was in bad shape and that, according to him, it remained in that state until 1981. I think that is what he said. So he is admitting that the economy is in shambles.
4.50 p.m.

But we do not have to rely on the innocence and the naivete of Senator Comissiong to be acquainted with those things. I am glad you have come – you have come to learn a few things. I am very glad that he has come because he must understand that when you are making contributions in here, you are talking to people who are knowledgeable and to people who have sources of proper information.

I do not want to spend too much of my one hour to talk about Senator Comissiong, except I will say finally that it is a little bit unworthy of him to talk about "spineless sycophants." I have been called many things in my life, but that one sounds good, Sir, it has a certain rhythm to it, so I will remember from now on, thanks to Senator Comissiong, that I am a spineless sycophant.

(Aside: SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: No, I excluded you.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Oh, you excluded me. I am very grateful for that.

Senator Goddard made a speech here this afternoon that I had every intention of making, dealing with the same things he said, but as Senator Lewis said, he is more competent and more articulate than I am. When I sat down here and heard him making the speech, I was sitting here saying I wish I was the one saying those things.

Asides

SENATOR L. R. TULL: They cannot understand that.

When we deal with the Estimates, we have to look at the overall picture of the economy, and Senator Miller has put forward the case with such devastating form that, again, anything that I say that is a repetition of what she said, will be a very pale reflection. She was very strong in her presentation, she was very articulate and she put a good case, so I do not want to spend any time repeating it, but one or two things nevertheless bear a little repetition.

I heard Senator Lewis quote from the World Bank Report. The same World Bank Report that he refers to said that between January and June of last year there was 3% growth, and the same World Bank Report says that there will be a minus 1.7 growth in the period the end of June on into 1987. You see, there are always selective quotations from these documents, but the World Bank Report is replete with a lot of interesting

information, and one of the things I feel good about is the ruling by His Honour, the President, yesterday that you can read to your heart's content, because Standing Orders have been given a holiday for this debate, leaves me free to read whenever I feel like. We would not want to make His Honour look wrong, so we might as well operate within the four corners of his decision.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I, Mr. .....

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: On a point of order!

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Man, who are you yelling at?

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: On a point of order: Mr. Deputy President, I cannot remember the President telling us in here or ruling that the Standing Orders had taken a holiday. The remark he has made, in my view, is insulting to the President of the Chamber, and I will not sit down and listen to that sort of nonsense insulting the President on his rulings in this Chamber. Others can stand for it, but I will not be standing for it, and I will interrupt any time I hear insulting remarks about the President of this Senate, because he did not at any time say that the rules of this Chamber had a holiday and members could run horses through them.

He said he does not want to make the President look wrong. It is very insulting, but perhaps he cannot help himself. I will deal with him when my turn comes.

Mr. Deputy President, did the President say that the rules of the Chamber are all suspended?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have not so heard.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Well, all right. Therefore, it is insulting for him to suggest it.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, I will not waste time on him. He believes that a lot of loud noise and repetition is valid argument. I hope though, Mr. Deputy President, that you will realise that he took up three minutes of my hour and that you will give me the three minutes at the end. Because if that is going to be the order of the day, they can all get up one after the other, take out three minutes, and reduce my period to 20.

I was dealing, Mr. Deputy President, with the questions raised by Senator Goddard, that if we are going to take a look at the whole background of the Barbados economy and wonder where we go forward, and see these Estimates in the context of the economic situation and its prospects, then we have to look at the four main areas of economic activity in this country.

We hear a lot about the productive areas of the economy, and these are usually classified as tourism, manufacturing and industry, agriculture and the offshore financial services and services generally. We know, Sir, that there has been a major decline in manufacturing, for reasons that have been stated. I do not need to go into them over and over again. There has been a softening of demand both in CARICOM and beyond for manufactured goods from Barbados. There has been difficulty in penetrating both regional and extra-regional markets. Indeed the economies of our trading partners, principally places like Trinidad and Tobago, have deteriorated to the extent to which they cannot buy as many goods as they used to buy.

I say this in the context of a statement made by Senator Phillips yesterday. There is a lot of loose talk about what is responsible for the falling off in trade between Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, and it is traced back quite often – and that was Opposition talk, I did not know it would be Government talk – about some row between, according to Senator Phillips, the late Prime Minister Adams and the High Commissioner for Trinidad and Tobago to Barbados, the late Basil Pitt. Things have changed, Sir. Both Mr. Adams and Mr. Pitt are gentlemen of recent memory, or late memory. They are not around, but the fact is that since this Government has taken over, trade with Trinidad and Tobago has fallen off even more than it was before.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: The figures show that the decline, the fall off in trade with Trinidad and Tobago, has been so substantial in the last six or eight months as to reach a crisis situation.

We have had the Minister of Trade going to Trinidad in August last year and coming back to Barbados and streaming across this country that there was some fantastic breakthrough in trade with Trinidad and Tobago, and that by Christmas there would have been 2,000 jobs. Let me tell you something, Mr. President, there has been a net loss of jobs in the manufacturing industry since the Democratic Labour Party became the Government of this country. I do not know the exact figure, I believe it is between 700 and 800.

I am not in any frame of mind to accuse the DLP Government for all of that, because that would be the height of irresponsibility on my part to make this reckless kind of comment. There are a number of factors, some local and some external, that are responsible for this situation. Time does not allow me to go into any great detail, but what has been said by the World Bank Report, which is nothing new, and nobody on that side or this side needs any World Bank to tell us that, is that if this

country is to maintain growth and to keep the quality of life of its citizens even as they are without even going forward, Sir, there must be export-led development. We have to export more, more manufactured goods, more agricultural goods and more services, that is, tourism and financial services. We have to earn more overseas in all these areas if we are to succeed in giving our people a decent standard of living.
5.00 p.m.

We have a document before us, these Estimates, that we thought would give us some small guide as to Government's strategy for meeting that particular need. But what do we have? While every reputable commentator, local and external, says that marketing is the key to success in these areas, there is a cut in the money provided for marketing generally.

I can deal more specifically with the Export Promotion Corporation, which was the subject of a pejorative attack by Senator Lewis yesterday. I hope that when he gets up and speaks again, if he does, he will tell us exactly what he means. It is no point whispering things around. If there was something wrong with Export Promotion Corporation, tell us, we are entitled to know, but he makes these little snide remarks, unworthy, again, of a Government Minister.

In the field of tourism, there are problems. Do not let us fool ourselves. As Senator Goddard said, we are having a rough time competing because of costs. The wage cost is high. We are not quarrelling about that. We are glad to know that Barbadians make more money than the people in the Dominican Republic, or Antigua, or Mexico.

We in the Barbados Labour Party are glad that we were able to move the per capita income of Barbadians from US$1 300 in 1976 to US$4 700 today. If that is not revolutionary, I do not know what is. I want any other country in the developing world to tell me that it has had that kind of phenomenal increase in the per capita income that has been experienced by Barbados during the period 1976 – 1986.

Agriculture, Sir, has its problems. I find myself incompetent to deal with the technicalities of the agricultural industry. What I do know, however, is that we started a vigorous campaign, spearheaded by Government through IDC, to produce more non-sugar food in this country, and it has succeeded. It is not only that it has succeeded in satisfying the domestic demands, but we have been able to ship a lot of non-sugar food to North America and the United Kingdom.

I heard Senator Fraser mention tandew melons. I remember when Bernard St. John came back from Canada, I think it was, with his pockets full of seeds of the tandew melon and he said "listen, I believe that this thing can take off", and handed them to the Minister of Agriculture and stated, "get your people working on them". Within a year we were shipping quality tandew melons to the North American markets. I remember, Sir, when we were shipping yams, sweet potatoes and onions to the United Kingdom and North America. All this was during the period of the Barbados Labour Party.

But I am not going to be like Orpheus. Orpheus kept looking back all the time and lost Eurydice, his darling. I am not going to look back. I want to look forward, because these Estimates talk about going forward. I want to know where in these Estimates is there provision for enhancing the competitiveness of Barbados' exports. There is a cut in the Export Promotion Corporation.

I heard Senator Eastmond say some nice things about what is happening in the Export Promotion Corporation. The Export Promotion Corporation set up an office in Puerto Rico and a representative there when I was Minister, so, thank you. The Export Promotion Corporation got money from the European Development Fund, from the United Nations Development Fund and from the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation to provide designers, managers and inspectors to improve, design, the grading, the costing and the pricing of products, and to take firms in Barbados in a pilot project to improve the quality of their design and production so that they could make inroads into the United States and Europe. And they succeeded! And when I hear Senator Eastmond say these things, it warms my heart, because, by sheer coincidence, these things happened when I was Minister.

We can hear a lot of talk about the National Anthem, "these fields and hills beyond recall", and that "this beach is mine" and all of that, but do not fool ourselves. We cannot like an ostrich, hide our heads in the sand. Our economy is under seige. It is under seige for external reasons and domestic reasons, and I want very briefly to advert now to the fiscal policy of the current Government.

You hear all the time about tax concessions and the Budget largesse of 1986. As I have said in here before, I do not quarrel if I get some extra money. But it is a bigger problem than whether I, or you, Sir, or any individual gets extra money. You can look at the very World Bank report, and I am only quoting the World Bank report because Senator Lewis did, because I do not think a few fellows sitting down in the World Bank can tell us in Barbados anything about our economy. They did not go to any schools we did not go to, and they do not have any brains that we do not have. We have people in Barbados who can look at these things and come to their own conclusions. It so happens that a lot of the conclusions of the World Bank coincide with the conclusions of the people in this country, and this

World Bank Report tells us a number of interesting things.

I want to go by a circuitous route to get back to that point because in the short time at my disposal, there is a lot that has to be said. I have to cram as much as I can into a short period of time. So much to do, Sir, so little time.

I heard about the Defence and Security, and I want to deal with that, because nobody really touched on it. Just under $17 million has been allocated for Defence and Security this year. Now the Prime Minister is a very interesting man. It seems that even his acolytes find it difficult to interpret him. They do not seem to understand him, and if his acolytes do not, how would I? The Prime Minister said he was going to cut down on the Defence Force, and that if he had his way, he would chase away all of them. It reminds me of what he said about the Harbour Police some years ago, that they were a lot of flat-footed old men walking about town drawing the taxpayers' money. The Prime Minister is a genius at making these kinds of comments about certain sections of the community. He was against the Defence Force, but he does not cut anything. He has not sent home a man!
5.10 p.m.

He talks about the Regional Security System. Back in 1982–83, there was a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the countries of the Eastern Caribbean, the LDCs, as they are called in Barbados, as a basis of understanding and for action in relation to a number of activities, not only military. I think there was very little about that in it. There were things like contraband, smuggling, oil spills and fishermen that are lost at sea, it was that kind of agreement. About a year later, the heads of these countries decided that they would enshrine in a treaty what was in the Memorandum of Understanding. My recollection is that nothing more was added in the draft treaty than was in the Memorandum of Understanding, but I heard the Prime Minister repeatedly say that the Memorandum of Understanding is good for him, he is not getting into any military exercises and this militarisation of the Caribbean. But there is nothing in the treaty that is not in the Memorandum of Understanding, and I would like perhaps the Leader of the Senate, who is more conversant with these things than the Minister who introduced the Appropriation Bill, to explain for the benefit of Barbados exactly what is the situation in respect of the Regional Security System, because from all I had heard, the Barbados Defence Force had participated in military exercises in the Caribbean in collaboration with the United States and other Caribbean countries, since the Government has changed.

I do not understand these mixed signals. You cannot tell us one thing one day and something else on the other. So I want to know, Sir, what is the position in respect of this $16.89 million that has been assigned to Defence and Security.

I have raised the question of the cut for marketing and promotion in tourism and manufacture. I also want to ask in this context, before I get back to the World Bank thing, why is there despite strong protestations of the Minister of Finance, cuts in many social services? I heard in here today that there will be no cuts, but those people who say there are no cuts are probably living in Guyana, not in Barbados, because Housing Welfare has been cut and old people, mercifully, have been saved from getting wet because of prolonged drought. But the rains will come, and they will start getting wet again.

It is also a fact that General Welfare Grants have been curtailed and, in many areas, stopped. Parents used to get money for uniforms, shoes and things for their children who go to school. That has been stopped. There has also been a cut in cultural and supporting services. The poor Minister of Sport, they gave him a bad deal, and he is now, instead of keeping quiet, trying to rationalise the very difficult situation that he is in!

I want to say something about the position articulated by the World Bank in respect of these things. The World Bank has taken the position that the Barbados Labour Party had taken before the elections and right after elections, that the Budget Proposals of last year will result in one or two things. One is that it could result later this year in a fairly substantial increase in taxation. Nobody expects personal Income Tax increases – that would be lunacy of the highest order – but one expects that there will be many areas of indirect taxation to raise money to close the revenue gap that is undoubtably there. When the Barbados Labour Party said that in the last eight or nine months, the Government were not prepared to accept it, but they are now beginning to see the light and they are accepting that. That is one side. They either have to have a substantial increase in taxation, and if there is, indirect taxation, to close that revenue gap, or they will be a resultant savage cut in services and jobs. Money has to come from somewhere. The cut in services has started. I made reference to some of them. The cut in jobs has started, and we spoke about that for many a month.

I want the Government to understand that there is a general disillusionment among the unemployed in Barbados, particularly the young unemployed. It is a matter for the Government to turn a deaf ear to it or pretend it does not exist. If that suits them, fine for them. But these people were led to believe that there was going to be a new dawn on the morning of May 29, and that the Democratic Labour Party had a panacea for all the ills of employment in this country. This has not been

realised, and even in crop time and the height of the tourist season, people in large numbers are sitting around the shop steps on the corners all across the country.

We on this side understand, Mr. President, that that need has to be met, and I want briefly to allude to something Senator Goddard said. He draws a rather nice distinction between wants and needs, but one man's meat is another man's poison, and I want Senator Goddard to understand that the determination of needs and wants must be made by the individual whom it affects. There cannot be somebody standing off and determining these things. We have set some fairly high standards in this country. We have brought a quality of life to this country that we cannot allow to slip, and believe me, Mr. President, what is a need in Dominica and what is a need in Barbados are two entirely different things. People's expectations are higher, and we have to grapple with these problems.

There is no question about unemployment, Sir. The Government has won a con game with the public, aided and abetted by the workers' unions in this country, a colossal con game! There was a time in this country when workers' movements were in the vanguard of social policy. It did not separate development of social policy from the representation of workers' rights. That has become a thing of the past, and just as I hear somebody in here talking about you cannot see certain things with the naked eye, I find it extremely difficult, Mr. President, to see the distinction between the unions, by and large, and the Government of this country.

A lot of speakers in here on the Government side go into the House of Assembly and listen to debates in there, soak up a lot of information that they do not understand and then come in here and try to put it back out. By the time they get here, the information is dried out, and they give a lot of mumbo-jumbo, but one thing they should have remembered, and which should have stayed in their system, is the fact that the three union representatives in the House of Assembly last week spent a lot of time talking about the police and whether a policeman can prosecute a case, all kinds of not trivial, but other things. I did not hear – well not directly, Sir, because I would not listen to them – the reports of any substantial input on the question of unemployment and jobs in this country.
5.20 p.m.

It is true that the current Prime Minister said some time ago that the unions are not concerned about the unemployed, because the unemployed do not pay union dues – they are only concerned about the people who pay dues. But unless we pay more serious attention and unless the union takes the lead almost as a missionary crusade to put more people to work, then everything is going to come tumbling down. Because, as I said, Sir, there is a lot of disillusionment and uneasiness in Barbados among those people whose expectations of jobs were so high in May last year and to whom nothing has been delivered.

Mr. President, I want very briefly to deal with this question of drugs. The whole debate on drugs, I do not mean in this Chamber, Sir, but generally in the country, has changed. It has changed as dramatically as the change of Government. When the Barbados Labour Party was the Government, all you heard about this country, and from the lips of the Democratic Labour Party people in particular, was that the drug problem was the creation of the Government and that a number of people in Government were involved in it. You would hear this night after night and day after day from spokesmen for the Democratic Labour Party. Now what are you hearing today, Sir? We must not be emotive! We must not apportion blame! This is a national problem! We have to put our heads together and work out a solution! You never used to hear that before!

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: If Henry Forde said it, Henry Forde is batting on the wrong wicket.

I, as Minister of Legal Affairs, used to have the Commissioner of Police come to my office on a regular basis, and I would ask him, 'Do you have any evidence of people in politics involved in this drug business?' And on every single occasion I asked him that he said, "No." I told him, and you can tell him when you see him, that any time.....

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Senator Boxill says that the Commissioner is lying, Sir.

(Aside: SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I said that you are lying.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Oh I see, I see. That is better. I can take that. Do not worry about it, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, but I cannot have that between you and Senator Boxill. I must warn you all. You know that I like a lively debate, but you cannot carry on a discussion with Senator Boxill, and especially about lying. I mean, what is one to bring the Assembly to?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Sir, I have not had any discussion with him. That is what he said, Sir. I was bringing it to your attention.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You do not engage in that sort of business. You should know better.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I do not know any better. I thought he said the Commissioner lied.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Did you say that you do not know any better?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No, Sir, I do not know any better, Sir. I thought he said the Commissioner lied, and that is why I pointed it to your attention. If he says I lied, Sir, that does not bother me. I do not want you involved in that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have to be involved.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Get involved, Sir! As you please!

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have to be involved in all the debates in here, unfortunately.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I would say so, too, Sir. I agree with you – unfortunately, for all of us!

Mr. PRESIDENT: But it is for all of us I have to.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Anyhow, I would warn all members, if not I will have to invoke the Rules, and I am not afraid of invoking the Rules of the Chamber in so far as the debates are concerned. I hope Members will not be surprised when I invoke the Rules. It will be the President invoking the Rules, the Standing Orders of this Chamber. No more cross talking by any member, whether it is a member addressing the Chamber or it is a member in his seat! I will invoke the Rules!

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Before you chase me out, Sir, I have a few more things to say.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have not said so, Senator Tull.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Oh, I thought that is what you were saying, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you are anticipating me, I regard these things as very insulting, and I call on you to withdraw those remarks, "before I send you out." Kindly withdraw those words.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Sir, you said you would invoke the Standing Orders.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Invoking the Rules does not mean I am going to send you out.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Invoking the Rules means you are in authority to send out people who cross talk.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Invoking the Rules does not mean I would send you out.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, Sir, I withdraw that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I have more important things to say, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Say them.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: My time is running out.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Where do you think you are?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am in the Senate, Sir, and, as you used to say, Sir, I did not come in here in a box cart.

Mr. PRESIDENT: And I did not come in here by one either. I would not have you speaking to me like that, and again I would ask you to withdraw those kinds of words. I am not speaking to you as a Senator. Do not tell me about you did not come in here in a box cart. I use no insulting language to you.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: How is that insulting to you, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is insulting to the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Whatever you want me to withdraw, Sir, I will withdraw. Do you want me to withdraw that?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I withdraw it, Sir, because I have some things to say, and time is running out on me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is your right, but you have to address the Chair with decorum. You must get that in your head. I am not there at your fancy. You have to address the chair with decorum. Get that clear!

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I am not here at your fancy either!

Mr. PRESIDENT: You like you think I am here at yours!

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Well, I do not know. I mean, you say that as if I am here at your fancy.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am here to preside over the meetings.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, Sir, if I may continue, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You may.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Ah, good, Sir. Time is running out.

Senator Lewis got in here yesterday and gave us a very long dissertation on management in the Public Service. As I had to tell him, Sir, if I were a Professor of Public Management, I would probably give him an A on it, but in terms of the context in which it was used yesterday, it was really, as I said earlier, a little bit vacuous and out of order.

I have some questions to ask about the Ministry of the Public Service. First of all, let me volunteer a few of my own views on it. I believe that the Ministry of the Public Service is an unfortunate incubus on the Public Service of this country. I also believe that it is an albatross around the neck not only of the Public Service, but the people in this country.

I, like the people of this country, do not like petty dictators, and there is evidence that there is petty dictatorship around the Public Service. I do not work in the Public Service, but one hears things. It is a small community, and there is a tremendous amount of uneasiness.

The objectives stated by Senator Lewis are good objectives. I do not quarrel with them. But the action falls short of the objectives.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You want evidence?

I understand, Mr. President, that a letter was sent by the Ministry of the Public Service to a number of Government statutory boards, in fact, commercial enterprises, like Barbados Mills Ltd., the Arawak Cement Company and to Barbados External Communications, saying that they will carry out a management audit of these companies. Really, Mr. President, that goes against every canon of good conduct in these matters! If the Minister – I see he is punching his thing – wants to get up and correct me, I am going to withdraw it. But that is what I am told! I cannot go up to the Government Headquarters and say, 'Show me a file.'

5.30 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, it was that very untruth that caused me to stray yesterday and make comments about the Managing Director of the Barbados *Advocate*.

At this stage certain words made by Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. PRESIDENT.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Senator Tull was made aware yesterday that it was a circular issued by the Unit of State Enterprises that was sent to these various agencies. I am sure that I said that, and I repeat again that it had absolutely nothing to do with the Ministry of the Public Service. It was a simple, innocuous circular reminding these agencies about a previous circular issued in 1985, when there was no Ministry of State Enterprises.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I really did not hear that yesterday. That is not to say that he did not say it, but I did not gather that. Of course, he was talking in such an esoteric way that ordinary mortals like me were not able to pick up the import of everything he said.

I understand that the Permanent Secretary (Special Assignments), as he was a few months ago, is now the Permanent Secretary in this unit to which the Minister makes reference, and that this Permanent Secretary works directly under the control of the Minister of the Public Service. Therefore, he has to carry responsibility for what happens in his department. But if I have the assurance that that is not so, well, that is the assurance.

I raised in here about a month ago or six weeks ago this very question of the encroachment of the Ministry of the Public Service in areas that were outside of its legal purview, like dabbling or trying to dabble in the affairs of parastatals. At that time the Minister sat down there and did not get up and deem this Chamber with a response to the question that I raised. I want to keep at it because it does not make for a good Government.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: He says he wants evidence. If you want the evidence, find out what happened at last week's Cabinet meeting and the position taken by at least five Ministers in respect to this very matter to which I speak. They are on your side, so they will tell you. They would not tell me.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But you are aware that is nothing for in here. What happened at last week's Cabinet meeting is nothing for in here. You cannot ask any of us in here to find out what happened at last week's Cabinet meeting.

SENATOR. L. R. TULL: No! I think I can ask anybody to find out anything they want.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no! You cannot ask anybody in here to find out what happened at last week's Cabinet meeting.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: But I thought I had, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no! You have no right to ask that question in here.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Well, what do you mean? I cannot ask a rhetorical question, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: You, as a barrister, knows very well that what happens in the Cabinet is secret. How are you going to ask them to find out what happened at last week's meeting?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Then they will tell him that, if it is a secret.

Mr. PRESIDENT: How can you ask us to break the law?

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I do not know if you understand what is a rhetorical question.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would like to know. No, I only want to know if you are really asking any member of this House to find out what happened in Cabinet last week.

SENATOR. L. R. TULL: Well, do you not think, Mr. President, that Cabinet decisions are made public? How are you going to run a country unless Cabinet decisions are made public?

Mr. PRESIDENT: But you cannot ask the Senators to find out before they become public.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I am trying desperately against the clock to get some points in, but I tell you, Sir, I am not doing very well.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do try.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: The clock – desperate, Sir!

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do try, without desperately trying.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I want to say again, Sir, because I am not finished with the Ministry of the Public Service, that I understand that the Ministry of the Public Service had signed tax waivers for the Customs Department. Now the law gives that right to the Minister of Finance. No Ministry of the Public Service has got any right in law to do that. Again, I heard so, and if the Minister wants to get up and deny that, too, he can say so. We will have to clock down all these interruptions. I am keeping a tally sheet, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the honourable Senator says that it is the lawful authority of the Minister of Finance and, therefore, it cannot be done by anybody else. I mean, to even presume that somebody else could serve that power is so far-fetched it is not funny.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You noticed, Mr. President, that he has not denied it! That is one of the things I know as a lawyer, Sir, he has not denied it! A lot of fancy words, taking up two more minutes of my time, and he has not yet denied it!

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Well, I will take another minute. I deny that absolutely.

Laughter.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: All right.

I understand further, Sir, that a senior officer in the Ministry of Finance was targeted for special leave at the instigation of the Minister of Public Service. Before he answers, Sir, I do not want an answer to this.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: That is right. Usually in these debates, you make points and in the reply he answers them, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This is a debate. This is not a question and answer.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I understand, Sir, that that is the case, all because of Appendix G that has been appended to the Estimates of this year. So later on we will hear about that, Sir, because we need these things to know how to shift for the future, as there will be a lot of shifting.

I want also, Mr. President, to find out from the Minister if he is aware that a man who was charged for receiving stolen liquor from the port was subsequently made a member of the Port Authority. I really want to know if he can throw some light on these things. The public is talking about these things and we are entitled to some answers.

I also want to know, Sir, whether it is a fact that the Minister has issued a directive to certain Ministries – Ministry of Foreign Affairs – that with immediate effect his Ministry will be responsible for public officers' houses. Usually, when Foreign Service Officers come from overseas.....

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I do not know if he proposes to tell me that now, but he has not told me that yet.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You are saying these things to the Permanent Secretary, not to the Minister. I know the Permanent Secretary received it. You hear these things. People talk, and these are things that cause a lot of disquiet. So if they are not true, the Minister has a responsibility to clear the air, because this is all I am hearing.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: They tell me I have about 15 more minutes.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: He said four or five minutes. I was just joking. You take me serious in everything.

I want very quickly, Sir, to deal with one or two other matters. I see the Minister of Foreign Affairs has passed around a document. He promised me he would, and I am grateful to him for giving us the document, 'Diplomacy In Development – A Review of Foreign Policy of Barbados.' I had intended to make some very intrinsic comments about the Minister of Foreign Affairs. But in view of the fact the Minister has given me a document for study, and the fact also that there is a Private Members' Resolution down and the Minister gives an undertaking that we will have a debate on Foreign Affairs some time in the near future, I will not pursue that particular line.

I want to deal with this question of Arawak Cement Plant. I think a lot of the Government's fiscal policies are misguided. This business of privatisation is an abandonment of democratic socialist principles that have brought this country out of the morass of the 1930s, up to today, good social democratic principles. What we are seeing is a headlong rush towards neo-conservatism. This business of privatising important Government commercial agencies, in my view, is a misguided one, and as I said, this neo-conservatism is going to cause some problems in this community. We have fought too hard for certain things to give them up.

5.40 p.m.

You take these tax concessions, Sir. The private sector and the people who are well paid are laughing all the way to the bank. When Senator Goddard mentioned the plan by certain public companies to put up $3 million for tourism promotion, it is as he quite rightly said, not any altruism on the part of those businessmen. They are businessmen, Sir, it is self-interest. They have done very well as a result of these measures and they want to say thank you by giving a tip. They made so much money out of this misguided set of proposals in the Budget, that they tip their hats and say here is a tip for what you have done for me. I do not want to push that any further than that.

The fact is that the Budgetary Proposals have driven a wedge between the poor and the well off, and there is no doubt at all that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. If you talk about the amount of money that has been given back to the community, over 85% of it has gone to individuals and companies that are the higher earners in this country. The people at the bottom have got nothing. What have the unemployed got? What have the porters, maids, cleaners and the gardeners got out of this whole thing? The people who have money have done very well.

This was done, I understand, so that it would generate jobs in the economy, but that has not happened, so there would be no reason why the Minister, although he can be a very obtuse fellow when he is ready, should not commit himself to a U-turn, because what he promised is not happening. I am not even on this occasion criticising him for trying it, because when it does not work, you have to review it and see if you can shift your position.

The Arawak Cement Plant. This question of selling off the public assets is the one that you have to view with a great deal of caution. We are copycats in this country. All across Europe – whether it is Britain, Germany or Poland, or even the socialist countries of the north, like Sweden – they are going in for this privatisation frolic. But the difference between them and us is that when they sell off a factory or a car plant, or a mine or a bank, they are selling it to their own nationals. When we sell off our assets, we sell them off to foreigners. We have not got the capital accumulated in Barbados to pay for these things, and foreigners step in and buy them, and that is what I think is cardinally wrong with it.

But there is another consideration, Sir. There is a difference between public enterprises and private enterprises. Private enterprises are concerned with profit, that is their *raison d'etre.* Public enterprises have a generous amount of social utility, and there is a cost for social utility.

This cement plant, Sir? I remember the days before the cement plant. Every few weeks carpenters and masons used to be sent off construction sites because cement had not come in or something of the kind. That is finished now, Sir, cement is here!

There is a cost involved, but it is important that we do not throw out the baby with the bath water. I think that Senator Phillips is a bit misguided in his recommendation. Sure, the plant is losing money, but the answer is not to sell it. There are a number of things that must be done. What has happened is that Trinidad and Tobago is consuming 40% less cement than it was consuming three years ago, and that there has been a 50% drop in the consumption of cement in the Caribbean area. The planning of the plant was predicated.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Tull, I am only warning you about your time. I will give you a minute more to close. It is that, but I will not cut you short.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I thank you for your generosity.

There is a wide chasm between the promise and the performance. The Government has promised to deliver milk and honey and what they are delivering is a lot of things, but not that. The Government has told the people that these enterprising new measures would generate all kinds of economic activity and put people to work. It has failed dismally. I am recommending that the Government review its current policy, taking all these factors into consideration.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, I have just listened to a speech by the Honourable Senator Tull which not only is replete with falsehoods, but is larded with rudeness and insults.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Smith, falsehoods is a little bit touching the crease.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Inaccuracies and insults, or if you prefer, terminological inexactitudes and insults.

I see on the Order Paper, Mr. President, a Resolution by Senator Jones to the effect that he is calling on the Government to take steps to give effect to the recommendation of the Constitution Commission that the Senate should be authorised to deal with money Resolutions. I think he should ask the Government to review the Constitution that the Senate should not be the dumping ground for persons whom the people have rejected, and who are just placed here to keep their existence alive and to let the people of this country know that they are still living. I think he should ask that the Constitution be amended that persons whom the people have rejected at elections should not be the next week finding themselves sitting in a legislative chamber, in this House, immediately after, and who talk in here as if they have a mandate from somebody. They do not have any mandate, and they are finding a resting place for a period of time at the mercy of the Leader of the Opposition. That is why the Constitution should be amended, that parties should pay respect to the decisions of the people when they reject people like you and Senator Tull!

5.50 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Miller, Senator Smith is addressing the Chair, not you.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Now, Mr. President, I would just like to start off by saying that neither of the two Senators are capable of unlacing the shoes of the Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Walton Barrow. Just as John the Baptist said that he was incapable of unlacing the laces of Jesus' shoes, these two can criticise him, but there are not a shadow to the leader of this Government, whom the people elected. I just want to start out with that. They are two lawyers, they should at least pay some respect to the Constitution of this country. The people elected the Democratic Labour Party by the biggest majority in the country's history, 24 – 3. It was either a massacre or an annihilation. Not only that, neither of the Opposition could accept the choice of the people, but they are now joining and having all sorts of people creating themselves as opposition, the media and other people in high positions, telling you they are balancing the Opposition, when the people say they want this Government. As a result of that, there has come here to lead this country a man who led it into independence, and who have given them the National Anthem. In the last ten years you could not change the anthem nor the flag. Barrow gave you those, and for all time they will remain the flag and the anthem of this country.

This is the first Estimates we are introducing. The last Estimates were introduced by the Barbados Labour Party. The Prime Minister was the Minister of Finance, he knew when he was calling the election, and he filled the Estimates with a lot of pork barrel fat. What the Democratic Labour Party is doing in these Estimates is trying to trim the pork barrel fat off the last Estimates that you introduced and make them more realistic. So when you talk about we have cut back, we are not cutting back anything. If we find that a Ministry or Department is doing something, we will come for a supplementary estimate, but we are certainly not going to, like you did in 1985–86, when you knew there was going to be an election, come in with a lot of bogus figures in the Estimates to fool the people, who, thank God, were not fooled by the Estimates that you introduced in this country. There can be no quarrel with these Estimates, because they are a realistic approach to the present state of the economy.

Let me tell you, if you do not understand what this Government was aiming at in the last Budget and in the last Estimates. We realised that the country was labouring under heavy taxation. The hotel industry was taxed. If taxation was making Tom Adams the best Prime Minister,

we would never get another one like him. He knew where to tax, he knew what to tax, and if taxing made him a good Prime Minister, we had the best we are ever likely to get as long as Barbados stays on this earth.

We realised that that was not in the interest of the country, that it was killing incentives. People could not buy and sell anything. The standard of living that we had established between 1961 and 1976 was being eroded. We decided, therefore, on the faith of the people of this country who had given us an overwhelming mandate, to introduce a budget putting more money in the pockets of the masses, putting more money in the economy, in the merchants' hands, on the understanding that the money would circulate and cause a turnaround. You have never seen the Lord – you probably will never see him – but you have to believe in God. Your religion is based on faith – I hope I will have the opportunity to see him – and we were putting faith in the people of this country who gave us an overwhelming mandate on May 28, and we were saying to them that if a merchant has more money, then he will employ more people. If a man has more money, one in the middle class, he will hire a domestic or two, he will hire a gardener.

Nothing is wrong with our Budget. It is a Budget based on faith and based on long term and short term objective. We have only been into power nine months going to a year. Would the World Bank or the man who voted for us on May 28, the morning after expect that 18% and 19% of the people are going to be employed? The people voted for us because they have always realised that the Democratic Labour Party is dedicated to the interest of the majority of the people in this country, and we, having that faith ourselves, will never let them down.

I have never had an opportunity to taste whether Miss Miller is a good cook or not, but all she has done is warmed-up, cold soup. As a matter of fact, it sounded as though she was frying it. We have been hearing that all the time, just cold soup warmed up, perhaps fried, because that is what she gave us the first day. And Senator Tull characterised that as a brilliant speech, lucid, accurate and what have you!

Let us deal now with the basic points in this Budget and the Constitution. The Public Service Ministry has been on the attack non stop, but we have always had the Chief Personnel Officer under the Prime Minister and Establishments under the Prime Minister. In your time, you did not need a Public Service because a Permanent Secretary was seen driving Senator Boxill's car, a good friend of his, up to the ministerial building, and he did not explain to Tom Adams about it. A party was given in Collymore Rock one day, coincidentally on the same day that Richie Haynes won the by-election, and somebody went up and told the then Prime Minister that he was celebrating Richie's victory. He was moved. You know that, too, so do not come now saying that you did not have a Ministry.

An Inspector of Police's name went up to the Police Service Commission nine times, and every time that Prime Minister saw it, it was out, and he only got promotion when he died. You know that. What do you want a Ministry for? We have set up a Ministry to stop that sort of thing.

One headteacher down at Westbury – I think she is related to Percy Smith who writes nonsense.

Asides.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I am not sure, I hope not. Be that as it may, a Schools Meals attendant told the Prime Minister she said he was telling lies. The next thing she was hauled up to the Ministry, during the time of Senator Miller. You know Miss Smith, too. She could not find a resting place. There was no resting place down here under Senator Miller's Ministry, because I had the opportunity to represent her. So when you come now and start criticising the Public Service, let us get facts straight.

This is an honest attempt by the Prime Minister to deal with certain things, and let me deal with that, because if Mr. Barrow wants to set up a Department of Aids, he can do it. It is his right constitutionally, the supreme law of this land.

When you hear hacks in newspapers telling you he has denuded a Ministry, let me tell you this. I have sat on the Estimates Committee for eight of my ten years as a Minister. Central Purchasing is a place where if a department wants 20 stoves, you order 20 stoves; you want six fans, you get six fans. No policy is made by Central Purchasing, so when the Prime Minister takes it under his wings or transfers it to the Minister of the Public Service, is it a big policy decision whether you should get six pads, two ashtrays or two waste paper baskets? And big papers will write that the removal of Central Purchasing from the Ministry of Finance is a big thing, saying that he does not like the Minister of Finance and he should resign!

Asides.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: But you have a right to correct that. You know that Central Purchasing makes no policy. Central Purchasing does not award contracts to anybody. Their job is to collect the 16 refrigerators or the 20 fans and dish them out to the departments. In any case, the Ministry to whom the amounts of whatever are allotted have to send vouchers to the Ministry of Finance, and the Permanent Secretary, not a Minister, will sign them, look at the vote and say they are allowed three fans. So when that is taken away from the Minister of Finance and the Press is saying that the Prime Minister is

insulting and denigrating and the Minister should resign, that is absolute nonsense!
6.00 p.m.

I said that neither of you could unlace Barrow's shoes. You know that I am one man who does not worship anybody.

Aside.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: If I want a job, do you have one to give me? I would beg you for one, so do not let that put you off. Do not listen, Mr. President, I can handle them anyhow.

Let us get on. Here is the Prime Minister, who is Minister of Economic Affairs. He has total responsibility to this country for its proper running. Now he decides that National Insurance is running into trouble, money is being used up. You introduce a good thing, but without thought, without proper regulations, the Unemployment Levy is being used up. They are hitting it, because you all caused all the unemployment in the country and it is being hit hard, hard, hard. The Prime Minister now, as a man who was Minister of Finance of this country for 15 years, who has an overall responsibility to the people, and he can change the Ministers like he changes his underpants, decides, as Minister of Economic Affairs, that he wants to have an overview of these departments which are involved in a lot of money. So he brings under him National Insurance and he brings under him the Investment Corporation, and whether he is selling or privatising or not, it is a matter which I feel the Prime Minister, because of his economic training and long association as the Minister of Finance of this country, must be responsible for. You have CBC, on which you are spending $20 million, a sizable investment. What is wrong with the Prime Minister of this country, whom the people of this country gave a mandate to saying, "Put this under me"?

They say he is too old. Do not mind Reagan is 76, Adenaur was about 90, the man who is running China about forty-eleven. Do you know that there is nobody under 90 years running the Chinese nation of 1000 million? Do not mind he dribbles, he still has 1000 million people. Reagan at 76 can press a button and blow us all into smithereens, and Barrow, at 67, is too old! I do not know why Barbadians do not put on their thinking caps and understand the foolish propaganda that is being spread. They say he is taking too much work unto himself, he is not able. Anyhow, you are going to learn.

Mr. President, the allocation of departments is a matter for the Prime Minister, not for the *Advocate* or the *Nation* or the Opposition. The Prime Minister, constitutionally, if in his considered opinion a department is involved in, or about to spend, or is losing money, because of his financial expertise, his long association with and his long occupation of, the office of Minister of Finance, can bring those departments under him, and I say that those last changes by him were masterpieces of political acumen and understanding. He has brought under him National Insurance, a possible problem area, hotel investment and CBC, about to spend $20 million, and the public quarrelling. He has the responsibility to this country, not Mr. Taitt or Mr. Sandiford or Dr. Haynes. It is Mr. Barrow's responsibility to the people to see that this country runs well. It is his responsibility to take away from Ministers areas of difficulty, or areas in which there is likely to be controversy, and it is his job to be accountable to the people of this country for what he has done.

Long may the Right Honourable Errol Barrow be spared to lead this country. He led it from 1961 to 1976. I am no hero worshipper, I have never been, but when I find that this country has produced a man in this day and age who stuck it out for ten years when other lesser mortals, perhaps like me, would tell the people where to go, and the people have again asked him in times of difficulty to take over the yoke and to pull the chariot, I have to praise him.

You were not here, Senator Miller, when I characterised your speech as cold soup, warmed up. That is all it is, and I am sure you will remove that sort of thing from your book recipe, cold soup, warmed up or fried. I hear that the Prime Minister is writing a recipe book – do not give him that one to put in at all, even with acknowledgement, because he cannot use that. You must give him a proper recipe.

I would like personally to pay tribute to Senator Goddard, although Senator Tull does not think that he is just giving the Government a tip, for what I thought was one of the best speeches I have heard in this Chamber, especially on a matter of such great financial importance. He has said quite rightly that the Budget gives a take off period in which, with good, shrewd management, we can achieve the goals which we set ourselves.

I just want to give you, Mr. President, one example of what these Estimates are about. I mentioned a pork barrel sort of operation. Let me give you something that this Government entered into, and which is costing the Government a lot of money. Let us look at the refurbishing of Parliament, and I am going to give the figures for this as a matter of interest. One Kenneth Gardner Associates are in charge. Up to date, let me give you the latest figures on this, a sum of $3 058 327.75 has been spent as follows:

Asides.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I never handled that sort of money yet, and am not likely to handle it. If you had $3 000 or $30 000, I could talk, but when you get into the $3 million, I fall out. I like to be realistic. I am grateful to the former Ministers who have handled millions, but that money is too big for me.

Of that $3 million plus, consultant fees have been paid to Kenneth Gardner Associates of $946 042.72. This is a contract entered into by the Barbados Labour Party for the repair of this building. Let me give you the figures so that the Press can put them down.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, on a point of order: the Debates Committee, with members from both political parties, sat down at this table and agreed that, and this is no sum of money to Kenneth Gardner, one consultant. Kenneth Gardner is responsible for paying all other consultants, who were divers.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: If there were divers consultants with a disbursement of over $3 million, do you mean that all the consultants got $946 000? No wonder the building cannot be finished before year end, because the consultants carry away most of the money. $946 042.72 of a disbursement in consultant fees on a payment of just over $3 million. I would like to see if the Minister can find the contract, because this cannot be signed by the Debates Committee, this had to be signed by the Government, and I understand – I am going to get like Senator Tull now and talk a little rumour, because he like he thrives on rumours, he is typically Barbadian – that the contract has not been signed yet by anybody for the repairs to Parliament, so that you cannot even pin him down.

This is what we are cutting out, Mr. President. As I said, we are cutting out the pork barrel fat that was put into the Estimates in 1986, because the Government knew an election had to come and they could choose the time. Well they chose the wrong time and they lost. To that extent, I hope that this new Government will look at Parliament buildings, remembering that we are celebrating 350 years of independence, and let us have a good Parliament in which we can celebrate that landmark.
6.10 p.m.

Sir, let us go on further to other departments in this Ministry. These Estimates are really figures. I have been in Parliament for a total of 14 years I think, and we know that when you have Estimates, they are just reflecting what departments want and what the Government is prepared to give. As I say, I sat on the Estimates Committee, and departments, as seen in Appendix G, come in and they want the world. You cannot give every department the world, or your budget would be far from what it is. It would be double or triple. So the Prime Minister appoints a responsible Minister – I was one.

Laughter

Aside

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I bet you he never appointed the two of you all. I would like to know if Senator Tull or Senator Miller ever sat on the Estimates.

The Prime Minister usually appoints a responsible Minister to deal with the Heads of Department to tell them what they can get or what they cannot get. So when a department does not get what you see it should get, it is arrived at after grave consultation. Every civil servant wants a new chair. Every time the refrigerator goes bad, he comes in with a request for a new refrigerator. Let me tell you, when you find a final figure arrived at, it is sometimes after you have been quizzing the Heads of Departments for days, using your red pencil and saying, 'you cannot have this this year, another department needs something more important,' like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Also, when you find there is a difference, remember that these are our first Estimates, so to compare them to what the Labour Party in an election year put in is not a fair comparison. You cannot compare! So let us approach it as this is the first Estimates of the Democratic Labour Party. It differs from what the Barbados Labour Party had in their Estimates last year, but we are not cutting back anything.

Estimates meetings start in October, then things are referred back to the Minister of Finance, and he recommends accordingly. So that Appendix G is not a cutting back. As you know, it is just like a beggar begging for $5. You only give him $2 if you have it – sometimes you do not give him anything at all. So it is not that a Ministry is entitled to what it asks for. The EPC, the Child Care Board, none of these departments is entitled to what it asked for at first blush. You still have to scrutinize it, and of course, if you are satisfied that this is the minimum that they are entitled to you give it.

I should like to assure Senator Forde that if in truth and in fact the amount granted to the Child Care Board is proved inadequate, you have a Minister and a Parliamentary Secretary who would not hesitate to come back to Parliament. So you cannot walk around giving away money, because you have to raise it.

I heard and shared the views of the Opposition, but then it was explained to me that this is an honest sincere attempt to get the economy moving. If you give middle class people more money, they should hire some maids to look after their children. If the merchants have more money, they should take on more people. There would be more purchasing power in the community, and this was the idea behind the entire give away – not to back raise any Barbados Labour Party. The people were skinning them out anyhow. They had become an arrogant, conceited bunch of people and the people were out to deal with them, Budget or no Budget. That is what they cannot understand. They were living fat off the hog, driving Mercedes Benz, hardly seeing people, not speaking to them, travelling first class, living like kings.

Barbadians resent that. Our Prime Minister still shops in the supermarket and still drives his old car because he understands that people do not like this ostentation, especially when they have to fork out the bill to maintain your standard of living. That is the whole point. The people were going to skin you all out anyhow. It is nothing to do with any Budget or back raising. It is true that Gabby, in the calypso, says that they got back raise, but that is nothing to do with it. The Barbadians have a sense of wisdom which is peculiar to Barbadians.

It was sad to hear Senator Miller get in here and say publicly that she was at some meeting in some island and Mr. Barrow is not respected. If they do not respect Mr. Barrow, he can do without respect from them. The man is the doyen of Prime Ministers. The man has led CARIFTA and CARICOM. The man was saying something about the President of the United States that the Tower Report now says that it is true.

Applause.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I have not heard any of them turn around and quarrel with it. The man has a perspicacity and a sense of what is good for the people. But you hear that she can get and tell the public in this Honourable Chamber that a West Indian leader has not got respect for the Right Honourable Errol Barrow, who by any standards in undoubtedly the greatest Prime Minister in the Caribbean – by facts, I am not talking because I know him – and she can tell the public that she has travelled and Barbados' name is mud. Barbados' name may be mud, but not because of Barrow. Barbados has enough mud.

I agree that within the Caribbean, for some reason there is a jealousy of Barbadians which makes it difficult for Barbadians to get along with others. When we play netball in Dominica or in St. Lucia, they never root for us, because maybe we are too affluent looking or too intelligent, I do not know, I would not even hazard a guess, but it certainly cannot be from a lack of respect for the present leader of this country.

I am sure that honourable and honest Leaders in the Caribbean must be looking forward to Mr. Barrow reviving the Caribbean Integration Movement and putting new life into it. When people are running and hiding from the West Indies Shipping Corporation, what does he say? He is not going to jump ship. He is on friendly terms with who? A. N. R. Robinson has the greatest respect, from way back. He is stopping CARICARGO, but he is going to sign an agreement in Trinidad next month in which Trinidad's BWIA is going to take up the slack from an airline that is losing money. You are talking about a man, who, to any honest thinker, politics apart must be one of the greatest living Barbadians of all time. There have been others, do not misunderstand me, intellectually and otherwise, and politically too, but he must take his place in 1987 among the great leaders of Barbados and the West Indies at this time.

Applause

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: He is the one they are looking to. He has a relationship with all of them, and for especially the younger ones, I am sure that for all of them, like Mitchell, he must be a father figure.

We would not introduce Estimates to fool anybody. They are just figures. Amazingly, there are no economists in the Senate, which is a pity. Of course, if you have some like the Opposition in the Lower House, it is not a pity, it is the best thing that could happen, because then we can bring common sense and understand the purpose.

I am sorry you were so hard on Senator Tull at the beginning, because I think that, by training and qualification, he can make a contribution. Last night I agonized, Mr. President, about whether I should make a political speech or a stateman's speech. I said that if I speak after Senator Tull, I was coming from a high level, but if I speak before, I know I am going to be in trouble. If I speak after, I have to mix it.

Laughter

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I have to do a little political thing and then a statesmanlike approach.

We are coming to the close of this debate. The Senators have all made contributions. We cannot analyse the Estimates in the time that we are allowed on this measure. Whether there should be amendment or not is a matter for argument, because we are just here, some of us by the mercy of the Prime Minister, some of us by the mercy of the Leader of the Opposition, and some of us by the graces of the Governor-General. We have no popular base on which we can ask the public to give us the right to deal or interfere with the figures set by those who have been elected. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it would be interesting to see if the Senate here, like that in Australia, was elected. Do you think we would have some of us here to face the people. I will take a bet that if we had a Senate elected like in Australia by the people, there would not be one of these nice faces I would see in the Senate, because no one would run. It would be a pity, though. But still I would like to keep the Senate this way, at least so that we can see some able Senators on the other side to contribute to debates of this particular nature.

6.20 p.m.

I should just like as would be expected to say that I consider, Mr. President, that we have a very good Police Force. I was amazed to find the attack on the police that I read in the paper from a member who is a member of my profession. They have rogues in my profession, too, and when they hit you, they hit you for millions. They do not hit you for a few dollar bills, they hit your pocket for millions and for hundreds of thousands. We have rogues in the legal profession, we have rogues in the medical profession and we even have them in the church, with all due respect to Canon Jones. So to characterize and destroy a Police Force because of what I read, a few or people with gold chains around their neck, is certainly not doing the country any good, and as a practitioner of 35 years, who has had a long association with the Police Force, I hope that the criticisms, which are necessary at times, but which should not be destructive, will not lower the morale of the Force to the extent where they fail to serve the purpose for which they are established.

I do not know what caused the attack on the Force, but I was one who fought very hard to have the Commissioner appointed after the Commissioner was acting, and rumour had it that he was not going to get the job under the BLP. One of the first few letters I wrote to the paper was pointing out that he was the best policeman in the Commonwealth and that they should stop playing Hollywood with him, and then, of course, he was appointed. I should like to let him know that the Senate and I expect him to deal with the bad eggs in the Police Force, but he also has our support for anything that is likely to raise the standards of the Force and to achieve the high aim which I know he has set for himself.

In the Force there are a lot of politicians, because the Barbados Labour Party politicised the Police Force. They picked out juniors and gave them promotions because of their political affiliations. A man who could not remember the number of a car leaving a murder scene got three promotions in 18 months. People involved in certain crimes got promotions. So they politicised the Police Force, and I know the Commissioner was very worried about this aspect, that politics was creeping into the Police Force, to the extent that they could not give of their best at all, and it started with the Barbados Labour Party. I could call some more names, but I do not want to, where people were picked out and pushed over the shoulders of other people because their political affiliations were known.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, on a point of order! The distinguished Senator is now ranting off at the mouth and foaming. Everybody knows that the Police Service Commission is responsible for the policy of the Police Force. There are no politicians sitting on that Commission. This is a terrible reflection on that Commission. I mean, because you have parliamentary privilege you do not sit in here and destroy people in this fashion. You should be far more responsible than that. Is that really asking too much?

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I agree that under the Constitution they are appointed by the Police Service Commission. But it does not mean that it cannot go through the Prime Minister before it reaches them.

Asides.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: All right. I do not know that. I know what Mr. Barrow would have done. I do not know what anybody else would do. I could tell you what Mr. Barrow would do, but I know that Inspector Springer's name went up seven times and got cut out before he got through. What I was saying is the Barbados Labour Party somehow or other if not through promotions, managed to inject politics into the Police Force, which I hope will die out soon.

On the judiciary, I should just like to say that there are certain areas which need not be aired in here, they are purely administrative, which the Attorney General, if he has the money will be able to correct.

I feel, too, that it is not because there are not some able prosecutors in the Force. I have lost cases with Police Sargeants, because the facts speak for themselves, and if a client is caught with marijuana and your case is good, you could be a genius and your client will still get convicted. It depends on if the policeman searches you and finds marijuana in your pocket. You could be a magician and it would not take a good Sargeant to get a conviction.

Asides

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: No, no. You have suggested a foolish magistrate. A magistrate would not be so foolish to believe it. The only way out is to suggest the police planted it, if they catch him with it. If you defend, you have to run that defence about the police planting it on him. That is common sense. Senator Tull is right, as a QC, that he has to run that defence. At least, he is thinking.

Be that as it may, Sir, I think that we are producing so many lawyers. I am not asking this as a means of giving them a living, but in other jurisdictions, like Jamaica, you have a person called the Clerk of Courts, who is a lawyer, and who does prosecutions, and as he does them day by day, he becomes better. I would like to suggest that if the Government can find the money, you could relieve the policemen of this duty by appointing young lawyers to the eight magistrates, have eight Clerks of the Courts who could do the prosecutions with the advice of senior members of the police.

I also feel that, with the present judicial system, judges should have law clerks, bright, young lawyers who can do the research for them. You cite cases in court and you do not get a judgment sometimes for three months because the trial judge is still sitting day in and day out doing trials, he has got to look up the law in Latin, and then he has the appeal judgments to do. A bright, young lawyer can go and look up the cases the lawyers cite. It would speed up justice and it also would enable them to prepare the material for future legal officers, because if they are bright, young men, you could recruit them into the Attorney General's Office, or you could put them on the magistry as their knowledge and wisdom expands. It is going to cost money, but it would also be a way of assisting some of the parents and the children who have spent thousands of dollars in Trinidad and at Cave Hill to qualify as lawyers, because the Bar can only accommodate so many, and we old men stick on, like Sir Theodore Brancker, until we really cannot go much longer.

If I had reached the Civil Service, I might have been able to retire. But I think that I am holding on until the day when I can draw my first National Insurance cheque and frame it. I have paid so much money, Mr. President, that I would not spend that one. God spare me to draw that first National Insurance cheque. I am going to carry it to Fine Arts in Independence Square and tell them to put it in a frame. I paid so much money that all I want to do is to get back some, Mr. President.

I would like to say I have enjoyed the debate, Mr. President, and I share the view that the Senate is part of Parliament. While the people of this country expect wholesomeness, the Independent Senators are in a different position from us because they are appointed by the Governor-General, they have no political axe to grind, and, therefore, they can afford to approach debates in an entirely different view from the Opposition Senators or Government Senators. We are the Government and are trying to keep the Government. They are in the Opposition and they are trying to get into the Government, so the approach to things must be entirely different, and I hope the members of the Senate who are independent, especially those who are experiencing these taunts and tussles for the first time, will appreciate that there is no animosity or hatred, but each one maintaining and pressing the philosophy of the party which we have the honour to represent, and that when we leave here, do not mind the taunts of Senator Tull and Senator Miller, we approach our job in this Senate as servants of the people, dedicated to ensuring that the best measures emanate from this Chamber in the interest of all the people. Whatever view we may take and the criticisms we may make, it is not because we hate each other or we dislike each other, it is that we both represent different views of the political spectrum, and I hope that the independent Senators understand that we are not being rowdy.

6.30 p.m.

I know we do give Mr. President a little trouble from time to time, but we are part of Parliament. Mr. President, I would like to say that you had the experience down below and I know, and I have read, Mr. President, that you understand and appreciate a good legal battle, a witty battle between members on both sides. I would like to thank you, Sir, for presiding so ably and for giving me the opportunity for urging the points on behalf of the Government of which I have the honour to be a Senator in this Chamber.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, before I get into the meat of the argument, I would like to take this opportunity – and I hope the members of this Chamber do not think me presumptuous – to say that I enjoyed the debate, even Senator Miller and Senator Tull, although they would like to throw some licks in us, and they went off quite a lot, but everyone spoke well.

There are three speakers in particular who I would like to make mention of, and I hope they do not think I am presumptuous in saying that I was extremely gratified in hearing Senator Phillips, Senator Goddard and Senator Wickham, although Senator Wickham was short. I do not want anybody to think that I am trying to be verbose or pedantic in calling these names.

In Senator Wickham's contribution he mentioned the Richard Moore Library. I think the time has come – we have been into power for quite some time, 15 years before and now we are coming back for another 10 or 15 again – when we have to stop teaching the young children about Nelson and Drake, Wood and Blake and these kinds of people and let them know something that we, as coloured people, contributed something to this society.

A lot of people do not know that we have a civilisation too, and had one long before the Europeans. There are such names that come to mind as Thomas Fuller, who, though he could not read and write, if he were in this day with Einstein, the world would have been at least 100 years forward, he was such a great mathematician. Then you had Isaac Murphy. A lot of people do not know about Isaac Murphy. Isaac Murphy was the first negro to win the Kentucky Derby, and was the first negro to win the Kentucky Derby three times, and as a result of that the people in Kentucky stopped negroes from riding in the Derby, because they did not want them to set a record.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Oh, Mr. President. I thought he was a horse. It is only in the end I recognised he was a jockey.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: He would think he was a horse!

Then you had such greats as Sue Perkins, Steven Lundrum, Hannibal and Toussaint L'Ouverture. Toussaint L'Ouverture, Mr. President, is the man who stopped Napoleon, who caused Napoleon's downfall. All these were great negroes, and he was another unlettered negro.

These are things I think that the masses need to know. We have been teaching them a lot of things about the Battle of Hastings and that sort of nonsense that is outdated now. It is time that we start teaching our people that we have contributed to this society. When I say this society, I do not mean only in Barbados, I mean the world society. We have really contributed.

There was Kunta Kinte and, last but not least, I hear about Bussa. I do not know much about him, I did not read much about Bussa, but the people who I spoke about are those I read about.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: No, we did not start to talk about short people, if not we would have to talk about Neville Boxill.

I would like to take up a few points from the two Barbados Labour Party Opposition members. I do not want anything I might say in this Chamber to be taken as personal. They know that when I am finished talking, we can go outside and we have a drink.

I would like to say this to them, as Senator Smith earlier said, but he did not dwell on it long enough, that it is within the Prime Minister's right, if he wants to appoint Gear Box as a Minister, to appoint Gear Box as a Minister, and you cannot do anything about it.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But when you were talking and kept dwelling on Senator Lewis being a Minister, let me remind you people, because it seems that your memories are short, that you had O'Brien Trotman up here, who contributed nothing to the society, and you had Clyde Griffith and Nigel Barrow. You had three Ministers in this Chamber and I did not hear any hullabaloo, any fuss and fanfare, so stop dealing with Senator Lewis, every time you open your mouth.

You seem to have something personal against Senator Lewis. He is a Barbadian, and it is the Prime Minister's prerogative, if he wants to make him a Senator and to make him a Minister, to do so. I do not think that you should keep dwelling on that because you are not getting anywhere with it. You waste too much time on that when there are other things you could have dealt with.

I want to deal with Senator Miller first. She keeps harping on the point that the Prime Minister said he is not going to borrow any money, or something like that. If he said so and they have to borrow money now, they are borrowing money, as far as I know – I have mentioned this on the floor of this Senate already, but I will say it again, because people do not seem to understand – because you went – I am talking about your Government under the leadership of Tom Adams – to the European market and borrowed US$60 million with a four year moratorium at 22½%. I did not hear you talking anything about that.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, on a point of order: It is really hard to have these words ascribed to me. I quoted the Prime Minister, who said there was no need for foreign borrowing, that money could be borrowed on the domestic market, and the Eurodollar loan was approved by Parliament.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. President, the Euro-dollar loan was approved by Parliament because they had the majority. Do you think if they had the minority it could be approved by Parliament? It is natural, so do not come with that. I am an older politician than you.

Aside

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Because it would be futile. Do you think we are like you to go and vote for things when we know that you have the majority? We do not waste time like that.

She keeps dwelling on that, she keeps challenging the Prime Minister on that, but Tom Adams said on the floor of the House of Assembly, just a little before he died, when they were dealing with the Abortion Bill – this is the shocking part – that every woman in the last ten years that was within child bearing age had committed an abortion. How come she did not challenge that? I found that to be reprehensible for a Prime Minister!

Aside

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Oh, you do not remember him saying that? Look in the debate and you will see it.

Aside

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Do you see what I tell you, Mr. President? He is not talking to me, he says he does not believe that. You see, they have convenient memories. I have said it before and I will say it here, I have a photographic memory. I can boast on that, that is why I am so bright. You can go to all the universities

you like, when it comes to argument, there is not one of you in here that I take my hat off to. He said so!

(Aside: SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I will have to see that in Hansard).

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: We touched on a lot of different points, but I was dealing with Senator Miller's point about what Mr. Barrow said, and I just mentioned what her former Prime Minister said and she did not comment on it. I also know that when they had three Ministers on the floor of this Chamber, one had a bad start and two never started at all, and I never heard one peep coming out of neither Senator Tull nor Senator Miller.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: You heard from Senator Tudor, the Mixed Bag).

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Most likely.

As I said, all the Senators made good speeches, but I would like to admonish two of the Senators who, in their exuberance, got carried away. One was Senator Jones. Senator Jones would know, he knows me personally, that when they were talking about having a Bishop, when I was a Minister I had him in mind to be Bishop of Barbados, so he knows anything I say is nothing with rancour. It is just then we are in a debate. 6.40 p.m.

I want him to be careful about what he is saying, because, as I said already, I memorise what they say. He was talking about the Defence Force, and he said it is not an army, that you call it a Defence Force. If it is not an army, it must be a troop of Girl Guides that Tom took up and sent down to Grenada to shoot down defenceless people. You cannot make those statements. It is an army, and I am always opposed to the Defence Force, because it does not contribute anything.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: What can you do? It is here. It is just like the Financial Building. I cannot go and lick it down. I have said this before and I will say it again. Costa Rica is in the centre of Latin America. It has no army, and in Latin America they change Governments more often than a lot of people here change underwear. Every morning you wake up, there is a coup. So why do you want this big, tremendous army, I think it was 1 500 people.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: About 800, I stand corrected. Do not forget that from the time you all got into power, you took the guns from the police. The police never did any practising with shooting or anything like that. You all had an army because you all were expecting to use the army to get you in power, but things did not work out for you. The same army threw you away!

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: It is? It is true though! I think some mention was made about the Coast Guard ship that they have down here. This is another waste of taxpayers' money.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Do not let us get to the North Point at all. I will deal with that later. If we had the North Point today, we would not have to build that monstrosity of the cement plant for $200 million, because we could send the North Point to Columbia, Venezuela, Cuba and Puerto Rico and bring cement here subsidised, and you would be able to see it much cheaper. So do not talk about the North Point.

Asides

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: What it was to do? You realise that you spent more money buying Mercedes Benzs than the cost of the North Point? You gave away that ship for spite. I am surprised you did not change the flag, as you wanted to, but you did not stay long enough. And you talk about the Constitution? You changed the Constitution, too!

Look here. In your manifesto you said – I brought this here for you – "the operation of Government during the period 1971 – 1976 has more than ever shown that....." then you went on to say – this is the BLP now – "to this end the party pledges that it will never seek to amend the Constitution of Barbados by unilateral action such as the DLP." What unilateral action we ever use? You changed the Constitution to steal the people's land.

Asides

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You really did not know what was going on, and you did not know I would bring in this.

Getting back to some of the points that were made – you see I have to go all around, because it is an omibus Resolution – I want to remind this Chamber that I heard Senator Wickham saying something about the library. I remember that I went to the library to borrow some papers, and I was told in no uncertain terms "You cannot borrow the papers." I said "Why?" They said, "We have orders from the Prime Minister that you cannot borrow them." I said, "Well, can I just see them. I am

not going to carry them away. Just let me look at the papers". They said "No." I said "What is the reason?" They said, "Well, they are going to microfilm these things". This was somewhere back in 1981. Up to now they like they have not got through with their microfilming yet. I have not seen these papers.

These are the kinds of thing we had to put up with under your regime. The people has seen it fit to give us the Government now, because, as Senator Smith has said, the people did not vote for us because of the back raise. The people voted for us because they were tired of you. They did not like the way you were mishandling the situation in the country and they wanted to get rid of you at all cost. Whether it was the back raise or the side raise, you were going through the eddoes!

Mr. President, Senator Tull in his remarks, in referring to Senator Lewis, talked about Senator Lewis being a petty dictator and all of this kind of thing. Let me tell Senator Tull about dictatorship. Every appointment from 1976 until he died that was made under the Barbados Labour Party was made by none other than Tom Adams. When I say every appointment, I am talking from a gardener back up to the Governor-General.

I know of an instance when one messenger went on vacation. They could not send anybody to relieve him, and when they did send somebody to relieve this messenger, he was back from vacation back to work, so they had two people doing the same job. This is the sort of situation that we knew was going on.

Talking about putting people out of work, let me remind you again. They had some School Meal workers who had nine years, 11 months and approximately 13 more days to make the ten years that would entitle them to get pension. It was drawn to Tom's attention and he said, "No. They have to go."

Bernard Bourne, who was working at the hospital, wanted about four more months to get a proper pension. Senator Miller would know about this good. Tom drew the pen through the papers. He had to go. These are things you should note when you talk about who is unfair.

Asides

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Thank you.

Bruce Spencer was a cook. When Bruce Spencer got the news that he was going, he almost fell sick immediately. These are the sort of things that you accepted. Not one of you said one word that it was unfair. You call one person that anybody from this side fired. I hear Senator Miller talking about the long knives. You would know about knives, not me.

I heard Senator Tull saying that we of the DLP played the greatest con game in this society. You want a bigger con game than the one they played, telling the school children that they were going to give them uniforms? I want to know how you were going to get this worked out. You have some tall children, short children, fat and thin, but you are going to make uniforms! Did you think you are going to make uniforms like at the prison where they just have to pick up the clothes? The uniforms turned out to be not even $100, but $99.90! They even take out ten cents! That was the sort of way these people were operating, and now have the temerity to come in here accusing us on this side of malpractices. Those were the kinds of malpractices.

6.50 p.m.

There is something I want to say here, Mr. President, that I am not sure if I should say, but it is to do with drugs. I have some very strong views about this drug problem. I have said before, and I think I told Senator Tull this yesterday, that I do not feel we should really lock up people for drugs any more, because you lock them up for drugs and they come back out and go back selling drugs after getting fat in prison. I have my own views, and when I express them, I am going to be called draconian and all sorts of things, but I think the time has come when we have to take a different approach to this whole drug menace that we are faced with. Do not think that we are the only persons faced with it, the whole world is faced with drugs.

Do not tell me you do not agree with certain things. I heard the lawyers say they do not agree with capital punishment. If you do not agree with capital punishment, you should not agree with locking up people for stealing either, because you put a fellow in prison for stealing and he comes back out and steals again. My view about capital punishment is that if you hang a fellow who commits murder, not that that would stop people from killing, but it will stop that fellow from killing somebody else. That is my view, not the Government's view. I am very serious about these things.

When a fellow is out selling drugs, Mr. President, he will sell them to your grandchild, his sister, anybody, he has no respect for anybody, and I think that if we are serious, we have to start using some draconian measures, use the whip. Do not use the tamarind rod, because school children get flogged with a tamarind rod. You have to use a bull pistle, which is the most effective weapon in the world.

The time has come when we have to be serious about this drug business. If you want a true example of what drugs can do to a human being, you just have to drive across Flagstaff Road any time and you will see what was a human being out there, the relic of a human

being. It is shocking. I know this young man who used to work with me in Canada as a request worker, and when I came back and saw this man's state as a result of drugs, I could not believe it. You may say that flogging may not stop him from using them, but we are out to stop the other people from doing it.

I think I heard Senator Goddard say that these people are making a lot of money and they do not pay taxes, and you see them driving some of the biggest and prettiest cars. I do not grudge them for driving their cars, but I am offended when I think that I have young children, I have grandchildren, I have friends who have children and grandchildren too, and about what could happen to these children as a result of some unscrupulous criminals selling these young people drugs. What is the object? I do not really know what is the object.

(Aside: A VOICE: Money!)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You say it is money. Have you ever looked at a dead? I have never seen a dead with his pockets stuffed yet, you do not carry anything with you. What do you want all this money for? I just do not understand. It is a sickness, and I think you have to stamp out this sickness with some very serious measures.

I heard Senator Tull mention some thief who is working at the Port, or is a member of the Port Authority. Let me remind Senator Tull that two wrongs do not make a right, so I am not saying that that may be right, but let me tell you something. At Highways and Transport, a police who went to license a car saw a man up there receiving money whom this same police had arrested about three or four times for three or four different crimes. The man was immediately removed after it was reported, and who sent back the man and said that, after all, the man had paid the price? Tom Adams! Do not tell me you do not know about it.

Aside

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But he was receiving money. This is like putting a cat to keep guard over a canary. The fellow did not go to prison for abusive language, he did not go to prison for giving somebody a cuff – he went because of larceny. People must get their things right, and when you come in this Chamber to debate these things, you must be careful about what you are saying. I do some research too, and I have a good memory, as I just said. I remember a lot of things, and I will always bring them up and give some trouble.

Apart from that, Mr. President, because I do not want to hold up the Chamber, I must repeat again that I was completely satisfied and pleased with the contributions that were made to the debate, even that of Senator Miller, although I do not agree with her.

I can understand the Opposition. It is the duty of the Opposition to make the Government in power uncomfortable, but you must not make blatant untruths. That is what you have got to be careful with. Senator Miller knows how I feel about her, and Senator Tull knows, that despite what I might say about him, there is no rancour in what I have to say to him or to anybody, because when we are finished, we are going outside and we will be friends again.

Before I close, I had to remind him that when he got in here on the last occasion before this and was ranting and raving about what had happened to his friend in Canada, I asked him if his son reported to him how well we treated him in Canada, because we on this side of the House are Barbadians, and we see all of you as Barbadians. We do not see you as any BLP yard fowl or DLP yard fowl. It is true that when we come to the political life, you want to be in power, and we intend to keep you out of power, with the help of the people. But apart from that, if I went outside tomorrow or now and I saw anything happening with you that was unfavourable, you know I would be the first to come to your rescue. Do not mind you belong to the other side; you are still a Barbadian. You know it was so until 1976. When I was in the House of Assembly, we used to have our cut and thrust; I used to throw some licks in Grantley, too, you know.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: No, you let me keep the job because Tom did not want me back here. When Tom could only beat me by 64 votes, do you want him to bring me back and then he goes through the eddoes? Do not come to me with any remark that you let me keep any job. You let me keep the job to keep me out there. Tom had more sense than you. Tom did not want any part of me about here, so that was it.

Mr. President, I would like to support this Bill.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I do not think it will be necessary for us to detain the Senate much longer on this debate, except, of course, for the time which the mover will take to wind it up.

I have to reply to some questions asked in the course of the debate by several members, and I now do this. First, some questions raised by Senator Shorey. The Ministry will shortly be in a position to give reply to the Parliamentary Question raised by the Senator on the

costings of the N1 programmes at the UWI and the Barbados Community College.

In respect of adult education, the Ministry of Education is at present reviewing proposals, for the reintroduction of the adult education programme. Funds for this programme will be requested at the appropriate time.

In respect of the Certificate in Adult Education at St. Augustine, the Certificate in Adult Education is offered by the University of the West Indies Extra-Mural Studies Unit at St. Augustine and is partially funded by the Caribbean Regional Council for Adult Education in conjunction with the International Council for Adult Education. The programme, which started in 1978, runs on a three-year cycle of three summers, and is specifically designed for teachers and adults. CARCAE/UWI provide partial scholarship covering 50 per cent of air fare-tuition and 50 per cent of accommodation cost per student.

The Barbados Government provides additional funding for Government sponsored students nominated, and the Barbados quota is three. At present three public officers are on the course and will complete this summer. Four persons have already completed this training programme in adult education.

7.00 p.m.

I realise, of course, that this does not meet all of your concerns, because, if I understand you correctly, you were asking why the university itself did not do this course instead of the Extra Mural Department. I dare say I should draw this to the attention of the Minister and see what else he has to say.

There was a question, I think from Senator Miller, in respect of the Pondside. The Central Planning Committee has reviewed the project. The original proposals had intended to have 50 units, with a mixture of two and three bedroom units. It has been decided that the project should be restarted, however, on a lower scale; thus, instead of having 50 units, there will now be approximately 34. The project is expected to commence very shortly. Consideration is currently being given to the acquisition of additional lands in the area in order to improve the standard of housing accommodation in that area.

There was a question asked, I believe, of the Ministry of Labour. I cannot remember exactly what the question is, but the reply is as follows: They are taking steps to update labour legislation – there is going to be a draft law on unfair dismissals, one on quarries legislation and then something under the Factories Act, draft regulations. Under consideration, also, are proposals for occupational safety and health legislation in all of those work places not already covered by legislation.

I am sorry that Senator Wickham has left already. He ask about the Richard Moore Library. The collection is currently housed at the Cave Hill Campus of the University of the West Indies and is under the supervision of that institution. The Government's contribution is $6 700 per annum, and this has been towards the upkeep and operation of the air conditioning unit. The responsibility for the payment of that money was originally under the Ministry of Education and that was passed to the former Ministry of Education and Culture. This responsibility has recently been returned to the Ministry of Education and Culture, and current information is that the collection is in good condition and is used from time to time by interested students and members of the public.

Senator Forde did raise some interesting points and made a very good contribution in respect of what she is pleased to call "the handicapable". She has taught me a new word, because I have never heard it before, but I like it immensely, and if I have permission, may I use it?

In respect to some of the concerns you have mentioned, I have already asked Dame Nita Barrow to make it her special concern in her contacts with international funding agencies to seek the kind of assistance you have suggested we should have.

I also have to tell you that, in addition to the School for the Deaf and the Blind, there are at present two annexes to primary schools which cater to the education of the mentally retarded. There is also a pre-vocational unit on the compound of the School for the Deaf and Blind. This caters to students over eleven years. Ramps have already been provided at the newly constructed primary schools, and these are also included in the design for the new schools under the Secondary Education Project. In addition, hand rails will be provided, and at ground level, at least one toilet facility will be specially built for the use of these children.

There were some specific questions addressed to me in my capacity as Minister of Foreign Affairs by Senator Jordan. I deliberately have not answered all of them in view of the fact that the answers to most of them are covered in this book which we have circulated from the Ministry, and which will form the basis, I hope, of the intensive debate which we will have on the foreign policy of the country. I have selected those of, I would think, topical interest, and these are them.

In respect to the question as to whether there was any chance of automatic pension increases earned by Barbadians who worked in the United Kingdom coming to them when they come home, the answer is that the issue of a Social Security agreement similar to those established between the United Kingdom Government and the Jamaican and Canadian Governments was discussed by me with Sir Geoffrey Howe when I met

him in September, and we continued that discussion last January. I have since, in the light of those discussions, given instructions to High Commissioner Smith to continue those consultations with the Foreign Office so that we can reach a conclusion which would prove beneficial to those Barbadians who are in receipt of pensions, so that they may have automatic increases when increases are granted to pensioners of those categories in the United Kingdom. The Secretary of State has assured me that he is looking at the legislation to see how best the cases of Barbados can be resolved within the existing legislation, or by similar legislation, as in the case between the United Kingdom and Canada.

In respect to the question, "What is the Brussels Government doing for Barbados financially and is it feasible to have a commercial attache there?", this is, in my judgment, nearly fully answered in the book. If you look at pages 22, 24 and pages 62 – 64, you will see that we have set out the functions of our embassy in Brussels, both in respect of our bilateral and our multilateral relationships. Since Brussels is not regarded as a significant commercial sector, the Government does not propose to locate a Commercial Attache in that city, but I am keeping an open mind on it and I would be prepared to recommend that to the Cabinet if I thought that I should. But certainly with the closure of the IDC office in Brussels, the corporation now briefs an officer in the Mission to look after any interest which may be shown or enquired into by investors there.

On the question of our diplomatic status with Haiti, Barbados and Haiti have always enjoyed normal relations since 1972, and at the moment Haiti has an Honorary Consul here in our country. Our permanent representatives to the UN, I believe Senator Tull will recall this as well, have always been appointed traditionally, to serve as non-resident Ambassadors to Haiti.

We regard the plans outlined by the interim Haitian Government for a return to democracy as a very welcomed sign. I had the opportunity of speaking with the Haitian Foreign Minister in September and I have given him the undertaking that when they are ready for their elections, as I expect there will be in a year's time, if there is any expertise which they think would be useful to them in the management and conduct of elections, we would make very welcome a visit of their electoral commission, or its representatives, here to liaise with our own people here and with the Boundaries Commission, if they think it will be useful to them.
7.10 p.m.

On the question of our position on the Belize-Guatemala issue, Barbados' support for Belize's independence and territorial integrity is very well known, and there has been a common position in both Governments. I see evidence of all my predecessors feelings on this point and they accord fully with my own, and we have made this known in every conceivable forum all over the world. The fact, however, is that with the recent change of Government in Guatemala, from a military dictatorship to a constitutional democracy, we have noticed a welcome and very healthy sign of rapprochement with Belize, and we have told both President Cerezo of Guatemala and Prime Minister Esquivel of Belize that if there is anything we can do when the two of them have agreed in principle about normalising relations and they are ready to finalise whatever accommodation they have with each other, if the provision of a neutral atmosphere away from the scenes of the tensions and conflicts is required, I am prepared to host a conference of their Foreign Ministers here to do whatever I can to set the seal of accord on their deliberations. But we have made it clear to each of them that we are not interfering and we are not prejudging the issues.

On the question of the position again of the United Kingdom and Argentina on the Falkland Islands, Barbados took a strong stand against Argentina's resort to force in the settlement of a dispute. However, thereafter, as condition for a renewed dialogue emerged and as both of the contestants have in the last two years shown some slight willingness to want to sit down and talk with one another despite the difficulties, we supported a majority of U.N. positions calling for resumption of discussions between the two of them on all aspects. Again, I have told the Foreign Minister of Argentina as well as Sir Geoffrey Howe that if I can be useful in their deliberations after they have reached agreement in principle, I would also be willing to host a conference here where both sides can meet and finalise their accommodations with one another.

The same thing, although in a slightly different way, holds good for the Guyana-Venezuela issue. We have always been supportive, and this is a continuing position in all the Governments of Barbados, of Guyana in searching for an amicable solution in its long standing territorial dispute with Venezuela, and we will continue to encourage both parties to work together towards a negotiated settlement. I have given the same undertaking to both countries, that if we can be useful in helping them to finalise any accommodation which they meet together, we will be happy to do so.

I have also been asked about the status of Deputy High Commission, Mr. Owen Eversley, whom we appointed as Deputy High Commissioner some months ago in London. My information from the Secretary of State is that since last December he has been listed in the latest issue of the Diplomatic list by the Foreign Office of Diplomats accredited to the Court of St. James and that he has been granted an exempt license for his private car and for his private possessions. I do not think there is much more to want. If there is, I shall know it.

I have also been asked about the status of relationships with Africa. After Independence, we pursued a policy of seeking closer ties with Africa, and during the 1970s we established diplomatic relations with eight African countries. First, of course, was Nigeria in 1970, and then, in this order, with Zambia, Tanzania, Mauritius, Senegal, Algeria, Niger, and Lesotho. Because of our slender financial resources, and rather doubtful trade prospects because of geographical separation, Barbados has had no diplomatic or consular presence in Africa, nor has any African country having diplomatic relations with Barbados sought to establish a mission here. The Nigerian Mission in Port-of-Spain is the nearest to us and, of course, since I have been Foreign Minister, I have received two Nigerian ambassadors, and I think we can safely say that we are building up good relations with them.

Perhaps Senator Tull can enlighten me, but I have reason to believe though that Ambassador Don Blackman is still in a certain sense, or in a technical sense, our Ambassador to Nigeria because I cannot find any evidence that any letters of recall have been sent out to him. So we have a very interesting case in which we still have an Ambassador there. So I suppose that if we had anything, to communicate to them and we could not find their High Commissioner, we might have to use him to convey any message.

Asides

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg your pardon. No, non-resident anyhow. I dare say the honourable Senator opposite would like to know something, but they will not get it.

I was also asked, I think about money given by General Gowan of Nigeria when he visited us in 1975. He did donate B'dos $500 000 to the Government for the setting up of a youth project. Before we could do anything about that, we demitted Government in 1976. My understanding is that it is that money which was used to assist with the establishment of the Skills Training Centre. Cabinet, I think has given directions to the appropriate Ministry that in some way recognition should be given to General Gowan's generosity – of course, he did it on behalf of the Government of Nigeria – and that some institute or something may well be named the Gowan Institute in honour of that gift.

We have dealt with the policy on terrorism, but I have in the course of my statement before the General Assembly at the United Nations last year, among other things, said this. In international forums Barbados has always consistently deplored terrorism, and I was speaking for both Governments here, whether resorted to by states, organisations or individuals, and have stressed that no political objective is worthy of support if, in furtherance of that objective, it becomes necessary to put innocent lives at risk. I have also repeated this sentiment wherever else I have gone, and that remains the policy of the Government.

The last question was, what is our policy on the purchase of properties in Venezuela and Trinidad? The answer is that our missions in Caracas and Port-of-Spain have recommended that we purchase properties for use as residences and offices. I have no objection to this, and I am prepared to recommend this to the Cabinet. But it is a question of what prices are available, and I do not recommend Ambassadors and High Commissioners to buy residences, even if the prices are right, in places where nationals have no access to them. I would not like that at all. It is a question of accessibility of nationals and suitability for easy business with the Government to whom they are accredited. We will consider this to be a priority. We did not ask for any money at this time, but I should like to give the House the assurance that I will seek an allocation of resources at the appropriate time if the ambassadors and High Commissioners themselves satisfy the requirements which I have laid down. 7.20 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, there are a few other questions which probably need answers, and there are some areas in which the most we might do is to indicate an intention to pursue the questions raised.

Senator Phillips in his contribution suggested the introduction of tax clearance certificates for National Insurance and Pay As You Earn collections. That will have to be referred to the appropriate Ministry for their consideration.

He also suggested that the Land Tax Department, the Collections Department, be upgraded with special emphasis on arrears due. This, again, is a matter for the appropriate Minister.

I believe he had concerns about the accommodation. I can give him some assurance that already action is being taken to relocate that department, even if temporarily, to another place in Bridgetown.

His concerns about the Customs Department, I believe, are already being examined. I expect he will observe some improvements in the operation of that department.

Senator Blackman mentioned the need for research assistance for Senators, and I believe that all of us in this Chamber will support such a recommendation.

His comment about staff accommodation of the Insurance Section of the Ministry of Finance has already received attention. They have been, or are being relo-

cated, to another floor in the Treasury Building. I believe that the standard of accommodation available to them has been improved.

With regard to the question of staffing, that, again, is a matter for the Ministry of Finance, and his suggestions will be drawn to their attention.

There was a comment about the relocation of Queen's College. All I can say about that is that the Warrens site is one of three sites that, as far as I am aware, have been under consideration for the relocation of Queen's College, and the very points which the Senator made about the dust difficulties have been drawn to the attention of the Ministry of Education. One of the other sites is an area in Wildey. The third site escapes me at the present time, but I believe it is Husbands. That is in the lap of the Minister of Education and the Central Planning Committee. You will, I believe, soon have some more information about it.

With regard to comments about the Tourism Investment Corporation, the Tourism Investment Corporation assumed responsibility in 1981 for the Dover Convention Centre and the Hilton Hotel, and subsequently in 1983 assumed responsibility for the Heywoods Holiday Village project. I believe it is because of the concern which the Prime Minister has for all the affairs of these particular activities that the portfolio is now placed with him.

The Hilton Hotel has not made substantial profits for the three years 1983–1985. Before 1983, it made profits, two-thirds of which found its way into the Public Treasury, and whenever the Hilton Hotel makes profits, they will find their way into the Public Treasury.

At the moment, as you are aware, the Hilton Hotel has been in operation for some 20 years. Government is committed to honouring its agreement under the terms of the rent agreement with the Hilton to refurbish the hotel, so that any profits which are likely to be made in 1987, and probably for another two years, will be partially consumed to pay for this refurbishing, which is absolutely necessary.

In the case of the Heywoods, that hotel is projected to make a profit in 1986, but that small profit which is projected for 1986 will be consumed completely by the deficits from 1983, 1984 and 1985. At the end of December 1986, the estimated deficit on operations was $2.8 million, but this sum of $2.8 million has absolutely nothing to do with the annual amortisation of the debt for Heywoods, which is being met by Central Government out of the Consolidated Fund.

The suggestion by Senator Pat Forde concerning the possibility of establishing a single Ministry of Social Services will be communicated, along with her comments on the Child Care Board. The only comment I wish to make is that the provision made this year for the Child Care Board is, in fact, the same amount provided in 1986–87 and is not a reduction. In terms, obviously, of how far the money will go, it will probably not go as far in 1987 as the funds will go in 1986–87.

Some comments were made about the budget of the Defence Force. The provision for the Defence Force represents a reduction of $580 000 when compared with the provision for 1986–87. In that respect, the information contained at Appendix G is incorrect, and not only is that information incorrect in Appendix G, but there are several instances in which other recipients of grants from the Public Treasury are not listed in Appendix A. Whether the Ministry of Finance will update it and correct it, I am not in a position to say, but there are at least three or four omissions which are known from that Table, Appendix G.

The various comments about the need for law clerks for judges and the magistrates' courts have been taken notice of and will be communicated.

The Ministry of the Public Service has no jurisdiction over the port or any other departments other than those named in the Estimates as falling within the responsibility of the Minister for the Public Service. I am therefore not in a position to comment on the allegation about anybody at the port or on the Board of the Port, or on the board of any statutory body, for that matter, since the Ministry has no statutory boards for which it has responsibility.

The movement of senior public officers has always been the responsibility of the Prime Minister. That authority is reposed in him by the Constitution, and I am not aware that the Prime Minister has delegated to anybody that authority for the movement of public officers.

There was a question concerning graduation in terms of the World Bank's policies. It is found in the document "Diplomacy and Development" at page 58. That is the Foreign Affair's response to graduation. The Ministry of Finance's response is slightly different, and the Ministry of Finance, I am advised, has always regarded graduation as a contentious area of bank policy. 7.30 p.m.

The strongest supporters of graduation have been Part I members, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, France and Japan. They are the major capital contributing countries to the World Bank. The whole idea was the GNP of certain countries – and in recent times, Barbados along with Trinidad and Tobago have been sighted as candidates – put them in a position where the

management of the bank recommended that they should no longer qualify for loans from the bank.

In pursuance of proposals which were made by the management of the bank to the board recommending the graduation of Trinidad and Tobago, Oman, Barbados, Cyprus and the Bahamas, various doubts were entertained by members concerning the desirability of any rigid enforcement of the graduation policy. Objections were raised, and it was noted that the recommendations affected only very small members, whose level of borrowing had little impact on the bank's resources and whose economies were very fragile.

As the discussion developed, it became clear that while Part I countries could have used their voting majority to secure passage of the proposals, the board would have been irrevocably split, with a large number of Part II countries objecting to the decision. A compromise was reached, in which it was agreed that, as in the past, management would continue to manage the graduation issue by obtaining the agreement of the country concerned before phasing out and terminating bank lending.

While the consensus statement, which was accepted by the board in September 1984, stipulated that every member had the right to seek bank assistance in the form of loans and technical assistance, it noted that the management reserved the right to determine whether or not to provide such assistance. In short, the compromise position represented a stalemate, with the prospect of a country, though not formally designated as graduated, would be unable to obtain further assistance from the bank and that is the situation which Barbados is likely to face in 1991.

In its 1984 proposals, the management had recommended that lending to Barbados should be phased out over a seven year period, starting in the financial year 1985–1986. The average level of lending proposed for Barbados was set at US$9 million per year, and one loan has been received since 1985 which the management considered as part of the phased-out programme, although Barbados has not agreed to being graduated, nor has any decision been made by the board in this regard.

The Ministry of Finance, apparently, proposes that Barbados should maintain its position on the need for continued World Bank assistance. The implications for Barbados are that if Barbados is graduated, it will be the loss of a source of foreign exchange. There will be need to seek commercial-type funding overseas, which is granted on harder terms than World Bank funds, and the repayment periods for commercial loans are shorter and the interest rates are substantially higher, to the extent that the Government is forced to utilise domestic resources, apart from foreign exchange borrowings. This could result in Government competing with the private sector in Barbados for available funds, neither of which positions the Minister of Finance hopes to have to face.

I am reminded that I had not responded to the matter of payments of child money by cheques. That creates a lot of problems, and I can promise to communicate that suggestion to the appropriate Ministry. I served for many years in the Public Treasury, and I am aware of the many, many difficulties which were encountered when monies deposited in the United Kingdom for children in Barbados found their way, through the Crown Agents, through the Public Treasury, into the Magistrates' Courts, into the hands of these people. I think that it is safer to put money into the hands of the beneficiaries than to use the chequing system. That is only a personal view.

When adjusted – Senator Miller wanted this information – this is my calculation based on the amendments to the Estimates – the adjusted estimated Current Expenditure will be $716 770 105, and presuming that the revenue remains the same figure this will give an excess of Current Expenditure over Current Revenue of $18 699 028.

The Capital Estimates, when adjusted by the moveins, and, again, this is my number, will come to $177 389 589. That means that the shortfall has gone up to $196 million approximately. That is the overall deficit, Capital plus Current. The revised amount which Government is requesting as an appropriation is $533 767 467.

The estimates of revenue which is given is some 9 per cent higher than the Revised Estimates for the previous year 1986–1987, and as a consequence of the fiscal measures which were implemented in July of 1986, the portion of total revenue contributing to tax on income and profits has declined, while that attributed to indirect taxes has increased.

Taxes on income and profits are approximately 24.1 per cent above the 1987–1988 estimated revenue, whereas they were 32.5 per cent of the 1986–1987 revenue figures, and indirect taxes, that is, taxes on goods and services, international trade and stamp duties were 59.8 per cent of the 1987–1988 revenue whereas they were 52.8 per cent of the 1986–1987 Estimates.

As we said earlier, the major areas of Government's Current Expenditure are for Personal Emoluments and for the service of Government's debt, both local and foreign. I believe I mentioned that Personal Emoluments and various other things amounted to more than 45 per cent of Government's current estimated expenditure.

Mr. President, in another few days, we anticipate that the Minister of Finance will go to the House of Assembly with his Budget in order to respond to a question which

was asked of me, and which I would not venture to respond to. I do not consider that the state of the economy is a matter that a Minister in this place should necessarily want to debate and hijack the opportunity which will be presented by the appropriate Minister, the Minister of Finance, in a few weeks' time.
7.40 p.m.

With those few closing remarks, Mr. President, I now move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

SPECIAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 2 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Special Loans Act, Cap. 105.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am asking that this Bill be taken by the Minister for the Public Service.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Bill seeks to amend the Special Loans Act to increase the limit of borrowings under the Act from $375 million to $500 million. The Estimates, as just presented, revealed that there will be a gap in the provision of funds to cover the capital expenditure of this country. In addition, during debate it has been disclosed that foreign funds will be required to ensure that substantial loans which mature can be amortised.

I do not believe that the Bill needs any further special introduction. We are all aware of the absolute necessity for the Government to raise funds to meet the shortfalls which will come during the coming financial year, and this Bill seeks to extend the limit.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 3 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, Cap. 114.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, some time ago a request was made to the Ministry of Finance and Planning, as it was then, for permission to purchase a vehicle in view of the small amount of travelling allowance paid to district auctioneers. The matter has been hanging fire for some time. It has been decided by the Government that, instead of granting a request for the purchase of a vehicle or whatever, the Ministry should propose fees for district auctioneers in the third schedule of the District Auctioneers Act as follows: that no travelling expenses for going to a spot where a board and shingle house may be situated for the purpose of selling it, the fee should be raised from $5.00 to $50, the travelling expenses for serving notice or order on a debtor or going to a debtor's last known place of abode should be raised from $2.00 to $50; and thirdly, for attending at a spot on the day of a sale of a house, if the sale is stayed by the payment of the debt and if costs are incurred, the fee for that to the district auctioneer should be raised from $3.00 to $50.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, this concludes our business for today, and I wish to thank honourable members for the expeditious way in which they have handled our business in the last two days.

I understand that something is coming from the Other Place which they are doing later on this week which will come to us, and I must therefore ask honourable members to come in on Tuesday.
7.50 p.m.

(Aside: Tuesday?)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Yes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Tuesday or Wednesday?

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: It is a measure which needs to be dealt with before the.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: April 1, All Fools Day.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: ....festival. It must not be done on All Fools Day, whatever it is. So, with very great regret, I must ask Senators to come in on Tuesday.

I therefore beg to move that the Senate be adjourned until Tuesday, March 31, at 11.00 o'clock.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Speaking on the adjournment, Sir, on behalf of all Senators, I believe I can say that we want to say how grateful we were for the way in which we have been served by the staff of Parliament, the clerks and the reporters in particular. It has been two very intensive days of work. We know that they have had a hard week last week, that they have got to work again this week and next week, and that it has been an exceptionally busy time. We want to register our appreciation for the way in which they have .....

Applause.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER ..... serviced us, according to the tradition and the high quality of work that we have come to expect from the staff of Parliament.

(Aside: Hear, hear!)

Applause.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

The question that the Senate do now adjourn until March 31, 1987 at 11.00 a.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.

7.55 p.m.

CONTENTS

MESSAGES

Mr. PRESIDENT. 233

Message re absence from country of Governor-General from March 23 – April 11, 1987.

OBITUARY SPEECHES

Re DEATH OF MRS. ANTOINETTE CLARKE, AUNT OF SENATOR MILLER 233

Senator Tudor, 233; Senator Smith, 234; Mr. President, 234.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR 234

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1987.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Report on Education in Barbados for the period 1st September, 1978 to 31st August, 1982.

Report of the Task Force Committee on Employment.

Organisation of American States (OAS) Report to the Government of Barbados on the Fifth Actuarial Review of the National Insurance Scheme.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 244

Senator Tudor, 244.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

APPROPRIATION ACT, 1987 235

Senator Lewis, 235, 342; Senator Miller, 245; Senator Shorey, 259; Senator Jordan, 267; Senator Wickham, 270; Senator Phillips, 270; Senator Blackman, 277; Senator Comissiong, 282; Senator Ward, 289; Senator Morrison, 291; Senator Forde, 295; Senator Prescod, 296; Senator Jones, 299; Senator Goddard, 301; Senator Eastmond, 306; Senator Fraser, 312; Senator Tull, 319; Senator Smith, 329; Senator Boxill, 335; Senator Tudor, 339.

SPECIAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. 345

Senator Lewis, 345.

DISTRICT AUCTIONEERS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987. 345

Senator Tudor, 345.

SUSPENSIONS. 250, 273, 282, 299

ADJOURNMENT 345

Senator Tudor, 345; Senator Miller, 346.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, C. A.
BOXILL, N. W.
COMISSIONG, D. A.
EASTMOND, G. L.
FRASER, V. C.
FORDE, P. Y.
GODDARD, J. S.
JONES, Can. I. McK.
JORDAN, M. deL.
LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.
MILLER, B. A.
MORRISON, A.
PRESCOD, T. A.
PHILLIPS, A. J. N.
SHOREY, Dr. L. L.
SMITH, F. G.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James
TULL, L. R.
WALCOTT, His Hon. F. L.