

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, June 22, 1988

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, at 11.10 a.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator M. deL. JORDAN, (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. Sir James TUDOR, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, (Minister of State for the Civil Service)

Senator A. MORRISON

Senator N. W. BOXILL

Senator D. A. COMMISSIONG

Senator Mrs. V. C. FRASER, B.S.S., J.P.

Senator Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND

Senator T. A. PRESCOD

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 Mrs. P. Y. FORDE

Senator J. S. GODDARD

Senator Dr. L. L. SHOREY

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, (Minister of State for Finance)

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

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN
OF COMMITTEE

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, in view of the absence from today's

sitting of His Honour, the President, and, of course, in view of your own incumbency, I should like to move that Senator Wickham be appointed as Acting Chairman for the remainder of today's sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: There being no dissenting voices, Senator Wickham has been duly elected to be our Chairman for the remainder of today's sitting.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

LAND (ADJUDICATION OF RIGHTS AND
INTERESTS) (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1988 – (CONT'D)

Order No. 7 was called – To move that further consideration of a Bill to amend the Land (Adjudication of Rights and Interests) Act, Cap. 228A be resumed.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, it will be recalled that when this matter relating to the Bill to amend the Land Adjudication of Rights and Interests Act, Cap. 228A, was going through its second reading, certain questions were raised concerning Clause 5 of the amending Bill. The matter has been examined, and I am to report that Clause 5 of the amending Bill for the first time creates offences under the Land Adjudication of Rights and Interests Act in order that the whole process could be enforced. In the absence of these offences, the Commissioner of Titles, as provided for in the original Bill, would have great difficulty in compelling persons to comply with orders and like matters during the process of adjudication of titles. It is for this reason that all the adjudication legislation in the Commonwealth Caribbean and elsewhere contains identical provisions for similar offences. I have been shown copies of legislation relating to this type of legislation providing similarly in Guyana, in Montserrat and in other countries based on United Kingdom legislation.

The Commissioner of Titles performs a judicial function when he is adjudicating titles, and it would

make a nonsense of the powers vested in him if there were not provision for creating offences. The Constitution of Barbados, like all the other Caribbean Constitutions, guarantees the freedom of expression, but like all the other rights and freedoms, they are subject to a number of exceptions by virtue of which Parliament may enact law for the purpose stated in those exceptions. This is one of those exceptions.

Section 20 of the Constitution provides that:

"Except with his own consent, no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of expression, and for the purposes of this section the said freedom includes the freedom to hold opinions without interference, freedom to receive ideas and information without interference, freedom to communicate ideas and information without interference, and freedom from interference with his correspondence or other means of communication."

But subsection 2 of Section 20 also says that: "Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to be inconsistent with or in contravention of this Section to the extent that the law in question makes provision"

The circumstances of this legislation are provided for and prescribed, and Section 20, 2(b) of the Constitution states:

"that is reasonably required for the purpose of protecting the reputations, rights and freedoms of other persons or the private lives of persons concerned in legal proceedings, preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence, maintaining the authority and independence of the courts or regulating the administration or technical operation of telephony, telegraphy, posts, wireless broadcasting, television or other means of communication or regulating public exhibition or public entertainments;"

I believe that the point made last time was that no person should be put in a position that he incriminates himself. It is certainly not anticipated that this provision could in any way cause a person to incriminate himself, because the person will be responding in a situation where there will probably be a dispute to a title, and his failure to state truthfully and fully the facts could only embarrass the completion of such adjudication.
11.20 a.m.

The circumstances relevant to Clause 5 of the Bill is that which seeks, to maintain the authority and independence of the courts.

Clause 5(c) reads as follows:

"Wilfully neglects or refuses to answer upon oath or otherwise any question which may lawfully be put to him by the Commissioner at the time of the adjudication of a parcel in respect of which the person claims a right on interest,"

Clause 5 may then be seen as the enactment of legislation by Parliament to maintain the authority and independence of the court prescribed over by any Commissioner of Titles.

I believe, Mr. Deputy President, that this explanation satisfies the questions which were raised. I therefore, move that this Bill be now read a second time.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, I was one who opposed this matter. I wonder if it is possible for members of the Senate to have a copy of the explanations which the leader just read. I think it will be very valuable information.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, I apologise for the late arrival. The reason for the late arrival is that I was checking a similar enactment in our library. In researching the law of Antigua, I do not see a similar sort of section. When I reflect, Sir, on the provision of clause 5(c), it seems to me that you are imposing a sanction in respect to someone who refuses to give information. It seems to me, Sir, that that penalty is a denial of what we are asking for. There is no need to lock someone up or fine them because they fail to execute their own application.

As I said, Sir, the reference I found at the Library deals with sanction, and it dealt more with sanctions of a fraudulent nature than the sanctions that are being imposed.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: We will make the copy of the Explanatory Note on Clause 5 of the Bill available not only to the persons in the Chamber, but also the provisions which the honourable Member should research of the St. Lucia Act and St. Kitts laws. There you will find it.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: All right. In the St. Lucia and Montserrat laws you will find it, and copies will be made available to you.

I move, Mr. Deputy President, that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were called and passed

Clause 5 was called.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I move, Sir, that Clause 5(c) be omitted.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I would like to support what Senator Blackman just said and second it.

The question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Clause 6 was called and passed.
11.30 a.m.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the day.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT LANCASTER ST. JAMES RE HIGHWAY 2A

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Lancaster, St. James for the purpose of improving Highway 2A and relocating houses.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, the reason why Order No. 2 cannot be done is that we are still awaiting copies of the Civil Establishment Order from the Government Printery, because I do not think that everybody has a copy, I certainly do not, so we have been informed.

Mr. Deputy President, this matter has to do with the acquisition of lands for Highway 2A. It appears that

some time in 1985, there was a Cabinet decision in respect of a considerable number of land acquisitions, and it was decided that the following lands should be acquired for the improvement of the proposed Highway 2A: nearly 12 000 square metres at Lancaster for the relocation of 13 houses, 2 000 square metres at Rock Dundo for the relocation of the Christian Mission Church at Rock Dundo and three houses from Sion Hill. Approximately 90 properties had to be removed along Highway 2A, and eight houses from Mile and a Quarter to Maynards which would have been affected by the road, had to be relocated on Government owned land at Maynards.

This decision was taken because Government recognised the importance of upgrading and developing the 2A network, which was designed to link the Northern Access Road at a point in Mile and a Quarter with the Airport to West Coast Road, which it will intersect with at Warrens.

There was a certain aspect of economic importance connected with this. There was the fact, for instance, that the road itself would be useful for the transportation of sand from the two largest quarries in the Scotland District to various points in the centre and south of the island. In respect of the sugar industry, the transportation of canes from nearby estates to Portvale and Haymans, and sugar from these two factories to the Deep Water Harbour for export, would be facilitated, and of course, perhaps most important of all, or equally important, cement from the Arawak Cement Plant in bulk to the Deep Water Harbour for export and in bags for distribution for local use. These were three of the perhaps most important aspects of the economic character of the highway.

Most of the activity involved on the highway relates to the widening and improvement of bridges and culverts, especially in the St. James area. The project is being undertaken, as Senators may know, in two phases, one section from Mile and a Quarter to Westmoreland and another from Westmoreland to Warrens.

11.40 a.m.

An integral part of the road project involved the removal of houses from the path of the alignment of the road. As already indicated, Lancaster was one of the areas chosen for relocation. The relocation of residents from Westmoreland to Lancaster is presently underway, so in addition to the parcels of land at Lancaster being acquired for highway improvement, the Resolution also seeks approval for the Crown's acquisition of nearly 12 000 square metres of land for relocation purposes. So for these and other reasons, Parliamentary approval is being sought for the total acquisition of an area of 18 197 square metres of land at Lancaster for highway improvement.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. Deputy President, it is a must for me today to participate in a debate such

as this and to give my full support to the Minister, support which I consider to be unequivocal, in relation to this matter of Highway 2A. The Minister has made a thorough evaluation of the tender in relation to this work on Highway 2A, and he must be commended for the type of exposition of the defects in the tenders of the contractor.

I am going to identify myself clearly with justice on this occasion. Rayside Construction, a black business company, is a well-deserved applicant in this matter. He has been known for prudence, honesty and efficiency, and despite little being heard about the quality of the work of this firm in this present "Don Must Go" or "The Minister Must Go" crusade, one must recognise that he has made a substantial contribution to the development of this country and can be considered equally as important as any other businessman in the business arena in Barbados. A lot has been said

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: If the honourable Member would give way, I rise on a point of order: The introduction by the Honourable Leader of the Senate had made no reference to any tender procedures, or Rayside or otherwise. It is a simple matter of acquisition of land at Lancaster for purposes stated in the Resolution, and with great respect to Senator Prescod, much as he may wish to go on record in terms of support, it is not relevant or germane to the matter before this Honourable Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. Deputy President, one cannot view pertinence in this rigid manner. The question of what, why and when must be extended when one is relating matters to any subject matter. This matter to which I am referring is related to Highway 2A, and any element which can be related to Highway 2A, I believe is relevant to this discussion.

Mr. Deputy President, clearly in my mind, the decision that was made in not giving the responsibility to the contractor C. O. Williams for carrying out the work on Highway 2A was based on the principles of equity. No man or no businessman in this society can expect to have full control of the cake of distribution. This Government is a socialist Government and its responsibility is to redistribute the projects of Government as equally as possible among all those businessmen who make applications to Government to serve.

There is nothing biased about the decision of the Minister, and as I go on in my presentation, I will expose the nonsense which I have heard, not in this Chamber but outside of this Chamber, which is relevant and has some bearing on the present discussion. There are people who are hiding behind the canopies of justice

while defending the interests of certain business people in this community.

C. O. Williams has had the opportunity on more than one occasion to make submissions to the former Government, and on those occasions C. O. Williams' tendered at a higher rate than Rayside Construction, and in the light of the principle that is being established here, that there is a tenet which purports to say that it is not imperative that the allocation must be given to the lowest

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Prescod, I must remind you that this is a Resolution to do with the acquisition of land.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I am supporting that Resolution, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I know it has to do with the improvement to a highway, but I am sure you will keep your points relevant to this Resolution.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: But it also reflects on the prudence and the judgment of the Government of Barbados in relation to the acquisition of this land, and the reason for acquiring the land, and therefore it has some pertinence to the subject matter. Other persons would not like to discuss this, but it is my intention today, with your permission, to expose the hypocrisy that has been given vent to over the last few days in relation to this matter of Highway 2A.

C. O. Williams Construction tendered on the West Terrace development project way beyond Rayside. Rayside's tender was \$1 398 375.80; C. O. Williams was \$1 927 259.40. C. O. Williams Construction was much higher than Rayside on that occasion, but it was awarded to C. O. Williams. This was under the Barbados Labour Party. At Oxnards Heights, C. O. Williams tendered \$464 215; Rayside Construction, \$223 247. Once again C. O. Williams was much higher than Rayside, yet he was awarded that contract. The road works at Simmons Road; Rayside came in at \$323 791, C. O. Williams \$402 694. The Barbados Labour Party Government awarded that contract to C. O. Williams, which was again higher than Rayside Construction. Road works at Apes Hill in St. James: Rayside, \$196 070; C. O. Williams, \$240 506. Once again, C. O. Williams was awarded that contract. We went on to Maynards: C. O. Williams was once again \$20 000 more than Rayside. On all of these occasions the Barbados Labour Party awarded the contract to C. O. Williams, despite the fact that his tenders were higher than Rayside Construction's.

Sir, they are condemning this very principle despite the fact that they used their judgment, or rather the whims and fancies of the party — there was no proper evaluation on this occasion

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Prescod, I must remind you that this is a Resolution to acquire land. Even though it may be with respect to improving the highway, I am sure you will confine your remarks to this Resolution.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I brought this historical background to indicate to this Honourable Chamber that the Barbados Labour Party has no moral footing to condemn this party for any position which it took in giving the tender to Rayside Construction. 11.50 a.m.

The Barbados Labour Party has come full circle. Less than fifty years ago, this same party, which is now condemning the Government for the decision taken on Highway 2A, was purporting in this country to be the defenders of the black working class and were condemning the plantocracy for not allowing an equitable distribution of the resources of this country to be filtered down to the working class black people in Barbados. That was the position of the party, and when a decision is made, it is made against a philosophy, a philosophy of the particular political party.

I would not be troubled if a South African Government were here making this decision, because I would understand why. But when the evidence is clear that there were four components of the project and three were already given to one contractor, there must be a principle that goes beyond the lowest tender. It cannot be the only element that is taken into consideration. And if one looks at the historical record of one of the contractors and discover that there were fundamental defects in specifications, in submissions, then one has a right as a Committee, as a Minister, to evaluate the facts that are available and make a decision. It is on that basis that the Government has made a decision in relation to Highway 2A.

I am not going to hide from this matter. I am not a hypocrite. And if my role in this Senate is supposed to be one of responsibility, then I am going to speak on issues like this, and I am going to defend them strongly. I feel very strong about the distortions that are placed in the public domain, especially when a leader of an Opposition party, and I am bringing all of this into context, because as I said before, it relates to the philosophy of the party. When the philosophy that is clearly enunciated by a party now is contrary to a position that the party took in 1951 one has to ask some questions about its direction. If no one else wants to defend this position, I am sorry, but I am defending it. Even if it is my last day in here, I will defend it.

The voice of the Opposition Leader sounds very much to me like that of W. E. B. Dubois in 1922 when the professionals and intellectuals were cutting against the voice of W. E. Dubois in a magazine at that time, when they were carrying out a campaign called, "Garvey

must go." Are you not hearing similar phrases now in the public domain in Barbados from the voice of the Opposition? What are we saying? After so many progressive people have been given the opportunity to come here and defend the rights of the majority of citizens in this country, must we stand here and remain silent on an issue which has moved beyond the corridors of Parliament throughout the length and breadth of Barbados and restrict it to the limits of just why there was an acquisition for Highway 2A? It has to go further.

The same things that I am seeing in cartoons around here now are the same things that were depicted during the time of Marcus Garvey, and Garvey was referred to as a little black man with intelligent eyes and a big head. All types of pejorative language was used. And the pronouncements of the Leader of the Opposition in defending his party's position sounds very much like the pronouncements that came from the intellectuals in the United States of America who were supporting the N.A.A.C.P.

I consider myself to be a very strong Pan-Africanist, and I stand firm on that. And if the Democratic Labour Party is a multi-class party with people who defend different interests within the framework of socialism, then I have a right to speak on these issues. Therefore, my main contribution today is to disclose the hypocrisy and to bring another exposition of the unjust position that the Barbados Labour Party took in awarding contracts to C. O. Williams. That is why it can be said in one of the leading newspapers in this country, "BLP FOR COW". It is no mistake. It is very clear to me why it would be said. And then you can have a Member also admitting that he is a shareholder within that newspaper. So one can understand that if he is a shareholder within this newspaper, and the newspaper tells you the BLP is for COW, you have no doubt of the interest which they represent.

Mr. Deputy President, I can go on much longer on this matter because there are various elements that must be taken into consideration. I have been hearing a mono position being put by the Opposition at all times in terms of figures. But one has to look at the value of the tender. We have to look at various aspects. It is on this position and the extensive manner in which clarification was given to this country on why the tender was not given to C. O. Williams that I feel pained to know that some people cannot understand why it was done. I felt it was imperative for me to come here today and speak and regardless of if one believes that I am creating acrimony in a situation when it is not merited, it is my conviction that this position should be defended. It is on that basis that I commend the Minister for his exposition and for the clear evaluation in arriving at what I consider is a just tender.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, I really had no intention of taking part in this debate today, because I was under the impression that the jury was out and we were waiting for the verdict. There was really nothing more to add, except the Government was interested in adding an Addendum to explain one or two things that have cropped up in the last couple of days.

Senator Prescod, to his credit, has done a remarkable thing and it warms my heart. He has given me the opportunity to see members of the Government squirming in their seats and giving expression to their annoyance to the things that Senator Prescod is sufficiently rash to raise. That is in their view.

Senator Prescod has given us a classic example of the guilty fleeth where no one pursueth. He has a message to bring, and I should warn him that in the days of antiquity, the messenger who brought bad tidings was usually executed. You have to be careful that you do not come bringing these messages to us and not allow the person who is issuing the message to come and deliver it himself.

Nonetheless, Sir, I am not going to get into the technical aspects of this thing. I came in here really to talk about the tendering process when we came with the Civil Establishment Order, and I probably will still hold my statements in that regard until then. But I do want to say that the central principle in this whole matter, which has exercised the interest and the emotions of Barbadians of every ilk over the last week or so, is not whether one company is efficient or non-efficient, because I think the evidence shows that both the companies that Senator Prescod referred to are good, efficient and capable companies in this country. So that is not the central issue at all. The central issue, according to some like Senator Prescod, is the redressing of historical balances, which is only a euphemism to say — let us give everything to the black people in the country and step on the heads of the whites. That is what, euphemistically, Senator Prescod is saying. If he is saying that, and he says that he is a man who does not fear to say what he feels, and he does not mind what other people are saying, why does he not come out and say so? Because that is at the heart of the argument that he has articulated today. I am not getting into that today, Sir, because I believe that that kind of debate will be an ongoing debate in this country for a long time to come, and there will be ample opportunity for me to say my own piece when I am ready.

12.00 noon

Senator Prescod also brought a high class of comedy into this debate. He says that this is a Socialist Government. Which Government is he talking about? Even he is sitting down there laughing at the fact that he can get up and make that kind of statement in here and say it with a lot of fire and apparent conviction. So there is a little humour in it, too.

Senator Prescod should be told that the real question of whether contracts are given to A or B must follow something more than just a whim. If we are going to do these things mainly on whims, we might as well pack up. As a lawyer, I have always understood that the basic principle of our jurisprudence is that the law must be certain. People who do business, particularly with Government, must know what the rules are and must know that the rules will be followed. That is a principle that I would like Senator Prescod to understand. If Senator Prescod is putting the point of view that the rules must be changed and that one of the key changes must be that Government contracts should go to black businesses and not white businesses, put that in the rules so that when people tender, they know what rules they are playing by. The public of Barbados will know what kinds of rules the Government wants this country to operate by.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: On a point of order, Sir: I have never purported in any way that the Government of the country should take an absolute position in allocating all work to no other people but black people. If this is the position that the member of the Opposition is taking, let him say that. But I have never in any way implied that.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you.

Senator Tull.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, Senator Prescod must be a little generous with me, because, to tell you the truth, he talked so much that it was beyond me. So if I did not understand everything that he said, you can blame it on my limited intellect. I thought that that was the gravamen of what he was saying. If it is an error, believe me, it is an honest error. So I hope that is cleared up and the word will go abroad that Senator Prescod is not saying that you should give all the contracts to black people.

What he is, in fact, saying, however, is — leave it to the Minister to decide whether it should be black or whether it should be white. I am saying you cannot run a system that way. Set the rules. If you are playing a game of cricket, you have got to understand what constitutes the front foot no ball or the back foot one. One is LBW and one is not. You have to know the rules when you get in the game. So I think if we have a set of rules already here in Barbados and they do not seem to be sufficiently suitable for certain segments of the Government, do the honourable thing and change the rules, and let the people know what the rules are.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Senator Prescod, for the benefit of other Senators, said that he did not know that I was a black apologist. That is akin to the statement about Uncle Tom in the Other Place, except that you are dealing with a very different person here. You can call me

black apologist, green apologist, Uncle Tom, or anything. I do not, like others, take umbrage and run and quarrel. Call me anything. It does not matter to me.

What I do know is that I am not labouring under a chip on my shoulder that is of the size of an oak tree. I do not have a chip on my shoulder. I do not want Senator Prescod to feel that these little stupid comments I hear from him make any difference.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Senator Prescod and his mentor are constant critics of the minibus operations. He is now reminding me. I have heard his mentor and I have heard him criticising the minibus people for making so much money, that they are doing too well.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Tull, let us confine ourselves, please, to the subject matter. Please do not distract Senator Tull.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am grateful for that, Sir. But I must slip in one final sentence. All 195 owners of the minibuses are black, but I hear Senator Prescod and his mentor attacking them. I am off that.

There is a problem both with Senator Prescod and the Democratic Labour Party Government. Both of them are riding two horses going in the opposite direction. They do not know where they stand. There is talk of philosophy. There is a lot of current jargon coming out of books that the speaker does not understand. What is the guiding philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party? The very fact that Senator Prescod's contribution in here today can cause a great deal of disquiet, visible disquiet, on the benches of the Government side, shows that there is nothing binding them together. They are opportunists, that is what they are. They do not believe in anything coherent. So one can say one thing and the others say something else. Do not run! Take your licks! Do not run!

Before other people run off with impressions that are totally wrong, I am saying, Mr. Deputy President, that the figures given by Senator Prescod today are totally bogus figures.

(Aside)

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: You do not know that. You are just saying so.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I would have thought that Senator Lewis had enough sense to know that on a matter that is as hot and topical as this one, any serious politician would have apprised himself of all the facts and got all the data in the last week or two. You have to be a joker of a politician otherwise.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Senator Lewis says that I am a joker. I hope Senator Lewis understands that when he attacks me, I smile. And he had better believe that he is going to hear more from me before the day is over. But I will not be sidetracked, Sir.
12.10 p.m.

Those figures are bogus figures, and since a Minister of Government is saying that those figures are not bogus and I am joking, I issue the obvious challenge, not to give us those figures in writing, but let the Minister get up and let the words come out of his mouth. I am challenging Senator Lewis to get up in here today and tell this Senate that those figures — and let him give them again, Sir — are accurate.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Tull, I must repeat I think you should confine yourself to the terms of the Resolution, the subject matter of the Resolution.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I would be glad to do so, Sir, but you have to protect me from the hecklers. If I get heckled, I will respond, and the heckler is very close to you, Sir, you can hear him better than I can. So any time you protect me from the hecklers, Sir, I will stick to the Resolution, but I will not let people like Senator Lewis get away. I will not deal with him now, Sir, but when we get to the Civil Establishment Order. He will hear a few things that will make him run outside, too.

In respect of the contribution, I do not want to get into the debate about the tender and all of that. As I said, everything will come out in the wash. But I cannot help but say that the members of the Government should not squirm so much when Senator Prescod expresses his views. After all, Senator Prescod is the 30 pieces of silver and they have to live with that. Judas went and hanged himself. They had better watch out. If he was part of the deal, they have to live with it, so it is no point getting there and fretting and sucking the teeth and all of that when their 30 pieces of silver gets up and gives views that cause them a great deal of embarrassment.

One final thing, Sir, this road contract business. As I said, I am not getting into it now. I think that if the Government is serious, they should give the country some more answers. The debate has taken a new turn in the last 24 hours and people are beginning to ask for more information. I would like to get some, too, but I do not know if they will give it to me. But it would be useful, to have this matter resolved to the satisfaction of the people of Barbados, that the rest of the information that should be forthcoming should come forward.

Do not let us fool ourselves, Sir, this is not a simple matter of a million and a half dollars. If it was that, some

people would say they wasted more than that. With a great abundance of charity now, I do not mean the Democratic Labour Party Government, I mean Government: "They wasted more than that, so we can forget about it." But it is more than that. There are some very serious principles at stake and the integrity of public life in this country can only continue if certain actions are taken at certain times.

This issue has sufficiently excited the interest and the curiosity of the wide public of Barbados that the Government would be doing this country a serious disservice if it withdraws into its cocoon and does not give the mass of the people of this country the benefit of the further information that can.....

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Why don't you stop heckling me? When I turn to him now, Sir,..... You are hearing him, Sir, and you will only hear when I deal with him. Why can't I be heard in silence?

I think, Sir, it would be a serious assault on the integrity of our system if the kind of doubt and suspicions, half truths, continue to spread across this country while the Government very quietly sits back and refuses to inform the public of what are the true facts so that an informed and reasonable conclusion can be brought to this matter.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy President, I am not a pan anything, I am a Barbadian and I rise to express serious concerns on this matter. We are not debating here whether the road was necessary or not, like most of the other Senators and people of this island, all the information I have on this matter is what I have read in the Press, what was reported in the Press and the paid advertisements. That does not make me an expert on the matter, and I am not even going to try to be judgmental.

I recognise that the Cabinet of this country has made a decision, and I think it is extremely unlikely that that decision will now be changed. We have to accept that decision even though it was not in accordance with the recommendation that was made by the Tenders Committee.

What concerns me very much is that it has been said that one of the reasons for that decision was to redress past injustices and all the racist overtones that that implies. If that is to be one of the new criteria that is going to guide this Government or any Government, whether it be on matters of tender or any other matters pertaining to this society, we would have come to a very serious crossroad in our development.

Mr. Deputy President, let me change that phrase. I do not mean a crossroad, because with a crossroad you can decide to go on, or to turn left, or to turn right. We would have come to a roundabout where you can very quickly go around it and start going back. This is my concern, that if this principle of redressing past injustices, and all that that implies, is to be a critical factor, we would have gone around the roundabout and be heading back, not going forward.

My main concern about that — and there are many — is primarily in the economic field, because we recognise that unemployment in this island is in the vicinity of 18 per cent. We recognise the need to earn more foreign exchange, we recognise the necessity of curtailing public expenditure, and to achieve all of these things we need more investment from both local and foreign sources. If we think we can attract, encourage and stimulate investment and at the same time maintain this ridiculous principle or standard of redressing past injustices up to the level of Cabinet decisions, we are kidding ourselves. Unless this matter is dealt with quickly, and very seriously, we can forget new investment which we need for the development of this country and for the people of this country. So it is in that vein that I make my observations.

There are other considerations that concern me, but to me this is paramount. The world does not owe us a living; we have to earn it. It is good to look back into our history; it is good to research it, it is good to update it and clarify it, but surely, Mr. Deputy President, our concern and our focus must be on the road ahead. Let us not go around that roundabout. Let us keep straight ahead, black, brown, white, our classes, our races, our colours, because if we get caught in this trap, God help us.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, my concern was that we were on the brink of passing a Resolution to which no one has spoken, and that at our last meeting I had expressed a wish that we should be provided with plans of any property which was being acquired by Government. It would seem to me to be comic that we should spend our time passing a Resolution for which we have no plans and to which no one has spoken.

Thank you.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. Deputy President, I did not intend to take any part in this debate today, but I feel that I must respond to the speech just made by Senator Goddard. It is something which I cannot

sit down and just allow to be said and not make some response.

My position is, Sir, that clearly part of the Government's duty must be to redress past imbalances and past injustices in this society. I have no doubts about that, I have no qualms in stating that, and this is not something that would be peculiar to the Barbados Government or the Government of Barbados. In the United States, for example, from the Sixties Governments in the United States have taken the position that they have to address past injustices and economic imbalances in the society to the benefit of black Americans who have suffered for centuries from economic deprivation in an unjust society. So this is not a farfetched principle. In the United States there are quotas for employing black people; there are federal programmes where companies are only given Government work if their employment record in terms of black people and in terms of a black directorate, etcetera, is a favourable one. So this is nothing that is farfetched or anything that we should be ashamed about. And it should not be called racism either.

Mr. Deputy President, we do not live in a society that just began two days ago. We live in a society that has a history, and perhaps the most significant aspect of that history is that for centuries the majority people of this country, the black people have been exploited, have been deprived and have been deliberately kept down by the white economic elite. There is no doubt about that. Even after the emancipation of the slaves between 1834 and 1838 there was a number of measures which were carried out in Barbados to ensure that black Barbadians remained economically deprived and at the bottom of the social ladder. The apprenticeship system, the Master and Servant Act of 1840, and the located labour system kept black people tied to the plantation, keeping them landless. We know that throughout these long years the whole political system was dominated by the white plantation elite and that the whole system of legislation was designed to buttress the economic interests of that class.

We know, for example, that when black people began to get a little money in the early years of the 20th century, Panama money, and began to form their own economic institutions, like the Friendly Societies, legislation was put in place to curtail the ability of the Friendly Societies to purchase land for their black clients. This is a history that we know about. We know about the consolidation of white planter and merchant interests in the early decades of this century, the Barbados Shipping and Trading Company, Plantations Limited, the consolidation of white economic power in a corporate setting, and we know about the stranglehold that they have exerted on this country up to, I dare say, the present day.

I am not saying that some progress has not been made. Yes, some progress has been made, things have

improved for black people, but not enough. We still have a major task to carry out so far as the redistribution of resources of this country are concerned. I have no difficulty with that, and any Government which claims to represent the masses of this country, which has been put there by the masses of this country, has to see that task as certainly one of their main fundamental objectives. I have no doubts about that.

Let us not take out of context what the Minister, Dr. Blackman, said. Dr. Blackman essentially said that we want to create in Barbados a just society, a society in which there will be equal opportunity for all. He said, and I think these were almost his exact words, that the only justice that firm C. O. Williams can expect is that they will no longer enjoy the preferential treatment that they enjoyed under the Barbados Labour Party regime. Let us be honest with ourselves. We know that is not an untrue or false statement. We know that C. O. Williams Construction enjoyed preferential treatment under the Barbados Labour Party regime. I do not think there is any Barbadian who does not know that, and those who seek to deny that are only seeking to fool themselves. The strongest, the most die-hard Barbados Labour Party supporter knows that that company enjoyed preferential treatment, and what the Minister is saying is that if we want to create a just society, that must no longer obtain.

I go even further, because I believe that Government has a sacred duty to try to redistribute the resources of this country. I have said in here already during the Estimates Debate that I believe that when Government gives out work, when Government spends money in the local economy, it should bend over backwards to spend that money with small businesses, small enterprises now developing, and when you say "small business" in Barbados, you are invariably saying black business.

12.30 p.m.

I have that type of orientation, and I believe that that is part of Government's sacred duty. If the work can go to small, black businessmen, it should go to them. Of course, I am not saying that that is a hard and fast rule, that you would not be looking at the performance record of the particular company and what have you. But once it is an acceptable company and you can find a way of using Government business and using Government expenditure to redistribute resources to build up and develop small black business, then it must be done. It is part of the duty of Government.

Mr. Deputy President, I conclude by saying that with all the details that have come out on this matter in terms of the granting of this contract, even if we put aside all considerations of redistribution of wealth, of risk, of past history of Barbados, and we just looked at the narrow process of granting the contract, I do not see

how the Minister can be faulted. The Minister said that, initially, the contract was split and tenders were asked for the split contract, and that when the tenders came in for the split contract, the Rayside tender, when taken together, was significantly lower than the C.O. Williams tender, and that it was only after the companies put in a combination bid that one found that the C. O. Williams tender was then dramatically reduced, to something like \$8.5 million, from what it was when the split tenders had been put in. And the Minister made it clear that he did not believe that the combination tender by C. O. Williams was a valid tender. He said that even when one looks at the tender itself, it was clear from the face of the tender that it did not deal with certain items of the contract. The pricing of certain items of the contract was not included in C. O. Williams' combination tender, whereas all items were included in the tender of the Rayside company. So even on that basis alone, the Minister was saying that he did not believe that the combination bid of C. O. Williams was a responsive bid and therefore it could be rejected on that ground, and that ground alone.

In addition to that, what the Minister was saying is that when you looked at the past record of C. O. Williams, you saw a track record of a company putting a tender at a certain price and at the end of the day you found that the price it was ultimately paid from the Government was way in excess of the price that they had tendered at. And the Minister was saying that, particularly with this type of track record, where you put in a combination tender which seems drastically lower than your first tender, a combination tender which seems unresponsive to the items that you were supposed to be dealing with -- when you take all those things together -- the tender put in by the Rayside company was the more acceptable tender. I really do not see how that can be faulted.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, you would forgive me, Sir, if I start my contribution by saying that Your Honour's indulgence opened Pandora's box. I will not be long, Sir.

This country has prided itself for many years as a country that has operated under a rule of law. Some of the references made by Senator Comissiong as to what has happened in other jurisdictions are rooted in law. Following the passage of the Civil Rights Act in the United Kingdom and in the United States in 1964, a number of Bills were enacted which stipulated that quotas and what have you be taken into account in Federal awards. Affirmative action was the principle on which they operated. And I support what Senator Tull said earlier. If the rules are changing, the rules must be clear to all and sundry.

Sir, a lot has been said about this issue of a contract and a road. From the comments raised in today's issue of the Press, the matter is still not fully clear, in that there may still be more information forthcoming.

I am disturbed, Sir, when it is said on the floor of this Chamber, or is being postulated, that two wrongs make a right, that whatever wrongs were done in the past, we must do a wrong now to correct those past wrongs. I am concerned about that because on the face of the information available in the public domain at this date, some wrongs are being perpetuated.

I say in conclusion, that Barbados has maintained a reputation in the outside world of high moral integrity. I think we forfeit that right to take high moral positions when we act in a way that calls into question whether, in fact, due process has been observed.

I should also like to make reference, Sir, to the fact that it seems passing strange that someone who had an intimate connection with the preparation of documents of the review process should, according to the media at the weekend, be now leaving the Public Service to go and join one of the parties in the issue. In the United States there are very strong rules about people who work in the Defence Department joining firms for a period of one year or more after being in employ. Perhaps these rules ought to be put in place in Barbados.

It raises questions of the credibility in the Public Service of this country if you can hop from a desk in the Ministry of Transport and Works today and go into a firm with whom you have dealt with yesterday on a contract. Is that your price for approving it and for passing information in a bias form to achieve a given result?

I did not want to get into this debate, Sir, but Your Honour's indulgence opened a Pandora's box, and I think I must go on the record. There is a lot still to be said on this issue. Mr. Harold Griffith, a former Technical Director of the Ministry has raised technical questions in today's issue of the Press which require some answers. As he said, there is nothing for either side to gloat about, in that there are answers to be given both in respect of remarks made by Williams as well as those made by Government. And, Sir, I think the issue is one where answers are required.

The person who opened this Pandora's box was not the Minister. The Minister was very circumspect. He dealt with the issue of 16 houses to be provided -- he did not tell us that, but that is what the plan tells us and I am grateful for the plan that he sent around -- and for the road improvement. But having, Sir, your allowing this thing to go the way it has gone, I think the country requires more information.

(*Aside:* SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: More information about the land?)

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I beg your pardon?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let us hear Senator Blackman, please.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Barbadians, in the absence of rebuttal to what has been said in the weekend Press, in the absence of rebuttal to the valid points raised by Mr. Griffith, are going to find that, at the end of the day, they are going to take their own judgement and say that this country has sold itself in the altar of expediency for \$1½ million. Is that the price of doing business? Is it a bribe now of \$1½ million?

12.40 p.m.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy President, I am more concerned about the efficiency, when we acquire this land, with which the Government will go forward to relocate houses on this land. In most cases, people tend to forget that when you disrupt persons from their accustomed lodgings, we may not be very efficient in putting them back in a new location with all the physical amenities that they deserve. I would hope that in this particular acquisition sufficient notice is taken of those things, that the people who will be disturbed and who have to be relocated.....

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I am just appealing to the Minister of Housing. I am only saying that I hope we move swiftly in making those people who will be relocated very comfortable in their new habitation.

Sir, I would like to refer to the comment made by Senator Goddard about racial overtones, and Senator Tull has been saying that we do not have any philosophy. I am going to read the first introductory remarks in our manifesto of 1986. It reads:

"The Democratic Labour Party as its name implies, is a people-oriented Party, dedicated to the upliftment of all Barbadians, regardless of colour, class, creed or political affiliation."

The Democratic Labour Party has never done anything by its decisions to disrupt the political and social fabric of this Barbadian society by which we have all been founded. We will continue to dispense justice in a free Barbadian society, upholding all the traditions which we inherited from the past.

The Democratic Labour Party has been able to move this country in the years 1961 to 1976 and to improve the lot of not only people who had money, but

people who never had a chance before. We have not, like some, stopped one from going ahead and let the other one come on. We have brought along everybody at the same time. People were fearful when the Democratic Labour Party came into power at that time that we would have made a big reversal. As a matter of fact, the plantocracy in this country and the business people in this country benefitted more in those years under this regime than anytime in the history of Barbados.

I do not see how in this day and age you can accuse us of anything about racial tones, because we have never operated that way. We do not intend to operate that way. I can give this Senate an assurance that it is not in our philosophy to divide and rule this country, and it must respect the decisions of Cabinet for what they are. They have got together by whatever route, and their decision will be based on what is available to them at the time. It will be a common sense result from the facts which they had to examine. It is nothing about any racial overtones or anything, which disturbs me very badly when I hear Senator Goddard talking about redressing past injustices up to the level of Cabinet decisions. That is a very strong statement, redressing past injustices. I do not know what they are, because Senator Goddard was very careful not to go into any detail about the past injustices he is talking about.

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Senator Goddard did not go into any detail about what he was talking about past injustices. He used a general term. I know that we are here to fight social injustice — this party of mine. We deal with social injustice. But Senator Goddard was very careful not to mention what those past injustices would be. So I cannot respond to that. I would just like to tell him that we are dedicated to dealing with social injustices. But when he talks of past injustices, we are not a witch-hunting party. I want to make that straight in here today. We do not go looking for witches in order to condemn them and to put them in the fire.

I would like to confirm this party's dedication to the upliftment of all Barbadians. We have said so from the beginning, and we have never done anything to indicate to the public of Barbados that we have changed from our basic philosophy, nor that we try to divide, which has been done in other places, this country of ours. I do not accept those kinds of statements and I would like to hear more from Senator Goddard on these past injustices.

If we as a party had to deal with those injustices, we would take another ten years to redress the wrongs which have been inflicted on the people in the last ten years. But you cannot run a country by going back to deal with what you feel might be wrong or right. We

have to go forward. We are not ones who just sit down and plan something in a certain way because somebody has been unfaired before. You do not run a country like that. We are going forward to the 21st century. We are looking for the 90s. Right.

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: We have never put any pressure on anybody. We have done things for the upliftment of all people in this country, and it is ridiculous at this stage that we are hearing statements in here trying to show that we might be doing something other than that. When I hear of redressing past injustices to the level of Cabinet decisions, I do not understand what that means, and if we have conducted ourselves in such a way in the past years as to bring so much social advancement to our people and to make our people a better people in this year of grace, I cannot sit down here and hear statements being made to show that we are a partial or piece-meal Government. We have always been a Government for all the people of Barbados. Our last leader, who died recently, despite the troubles he had been able to withstand and the problems he encountered, never stopped from going forward to bring about change which would benefit all people and not one particular set of people.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I little expected when I introduced this Resolution that I should have to be replying to it. I find that no questions have been put to me in respect of the substantive matters within the Resolution, and I, therefore, must apologise to the Senate for not being able to reply to the Resolution, or any questions raised in it.

However, there has been a debate and I am not sorry that there has been, because I think it illustrates something about the nature of our society and our politics. We are an adversarial society. In fact, our system works on the basis that those who govern must expect to have their policies and their actions thoroughly scrutinised by those who for the time being are not in government, and so it must be. I would not change this kind of system for any other. So I am not in any way alarmed by the tone of this debate.

12.50 p.m.

Sometimes when we are getting into these areas, we ought not to start a story at the point at which it makes its impact at us when we are discussing it. Everything has a beginning and a continuation and, hopefully, an end, and for somebody who has been in politics as long as I have, this is almost like a roundabout. How many people remember the big national debate that took place in this country some time in February 1985, a few weeks before we suffered the national bereavement in the passing of

the late Prime Minister Adams? The big argument then was whether COW should or should not have a contract in which the Inter-American Development Bank was involved, and which, because they were the funders, they had awarded to a Venezuelan firm. A lot of people in this country — black ones, white ones, all sorts of people — made a tremendous amount of propaganda, most of it genuinely directed on the ground that if Barbados was going to spend \$90 million, a Barbadian firm should have the spending of it or should have the contract. A lot of business firms, some 60 of them, some of them even connected with Mr. Williams, took out, I believe, pages of advertisements in the national Press saying that in order for Mr. Williams to be given this contract, if it was a question merely of raising the money, they were prepared to put up money in order that "Cow" Williams should have it.

Funnily enough, Errol Barrow, though for different reasons, agreed with that point of view, because he took the view that if you are building a road and you have the sand, the grit, the cement and most of the things you need, there is no point in borrowing money to build it. You may need some foreign exchange component of it in respect of the machinery and other technical inputs you need, but he made the point that so far as national resources were available, they should be used.

But the point was, Mr. Deputy President, that the Barbados Labour Party, exercising its own sovereign judgment as a Cabinet, decided that it would make representation to the Inter-American Bank to change their view. It was not quite successful, but nobody at that time queried the rightness or wrongness of the Cabinet of Barbados to come to a sovereign decision on a matter like this.

Mr. Williams himself made certain positions clear on his own behalf in the papers, and he said, 'If I get this, I will give Mr. Rayside.' This is where, not for the first time, Mr. Rayside's name has come in with Mr. Williams' in respect of these matters. He said, "give me this one and he can have the Greenland to Mile and a Quarter contract," as if Mr. Williams himself could give out a contract. He said it and nobody contradicted him.

What I want to make clear here is that we may have reached a stage in which we are arguing, perhaps, the wrong things. It seems to me quite clearly that there is a level now of sophistication and expertise in road construction in this country in which two, possibly three or four, firms can do all the work that we need to do, and they ought to get together with Government and decide how it is to be done so that we will be free of all of this confusion over matters which, really, are not themselves matters of such substance as we think.

I participated, as a member of the Cabinet, in this decision. It did not then, it does not now, seem to me that I helped to make the wrong decision, because from all the available evidence before me, as a Minister and as a person with political experience and whatever, the conclusion seemed to me to be a correct one, and that was all there was to it. If you argue that the Cabinet of this country is the principal instrument, of policy, you cannot then say that when it takes a decision in one instance, it is acting with all the propriety, and if it acts in another instance, simply because it does not suit certain people, you have to question that decision. I cannot see it that way at all.

The next point I want to make is that I think we ought to be mature enough to be able to discuss the racial situation in this country without running into corners and hiding about it. I am not like the Irish, who have too much history. I feel the history of Barbados is sufficient for me, and I do not have to read into it more than it is, and I cannot rewrite the past. I am a product of that past, though I am a black person, as anybody who is white is a product of that past, and we have to accommodate ourselves to the history. We have to face it squarely, accept its interpretations and use its lessons to make a better society than the one we have inherited.

Only the other day I read what I thought was the most insulting thing I have ever read in recent years, and it was a comment made by Mr. Philip Goddard in respect of the argument which was then going on about the Budget and public expenditure what he was reported on the front page of the *Advocate* as saying is this: give some of these fellows \$10 000 and a rum shop and they will be bankrupt in six months. It was a most insulting comment, because "these fellows" would, of course, be black people, because black people run the Government now. But I would not say that of any category of people in this society, because the bankruptcies which have taken place really in this country in the last three or four years have been bankruptcies of people who did not run rum shops and who, for the most part, were not even black. So I think we have to be very careful.

I yield to nobody in my pride in the citizenship I have of this country. I do not even describe myself as a black Barbadian, except for purposes of accuracy in certain instances. I am a Barbadian, and that is sufficient, and anybody who has been born in this country, descended from people who have been born in this country or who acquired the citizenship of this country by naturalisation, marriage, descent or whatever it is, shares a common citizenship with me, and I am happy for that. So I make no distinction in my own mind or attitude towards it.

However, any Government has to say and make clear certain aspects of its policy, and it ought always to

state things as clearly as possible, give all the explanations necessary and should have nothing to hide, and say what is true without rancour or bitterness.

So in a way this debate has helped us all if it has given us a clear perception of what this country is and what its people are like. We do not have to continue eating each other, but I believe that we ought always to be arguing, because our system of government is adversarial. You have a Government, you have an Opposition, you polarise the society to a certain extent, you have to be careful you do not polarise it beyond a certain point, but it has to be like that, and that is what gives it its nature, and, in some cases, its perfection. I would not wish to live in a society in which Governments could not be criticised, or should not be asked to give an account of their stewardship outside of election time. This is a good thing for us, and for that I am glad.

I do not think I need say anything more, except to say that it was the Cabinet of Barbados that made this decision and it stands by it.

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

1.00 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for one hour.

The question that the Senate be suspended for one hour was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly.

ON RESUMPTION

MORTGAGE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1988

Order No. 2 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Mortgage Insurance Act, Cap. 233.

SENATOR THE HON. DR. C. D. CLARKE: Mr Deputy President, this Bill seeks to remove certain anomalies which exist within the Mortgage Insurance Act. The Housing Credit Fund was developed to facilitate the flow of housing finance, or to make the availability of funds easier, for lower income earners to acquire homes. The Housing Credit Fund had as its major improvement work conversion from pit latrines to the waterborne sanitary facilities. However, a problem arose in that the type of person who would seek assistance under the scheme is usually the owner of a chattel house, which is more often than not located on rented land. A problem

arose as a consequence, since under the Mortgage Insurance Act, that is the principal Act, all loans must be secured by a first mortgage. This means that the mortgagor must own the land in addition to the house. Therefore, in cases like that, such a mortgagor would be excluded from being covered under the Mortgage Insurance Act, because he could not offer a first mortgage. This was so because the land is excluded from coverage under the chattel building mortgage fund, since any construction in permanent material removes the unit from the category of chattel.

This Bill therefore seeks to make other forms of security acceptable under the Mortgage Insurance Act.

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

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee, on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1988

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1988, provides for the establishment on a permanent basis of some 440 temporary posts. The establishment of these posts is another phase of an ongoing exercise on the review, from time to time, of temporary staff provided to man the several Government offices. The last occasion on which the review was undertaken was in 1986, when 202 temporary posts were established with effect from April 1, 1986. On that occasion the posts were spread over 22 departments, with the bulk of the posts, some 97, going to the Ministry of Transport and

Works. On this occasion they are spread over 30 departments, with 186 of them going to the Ministry of Health and its departments.

Some time during 1987, the staff structure and the operations of the National Insurance Department were examined and certain adjustments to staff were recommended, and these are being catered to in this Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order. Additional posts were only provided on a temporary basis, and although they have not been in place for too long, it is considered that that agency should have the additional posts in order that it may properly make its contribution to the development of this country. Some 65 posts are being established in that department.

The Order also provides for staff adjustments in the Government Electrical Engineering Department. It is known that the responsibilities of this department have increased over the years, and the improved structure is designed to reflect the present responsibilities. This includes technical staff, so that designing for Government buildings can be undertaken, which will result, we hope, in a saving of private consultants' fees.

The departments for which staff has been provided include the Judiciary and Registration Department, and the Prisons, as a result of a 24-hour patrol service which was instituted in the maximum security section of the prison in order that prisoners in this area could be supervised during exercise periods. There was also a problem of overcrowding, and a section of the prison formerly used for female prisoners had to be converted to house certain male prisoners.

In the Customs Department, some posts were provided on a temporary basis as far back as 1979, like when the airport terminal building was opened. Then there was an additional shed at the harbour which was provided to ease congestion, and posts had to be provided for them. Over and above that, there has been a general re-organisation at the Customs Department, and among other things, a post of Financial Controller has been provided to assist with covering the collection of revenues in that agency.

2.15 p.m.

One of the departments which benefits from this exercise is the office of the Ombudsman. The posts were originally provided on a temporary basis and they are now being provided permanently.

In the Ministry of Transport and Works, some time during 1984 a Planning Unit was established. The functions included project identification, preparation and their involvement with funding agencies, monitoring, preparing and reviewing transportation plans. The estab-

lishment of a Licensing Authority was also undertaken, and temporary posts were provided in that department.

In the Ministry of Housing and Lands, a Property Management Unit was established in 1980 with a Senior Executive Officer, an Executive Officer and a Clerical Officer. Now that that section has been properly examined, additional staff has been provided.

For the Ambulance Service, there have been alterations, and there are now new posts of Paramedic Technician in order to fully satisfy the needs of the Ambulance Service.

These are some of the examples of situations which have been provided permanently, and I now beg to move that this Resolution be passed.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, I think it would be less than responsible if a Civil Establishment Order Resolution coming to Parliament at this time was debated solely in terms of adjustments and creation of additional posts, and the appointment of temporary people to permanent positions. It really would be an injustice for us to just deal with those things and not have a word or two to say about the whole Public Service. I therefore want, Mr. Deputy President, to make a few general observations, and these are observations based from my own experience as a Minister of Government for ten years, and therefore, one who has worked very closely with people in the Service at all levels, but more particularly at the senior level, and also from developments that one has observed over the past two years.

From the very beginning of the creation of this Ministry of the Public Service in 1986, grave misgivings were expressed about that particular Ministry. I would hear, perhaps later in the debate, that there was always a Ministry of the Public Service. I do not know that I am able to argue these subtleties. True, the Prime Minister's Office ever since Independence has always had a general overview of the Services Commissions and the departments, all but one or two that fall now under this Ministry of the Public Service. But Prime Ministers had a way of dealing with these things in a way that, perhaps, exuberant new Ministers do not.

The fact also that a civil servant was appointed Minister of the Public Service is one of the most stupid and supine decisions made by this Administration. Not because there is anything wrong with a civil servant, but when that civil servant has worked with most of the people he is dealing with now in the Public Service, I think it is a very unfortunate coalition. In fact, it is no coalition. It has not turned out to be that. Old prejudices, hostilities and suspicions remain, and, therefore, the relationship between the Minister of the Public Service

and the senior public servants is a less than happy one. That is inevitable, it is only human nature.

Sir, judgements flow both ways. The Minister of the Public Service can make a lot of comments about hidden agendas of senior public officers and all that kind of thing, but the Minister is only saying what the senior civil servants have been saying about him and they know what his hidden and open "agendas" were. Agenda, Sir.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No, only the Minister of the Public Service says "agendas."

(Aside: He made a mistake.)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No, he did not make any mistake. Agenda, plural. Yes.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: His agenda were well known by the people who worked with him in the Public Service, and they all talk about it, and they do not talk about it privately, they talk about it quite openly. Therefore, this forced marriage between a Minister and the people he worked with, when the relationship has always been a very strained one, is causing a lot of problems right here in this Public Service in Barbados.

I know it has been a common practice for the Democratic Labour Party to abuse the Public Service. The late Prime Minister Barrow used to give us some virtuoso performances in that regard. He was good at that, Sir, but, somehow or other, Prime Minister Barrow got away with a lot more than other mortals in this society have not been able to get away with. But the present Minister of the Public Service foolishly decides to take up that particular cudgel. So he can walk around Barbados now and tell the civil servants that they have hidden agenda, that they are undermining the Service and that they are about their own business, and he makes a lot of unwelcome slurs on senior officers in the Public Service. Incidentally, Sir, senior officers who are far more competent by any objective standard than the Minister has ever been as a public servant.

But that is what power does to you. I have said in this Chamber before, and I continue to say it, that never in the history of this country has there been so much fear lurking in the corridors of Government in this country. Civil servants are afraid because a new kind of reign of terror has been unleashed on the people in the Public Service in this country. Victimisation has reached the level of a fine art.

(Aside: That is not true!)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Lord, I am getting heckled. You know, Sir, whenever I sting them, they always get excited. That is all right.

The level of victimisation in the Public Service of this country is such as has never been experienced in this country before. You only have to talk to public officers to discover that. The Democratic Labour Party got into the Government two years ago and set about as a holy war, a crusade against people who they did not favour. They sent home hundreds of people from the Public Service. Hundreds of people in the Public Service were sent home, for the reason stated in some cases, that they were cutting down on expenditure in certain operations, and immediately after these people were sent home, they recruited new people in their places. And one of the remarkable coincidences about the new operation was the addresses of the persons who came on with whoever was the substantive Minister in the particular department or the respective department.

These are things that are causing concern in this country. And do not let us fool ourselves — people are going to carry the yoke for some time, and then they are going to try to throw it off. That is one of the lessons of history. The Leader of the Senate is a historian, and he should be able to point out some of these things to his ministerial colleague on his right.

Mr. Deputy President, the whole question about what to do with the Civil Service today has to be addressed. I will get back to these personal aspects of it. But looking at it broadly, Sir, one of the weaknesses in the Public Service, which I thought this Ministry of the Public Service was going to address, was modernising the Civil Service. The Civil Service is still one of the greatest forces of reaction in this country. Everything else seems to be moving ahead of the Civil Service. Its systems, its modes, its methods of operation, methods of promotion, almost everything in the Civil Service is crying out for modernisation.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I did not hear that.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: They tell me I should have known that when I was in power. I like that. They cannot help going back all the time. You see, they do not know what to do.

To get back to the topic, the Civil Service needs to be modernised. We have in our system a lot of archaic

procedures and systems, and the whole system creeps along in a very ponderous way. I am going to deal with some of them as I develop the point I am making. But before I do that, I have to mention the direction of the Public Service, because that is related to the quality of the Government.

2.25 p.m.

One hears repeatedly among senior public officers that there is no momentum and no dynamism in the departments, that they are waiting and crying out for leadership in the areas of policy formulation. I do not mean the Permanent Secretaries now — they want to be inspired by the Ministers in the respective Ministries who could come up with the kind of policies that could inspire civil servants to dig in and feel that they are doing something. They are a little bit tired of doing the routine, back-breaking type of clerical work that so much characterises our Public Service, and this has been so for a long time. I am not making that point in relation to the Civil Service in the last two years, I am speaking over a long period of time. A lot of paper is written on, a lot of useless minutes are written, and things are shifted from one desk to another, and, more often than not, it takes three and four months to do something that would normally be done in the private sector in three or four days. I am one who is always very anxious not to equate the public sector with the private sector, and I do not want to equate them, but sometimes a little comparison is not a bad thing. That needs to be dealt with. People are tired of that and they tell you that. They spend all this time writing these useless minutes because they do not have anything to inspire them to use their intelligence and their scholarship in a creative way.

The Civil Service has to be looked at against that kind of background, and that is a fruitful area for creative activity for the Ministry of the Public Service. Unfortunately, that is not happening.

We have, Mr. Deputy President, the whole question of rewards, promotion, and so on. Too often the system is hide-bound by promotion in terms of seniority — how long a man was in a post, how many days seniority he has over another man — rather than how able and competent a particular officer is. This has to do not with following what one finds, but with a lack of proper assessment of public officers. I understand that each head of a department makes some very general comments in terms of A or B or 1, 2, or 3 on a card annually on public officers. There is no discussion on it. They just make these notes and pass them on to whoever collects them. I do not know, Sir. These things are often pulled out to justify the malfeasance of people who have to make decisions.

One of the things that trouble me, is the fact that the Minister is too busy in these affairs. It is no role of

any Minister of Government to get himself involved in the assessment of officers in a particular department, and determining for himself who should, and should not, get promoted. But this Minister has been more involved in that than any other Minister since Independence. That is because he has nothing constructive to do.

I ask, Mr. Deputy President, how can the Minister of the Public Service walk about talking of lack of motivation in the Public Service when the motivation must come from the top? There is no motivation in the Public Service because all like the Minister of the Public Service are not providing that kind of motivation. There is too much ministerial diffidence. There is too much abrupt change in policies. As soon as the public officers get into the meat of a particular policy, at the slightest whim there is a change. There is no continuity. There is no blueprint. The Government itself admits that it has no development plan. So there is nothing in many departments for officers in some sections, to work on, because there is no development plan in hand for them to get working on. It is this kind of problem in the Public Service that is causing a loss of morale, a lot of loss of interest, and it is because of this that the Minister can walk around pushing people from one place to another, as if they were draughts men on a draft board.

Mr. Deputy President, subjectivity in assessing officers in the Public Service has taken over. The question of assessment is a long-standing problem, I do not lay that one at the door of the Democratic Labour Party Government. That is an old one, but certainly proper assessment is critical to objectivity in the appointments and promotions in the Public Service. If you cannot properly assess people, you have really not much to go on, and that leaves a wide area for the subjective views of people like the Minister of the Public Service to inject partisanship and prejudices into what happens from time to time in the Public Service.

Another area that I am concerned about is that the Public Service is not often aware of what are Government's priorities in terms of its overall plans and programmes. I missed the debate last week on the Exempt Insurance (Amendment) Act, but one of the things that I heard was mentioned is the attitude of the people at the Immigration Department to the processing of work permits for people who apply from the offshore services. I give that as only one example, there are several others that I can give, but it tells me that quite often the heads and staff of certain departments of Government are not in tune with what the Government has set as its priorities, and this is a question of information. I do not know how information is passed on in this area, but I think that it is something that the Government has to look at.

In here sometime ago, I mentioned the refund of taxes on idle lands. There is no point telling people

that the money they paid as taxation on idle lands is their money and must be refunded to them if the Government does not at the same time tell the departments concerned to draw up the list of all the people who have paid this money, get in touch with them and tell them there is a voucher in the Treasury for their money. I have people constantly complaining to me that they are being driven from pillar to post when they seek to get the refund of those monies. I have been told on two occasions in this Senate that this matter will be given some attention, but it looks to me from the position in which I stand that nothing has been done about it up to now. 2.35 p.m.

I want also, Mr. Deputy President, to raise the question of the Public Service being in the vanguard of change. In developing countries, people look more than they do in First World or highly developed countries, industrialised countries, for leadership from Government. Government has the transcendental role in the lives of people in the developing countries, and there they look for leadership. They do not look to the private sector, that is not the historical reality of Barbados, and therefore Government has a responsibility, as I said, to be in the vanguard of change, and I am talking about change in every sense.

There is technological change, and the Government is behind the rest of the society in that regard. But even more important than that, in respect of social change, too often we find that the Government is rushing to catch up with the rest of the society in important sectors of activity in this country. That is a role for the Ministry of the Public Service. A Minister of the Public Service who has a vision of a modern Barbados and where he would like to see Barbados in the 21st century, and the role of the Public Service in that new Barbados, has a lot to do, not meddling around with who gets transferred and who gets promoted and that kind of thing. That is not what you pay a Minister of Government to get himself involved in.

One of the things that trouble the private sector, and I am sure that Senator Fraser will agree with me, is sex exploitation. People want jobs, promotion and more money — of course Senator Fraser is quite welcome to disagree with me if she likes, but I know she agrees with me on this one — yes, I have to get you in on this one —

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes, Sir.

I know, Sir, that that is a big problem in the private sector. It is a big problem in the public sector, too, except that people do not talk about it enough. I want the Minister of the Public Service to give some special

attention to that, because the women in the Public Service are complaining that they are being approached by their seniors.....

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I hear now, Sir, that that has nothing to do with the Minister of the Public Service. Well, I tell you it has a lot to do with him, because if he does not get something done about it, he is going to get hanged properly with it. And the Minister knows what I am talking about, too. All you hear is about whose girlfriend gets transferred and whose girlfriend gets appointed and that kind of thing, and if I am pushed too much, I will start to say more than perhaps I should say on the floor of this Chamber. That is the kind of thing that is going on in the Public Service, and I am hearing about it in a way that I have never heard about it before. That is a problem that is causing a lot of concern in the Public Service.

People who practise law, for instance, from time to time get civil servants coming into their offices complaining about these things and saying, "It seems to me that doing my work well is no longer a qualification for security or for promotion," and that is one of the things that has to be addressed by this Minister of the Public Service. But this Minister of the Public Service is too concerned about a lot of trivialities to be concerned about the broader issues.

I am not going to say a lot of things that I had intended to say when I got up. I will say them if provoked, because I believe I will be given an opportunity, with something else coming up, to say what will arise out of that provocation.

I want to make a few comments about one or two departments. The first one is the Prisons Department mentioned by the Minister. The prison is overcrowded. That is not new. At the moment they have three prisoners staying in a cell that was built for one person, and not only staying in a cell that was built for one person, but was built for one person 150 years ago. That situation is one that has to be looked at seriously by the Government.

But more important than that, Sir, is that there is an acute shortage of prison officers to deal with this increased prison population. I have it on reliable information that many nights there are only two officers on duty in the whole of Glendairy yard patrolling through the night. That certainly is a problem that has to be corrected. I cannot see, with the kind of prisoner that we are increasingly getting at the prison, that we can have a situation like that obtaining.

We also have in workshops in the prison one or two officers working with 20 or 30 prisoners, all of whom have chisels, saws, hammers, cutlasses, and so on.

I am not blaming the Government for this. They do not understand how fair I am. When I am criticising you, I am criticising you. When I am making observations as a citizen of this country, I make them. I am not blaming the Government for that, I am just bringing it to their attention if they are not aware of it.

They have a place up there called the wood pile, a depressed area, where you have 30 or 40 prisoners cutting wood and they have axes, hoes and so on, and two or three prison officers among them unguarded, without any protection. I mention these things, Sir, because increasingly you are hearing about this situation, oddly enough from both sides. You are hearing it from the prison officers, who are complaining, and you are hearing it about the prisoners, who are making observations about their superior position in case they want to do something. I am bringing that to the attention of the Minister because I think something is not right in that situation. I am not blaming the Government for that, I am just giving you some information.

In respect of the Customs Department, I have mentioned this before and I repeat it. The introduction of the two-tier system of duty to CARICOM and non-CARICOM goods is causing a problem in the Customs Department, according to reports coming out of the Customs Department, not according to Tull, and the complaint is that they are not equipped to deal with this distinction between one and the other, because it requires a lot of time and effort and packing and unpacking because of the very clever manipulations of some importers. I think that is something we can look at.

I also want to mention very quickly the Ministry of Education. I think there is a Resolution dealing with acquiring land — okay, I will reserve my comments until that time, Sir.

Finally, Sir, the division of labour among people in works Ministries. We have a problem, again, Sir, it is a historic problem, of low productivity in works Ministries in Barbados, for instance, the Ministry of Housing the Ministry of Transport and Works, and what is creeping into these departments again, Sir, from what one hears abroad, is that people are drawing very sharp lines over what they are supposed to do, and that they are not going to do anything other than what they perceive their work to be, and this is at all levels of these works departments. The result is that a lot that can be done is not being done, and the Ministry of Public Service would spend its time far more usefully looking at this kind of operation and trying to see how they can shake out the wrinkles in these works departments so that people can get a better understanding, both the supervisors and the men, of exactly what they are supposed to do and to be in a position to enforce it.

2.45 p.m.

Finally, Sir, wrongful dismissals in the para-statals, the statutory boards. A lot of people are being put out of their jobs in statutory corporations for what I consider rather dubious reasons.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Tull, you have a further five minutes.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: All of that time has gone, Sir? I will finish with these para-statals anyway, Sir.

A lot of people are being put out of their jobs on statutory boards for very flimsy reasons. In this case, Sir, I am not prepared to say that it is political victimisation. I say that when I feel confident. I do not know if it is that in this case. Here, again, one gets the feeling that although we have made a number of tremendous strides in the social development of Barbados where people understand that the right to education is a right, or the right to health or the right to vote, and so on, we are still a long way from the position where the right of security of a job is a second sense with us, and that people should not be put out of their jobs in a way they are being put out in Barbados, and particularly so by Government and quasi-Government operations. And, again, the Ministry of the Public Service would do well to cut out its obsession with trivialities, and turn its back on all the gossip and rumour and pettiness of a handful of people in the Public Service who have other people they want to do in — it would do itself a powerful good if it turns its back on that kind of thing — and take a look at the operation of statutory boards to make sure that in this year, 1988, the circumstances in which people can be put out of a job almost without provocation will not continue, and that clear guidelines be set so that the citizens of this country can be protected from many of the people whom we believe they are being paid to protect.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support the Resolution and to remind Senator Tull that he must be more careful when he is making these wild and unsupported statements. I also want to remind him that he is talking to members on this side, including Senator Tudor and myself, who are older than he is in every sphere of life, both in the political life and in normal life.

I was counting just now and I know a way to stop him from talking. All we have to do is to put a microphone before him with a standing speaker so that he cannot keep bending it, because I counted that in 34 minutes he touched the speaker 36 times. He pulled and bent it 36 times. That is by the way.

He said that with this party, which I have the honour to belong to and of which I am proud, because I am no johnny-come-lately, I was with the party from its inception, came in and started to victimise people who did not support us. That is not true, and I will remind the Senator again. I am speaking to him deliberately because I know the reporters are going to run out tomorrow with big headlines about what Senator Tull said, so when they are writing what Senator Tull said, let them also say what Senator Boxill said.

In 1977, Sir, there were 37 School Meal Workers who wanted as much as a month, some wanted less than a month, to complete their ten years' service in order that they would be entitled to a pension and gratuity. The leader of the Barbados Labour Party at the time said there was no way these people would get a pension, and he drew a line through the thing with so much vengeance that it tore the paper, especially with a woman by the name of Rebecca Ward, because he said she made black pudding for Errol Barrow and therefore would get no pension. If he does not remember that, let me also remind him about Bernard Bourne — I am calling names — who worked at the hospital and who wanted five months more to complete his time to get a full pension. Through the eddoes Mr. Bourne went! At the same hospital "Boo" Spencer went, because he was a friend of Mr. Barrow!

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I do not know about carrying away any groceries. If he carried away groceries, you should lock him up. If you talk about carrying away groceries, they have more thieves. . . .

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the matter in hand.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir, I am addressing the matter, but the honourable Member is talking about carrying away groceries. We all know that carrying away groceries is carrying away something that can be eaten, but I have known that one of their members carried away a house. He knows whom I am talking about. As I have said before, you are talking to a seasoned politician.

The Senator made one or two very good points, but the Senator cannot help himself at times, like a cow which will give you a good pail of milk and then turn around and kick it down. That is the trouble with the Senator. He made some very good points which I have to commend him on, but he should not try to give the impression that the Democratic Labour Party is a party of victimisation, because right now we are being accused of hiring and keeping on people who were diametrically

opposed to us. I have heard of a story where on June 1, when Errol Barrow died, a certain worker in one of these quasi-Government agencies came to work in a red dress with a big red bow in her bosom and said it was the happiest day of her life. So do not let the honourable Member try to get away with this thing.

When the honourable Member talks about civil servants trying to make female applicants pliant in order to get a job, the honourable Member should remember the leader of his party. I have known the leader of his party to terrorise a woman. I am not going to call any names now.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But you said that this thing is happening now under the Democratic Labour Party, and I am trying to prove to you that if it happens now, I do not know about it, but I know when it happened.....

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Address the Chair please.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am addressing the Chair, do not mind I am looking that way. It happened with the Barbados Labour Party in power.

It is unfair for the Senator to keep harping on the promotion of the Minister of the Public Service. If he has a personal vendetta, that is a matter for him, but the Ministry of the Public Service is nothing new. It was here from ever since, I would say. Before we had ministerial Government, it was the Colonial Secretary and his fancy boys who used to make the appointments. Then we had ministerial Government, and it was the Ministers and the top Permanent Secretaries who made these suggestions, and then it went before the Public Service.
2.55 p.m.

The honourable Member seems to forget that from 1976 until 1986, the Public Service Commission never operated. I know that Ministers carried people to work in certain departments without going through the Public Service Commission. It is only now that you are getting a Public Service Commission again to operate.

(*Aside:* SENATOR L. R. TULL: How did they get paid?)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: How did they get paid? By the Ministers going and telling them that they brought on Tom, Dick and Harry. Well not Tom, Tom was already getting paid, that they brought on Dick and Harry.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: This is a fact. I do not want to call names right now, because I have not notified the Deputy President that I would be calling names. But he knows what I am saying is true.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You do not know? Well, when we are finished talking in here, Mr. Deputy President, I will tell him who the Ministers are. He knows that I have my facts. They brought on people to work, and not only in National Insurance, without going through the Public Service Commission. And they were being paid.

It is only since the Democratic Labour Party came into power that certain people know about rights and wrongs. There were no rights and wrongs from 1976, from late September, 1976, mind you, until May, 1986. All of what they did was completely okay. But since the Democratic Labour Party came into power, they know now that you must have a Public Service Commission. We accept that. But do not get in here now and try to belittle the Minister of the Public Service because some civil servants have a grudge.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: And let me tell you something, Mr. Deputy President, this is one of the reasons I believe God made the world first and then made man, because if God had made the mistake of making man first and then the world, you would know that all like now he would not have finished making the world, because somebody would not want a moon down here. This is the whole gist of it.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: These people only now know what is good for this country since the Democratic Labour Party came into power. But I know for a fact that the first time the supposed-to-be independent Senators did anything, was after I wrote an article criticising them and saying they never vote against anything. And that is when they brought in some piece of thing here that the President of the Senate had to cast his vote, because it was tied, and the President of the Senate had to cast his vote to save them. They sat in this Chamber and allowed all sorts of wrong-doings to take place in this country. Nobody knew then that they were wrong. But from the time that the Democratic Labour Party came into power, everything that we do happens to be wrong. No matter how right it is, it happens to be wrong. Well, it is not going to change because you are saying that.

The honourable Member should know quite well that we are not fleeing in our attitudes. He raised a point last Wednesday when we met, and I was one of the first to ask the Minister to withdraw the Resolution and let us get further information on it before we proceeded. We complied with him. When they were in power, there was not any complying with anything. They said something is so, and whether you liked it or not, it was so. So do not try to play you are running us down.

I am not trying to push anything for anybody, but I belong to this party, and I am not going to let anybody — when I say anybody, I mean anybody, I mean anybody including my family — run this party down unfairly. When the party is wrong, even if I do not come in here and say it is wrong, I tell them I do not agree with you. But I am not going to let people come in here and make accusations against the party that I know that are not true.

When you say that we have been dismissing people willy-nilly since we came into power, nothing could be further from the truth, because my argument has always been, when I was a Minister and up to now, that you are a Barbadian first and anything else after. My view is that if I can help a person whom I know is a Barbadian, whether you are against me or not, but if you were openly against me, you do not expect me to give you a job in front of somebody who was for me.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: But he was qualified.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You know he was not?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Address the Chair, please.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Sir. Mr. Deputy President, I am addressing the Chair. Do not mind I am looking this way. If you want me to look at you, then I could look at you and talk.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: The honourable Member is talking about we gave Senator Lewis a bank manager's job. But the honourable member seems to have forgotten the amount of people that they brought in here already. He is a Barbadian. You talk about giving? What about the South African that you took up \$385 000 of the taxpayers' money and gave to do a job here at this same Chamber that we are in, Sir, and the man went

away long before he did anything? He does not have to come back either, because he did not have any passport. The man has gone away about his business. I have not heard one peep come out of him about that. This is a South African, mind you. He knows what I am talking about.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: I do not know.)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All right, I am going to tell you when I am finished.

This is the thing that annoys me about these people. We know that it is the duty of the Opposition to always try to make the Government uncomfortable. I accept that. But it is also the duty of the Opposition not to become a perfect nuisance in times when there is no need to be. The Opposition should point out to the Government where they think that the Government can do so and so. Constructive opposition I can accept. But when you come in here and you are opposing everything down to the appointment of a Barbadian like yourself because you have some beef up your sleeve, or some civil servant has a beef up his or her sleeve because they do not like Mr. A. There are lots of people who did not like Senator Tull as Minister of External Affairs, too. There are lots of people who did not like Senator Tull as Attorney-General, or as Minister of Education. But there are lots of people who did not like me as the Minister of Communications and Works, either, because I used to make them work.

Laughter.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: I do not believe you.)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: It is true.

The point is that because you do not like a person, that does not mean that the person does not have the ability to carry out the job. Let us give the Minister our support in the thing. If the Minister is wrong in something, come in here with a Resolution and debate it. This is what the Chamber is for. But do not get sniping all day long behind the Minister's back about the Minister did not do this and you are hearing this about the Minister. Is everything you hear true? I hear you have a lot of money and you deny it.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: So we cannot go on with all of these things.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I get tired with this sort of sniping. Every five minutes you hear something about it. You do not hear about any other Ministry, Mr. Deputy President. You do not hear them criticising any other Ministry all of the time, so it is a matter of a personality. I am sure that if Senator Tudor was the Minister of the Civil Service, or if it were any other person, you would

not hear all of this talk, talk, talk, talk, all the time, about this, about the Ministry and the next thing about the Ministry. It is about time that we grow up.

I want to repeat, do not make the mistake again of saying that we victimize any people, because I will tell you about the School Meals workers. There were 37. Go and check it. You see, I am a man who checks my facts. Thirty-seven who had a month, some had less to go, were sent through the eddoes by the leader of your party. I did not hear one peep come out of you. I know you are going to tell me that because you do not like the field placing, that does not mean you do not take the catches.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: This is what I want you to understand. So do not come to me with that.

Then there was Bernard Bourne, who only wanted five more months to complete his thing, and there was "Boo" Spencer. The honourable Member comes in here when we talk about "Boo" Spencer and comes telling me about stealing groceries. If you find a man stealing, the courts are there for that — lock him up, not only get rid of him. If he is getting a good salary and he is stealing, lock him up.

Do not come in here and try to give me this impression that the Democratic Labour Party is a party of victimisation. I have said before, and I will say again, that the Democratic Labour Party has always been a party of the masses, as against the Barbados Labour Party, which has always been a party of the classes. I can speak, Mr. Deputy President, because I have been in the struggle before any of them, any, and when I say "any", I mean the great Grantley Adams. When Grantley Adams was fighting Erskine Ward and writing all kinds of things against him, I was in, from 1932. So you would understand.

I am no johnny-come-lately, I have been in this thing every since. But I could not run for public life, because I came up in a poor home. You know how it would be. People would laugh at me. I did not want to be laughed at. I waited until when I got the opportunity, when I knew I could win. So do not mind the honourable Member, because he is a johnny-come-lately. They do not understand what is going on.

Do not come in here with this kind of thing and think you are going to get away with it. As I pointed out, to him when I started my speech, Senator Tudor and I are the two oldest politicians in here from the position of age and public life. And as I said before, I went into

the struggle from in 1932, so I know all about what was going on from then until now. The honourable Member is what we call a *parvenu* or neophyte. Just come, you know! Johnny-come-lately, as we would say in ordinary Bajan terms.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy President, would you protect me from the harassment of the honourable Member?

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I do not want to take up too much time. I just want to set the record straight, because I know tomorrow morning you are going to see big headlines about what Tull said about the thing. I want the headlines to also say what Boxill has said, not that I am looking for any fame. I played football about here in the days when you had to pay to watch me play.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I was a good everything. So I am not like these Johnny-come-latelies trying to get my name in any Press. My name was in the Press long ago.
3.05 p.m.

The honourable member is a Barbadian, and he is not a bad person. He makes some good speeches at times.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, he is my friend. But I want him to stop haranguing the Minister. If you do not stop haranguing, I will not stop haranguing you. It is as simple as that. I do not mean you, Sir.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am happy to see that I can entertain you. But I entertain you with the facts. I am not like some people who get in here and speak. I am giving him facts, chapter and verse. The only thing I would like to tell him before I sit down is — leave the microphone alone. It shows a kind of nervousness.

Mr. Deputy President, I beg to support this Resolution.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I just want to make one comment on something I heard Senator Boxill say, if I heard him correctly, that the Public Service Commission did nothing for the last ten years. I happened to be a member of the

Public Service Commission for a few years, and I can tell him that while I was there we made several appointments. I do not know which appointments he is talking about that the leader of the party made. But I can definitely attest to the fact that several appointments were made in the established staff when I was a member of the Public Service Commission. I do not know if he is referring to the unestablished staff, about which, I think, since 1974, the law was changed. But for the established staff, I can tell you that several appointments were made while I was a member of the Public Service Commission. I just want to make that point.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Deputy President: When I said they did nothing — you know English is a funny thing, and a lot of people do not get it exactly sometimes — I did not mean that they did not make any appointments. What I said, and I want to make it explicitly clear, was that appointments were made without the Public Service Commission making the appointments and I did not hear any peep coming out of anybody at the time. That is the point I made.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, when in 1986 the mantle of the Minister of the Civil Service fell on my shoulders, I was not unaware of the fact that, because I had served for 33½ years in the Public Service, this might sometimes be used as an instrument to suggest that I might not be a suitable person to perform the role. I was fully aware of that. What I am not aware of is many of the insinuations which from time to time are made to suggest that there is any group in the Public Service that is opposed to the idea of the Ministry of the Civil Service as presently constituted. Indeed, we are heartened by the support that we get from civil servants at all levels, because they find that there is an agency to whom they can communicate and, quite often, get assistance for some of their problems.

Let me repeat what has been said on several occasions. The Service Commissions appointed under the Constitution of this country are allowed by the Democratic Labour Party Minister, and by the Minister of the Civil Service, to play their full roles in administering the affairs of this country with relation to recruitment, promotion, and transfer of public officers. These constitutionally-established bastions of the Civil Service management know that during the period 1976 — 1986, in spite of what we just heard they were often bypassed and several appointments were made by Ministers who often would take people into Government agencies. If anybody has any doubt about that, the proof can be provided.

It was a fully indigenous Public Service that was responsible for effecting a smooth transfer from colonial status to nationhood in 1966. It is that same Public Service which is the envy of several of the countries in the Caribbean. Although it was at the point of emasculation in 1986, I am happy to say that, after two years, it is responding, and it will be the pride of the Caribbean again. It was the foresight of the Democratic Labour Party Administration which ensured that appropriate training opportunities were provided for the Civil Service in this country, and although much of this had stopped, it is happening again.

We know that during 1976 — 1986 several of the major institutions of this country were severely battered, but none of them more so than the Public Service. On another occasion I have pointed at instances in which public officers collapsed on their jobs because of the pressures and the fears which were exercised. So when one is talking about fear in the Public Service, one should reflect, especially after having served for ten years and being in a better position to observe what was happening.

I will not say much more, except that I was in a very good position to observe at a distance some of what was going on, so, I would know what the Democratic Labour Party must not do. As long as I have anything to do with it, I will try to ensure that public servants are not persecuted in the way they were persecuted between 1976 and 1986. That is an assurance I can give this Chamber at any time.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put to the Senate and agreed to.
3.15 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PROUTE, ST. THOMAS

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Proute, St. Thomas.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR:.....These efforts were thwarted because the documents which were requested from the owner either could not be found or in any case were not submitted.

Apart from this defect, there was no question whatever about disagreement on the sale price which had been reached, so it was therefore decided that the acquisition of the land should be continued under the provisions of the law, and therefore, this Resolution now seeks parliamentary approval for the compulsory acquisition of 12 482 square metres of land in the designated area for the purposes of developing a playing field.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ORDER, 1988

Order No. 5 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Public Holidays Order, 1988.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg to ask leave for my colleague, the Minister of State for the Civil Service, to take charge of this item.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Leave is granted.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, this Resolution is seeking approval for the Arawak Cement Limited to be placed on that list of businesses which may open for business on a public holiday.

Section 6 of the Public Holidays Act exempts certain persons and businesses, which have to be listed in the Second Schedule, from closing operations on public holidays. The request from the company is based on the fact that the business is involved in the continuous operation of a cement manufacturing plant 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and the nature of the work is such that frequent shutdowns not only are totally impractical, but are very costly.

It is understood also that the latest collective agreement between the company and the Barbados Workers Union envisages that the company will be applying for this exempt status. The Minister has given support to the request from the company and this Resolution now seeks to put in place the Order signed by the Minister.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CANE GARDEN, ST. MICHAEL AND ST. THOMAS RE HOUSING AND SECONDARY SCHOOL

Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cane Garden, St. Michael and St. Thomas for Housing Development and for the construction of St. Thomas Secondary School.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I apologise, Sir. I am passing around the Table, so that members of the Senate can see for themselves, the details of this parcel of land we are acquiring for the purposes set out in the Resolution.

The story is as follows: The Cabinet had agreed in November, 1986, that the contract for the erection of 496 houses which were to be built consequent upon agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Inverciones Company of Venezuela should be done in three phases, so a parcel of land at Husbands, St. James, consisting of 225 000 square metres, or 55 acres, roughly, had previously been earmarked for the siting of those houses. It was later determined that this land could only accommodate 394 units. Subsequently, a parcel of land containing 94 000 square metres, or roughly 23 acres, at Cane Garden, St. Michael was identified for the location of the remaining houses.

The property is owned by C. G. M. (Barbados) Limited. On a subsequent occasion, some time last year, the Cabinet agreed that this parcel of land of 94 000 square metres should be purchased for the siting of the additional houses in the joint project between Venezuela and Barbados, and so they put steps in motion for the acquisition of these lands. However, when the Ministry made a decision in respect of the acquisition, they were informed that Government was willing to offer by private treaty \$566 000 for the land and that seemed to have been all right.

But there was a snag. Before the acquisition could be further pursued, the Ministry of Housing and Lands was informed by the attorney, Mr. Charles Edghill, acting on behalf of Land Development and Building Limited, that their agency had entered into a valid legal contract with C. G. M. (Barbados) Limited to purchase the same area of land which the Crown was about to acquire, and that the deposit had already been paid to the prospective sellers. Eventually, a settlement was reached between the two parties to the contract and the deposit was refunded.

After that action was put in motion for the finalising of the transaction by private treaty, the relevant title deeds were requested of the owners and the appropriate searches carried out. On January 18 this year,

the agreement for sale was executed. However, the matter was somewhat held up — in fact, the speedy conclusion of the sale was prevented — since searches revealed that there were a number of judgments against the property, that is to say, the property of C. G. M. (Barbados) Limited.

In view of the unsatisfied charges against this property, it has been decided to finalise the acquisition under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228. So this Resolution seeks parliamentary approval for the acquisition of the 94 989 square metres of land at Cane Garden, St. Thomas, for housing development.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.
3.25 p.m.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. Deputy President, I have a number of questions that I would like to raise with the Minister in respect of the proposed construction of the secondary school on the site identified in the plan that has just been passed around, and which relates to this Resolution.

I understand, Sir, that there are about 31 000 secondary school children in Barbados. At the moment there are, I believe, 21 Government secondary schools and a few Government private schools. Those in the private secondary schools and the approved secondary schools are just over 4 000. The construction of a new secondary school at Wotton, I understand, should make provision for 1 200 students, and the one at Cane Garden in St. Thomas for 1 050. The Minister of Education has also said that he intends to have another 150 children on the rolls of Queen's College when that school is constructed in a little over a year's time. That is an additional 2 400 secondary school places.

It is common knowledge that the number of children in both primary and secondary schools has been falling steadily over the years. Indeed, the figure between 1978 and 1988 in secondary schools is a figure of something in excess of 600. We have across the country a number of primary schools which are so depleted of students that you can safely land a Boeing jet inside some of them without causing any injury to the students. That exaggeration is just a way of emphasising the point that I am making.

The reason for this is two-fold. One, as I mentioned, is the falling numbers of school children, and the second is the policy started by the last Government of constructing a number of new primary schools with greater capacity and better facilities, so in areas where the old primary schools are still being used and have not been closed, you find a number of students have moved away from those schools to the new schools and the numbers are seriously depleted.

My concern, however, in respect of the secondary schools amounts more to what should be a caution. The Government has to be very certain that it does the kind of projection that will not land us, perhaps in 10 or 15 years, with spare capacity in highly expensive secondary plant.

Political considerations, in my view, dictate that a secondary school was built in St. Thomas, because during the by-election of 1985, or whenever it was, there was a constant refrain on the platform of the Democratic Labour Party that St. Thomas was the only parish in Barbados without a secondary school, and the promise was made, in the heat of the moment, that if things went a certain way, they would get a school. I do not know what kind of planning that is. You said that without a serious study of the logistics.

The schools in the north, particularly the one in the Belleplaine area, the Alleyne School, and the West St. Joseph, the Grantley Adams Memorial School it is now called, are going to be under a lot of pressure with the construction of two new schools in St. Thomas, one at Cane Garden and one one mile away, Queen's College — it is not even one mile away. I cannot understand the kind of thinking, and I thought I would have heard something about that, that would have moved the Government to build two new secondary schools — it is true that one is replacing an existing school — less than a mile apart.

Dealing with spare capacity, the population figures suggest, and this is very easy to tell — if the Government would look at the numbers of the primary school population *vis-a-vis* the primary school population of a year, two years or five years ago, they would see it — that the primary school population has fallen, and therefore the demand for secondary school places will ease as the years go by. The Government has to decide whether its policy is to wipe out the private secondary schools. As I say, there are about 4 000 children in Barbados in private secondary schools, and if we provide 2 400 new places, it would mean that we are eating into the 4 000 of the approved secondary schools at the moment, so that leaves 1 600, and if you take into consideration that with the falling birth rate the numbers of children going to secondary school are falling year by year, it is not beyond belief that within five or ten years there may only be 1 000 or fewer children then available for the private secondary schools. I would like, therefore, to know whether the Government intends as a matter of policy, or is all this an accident, to wipe out the private secondary school system in Barbados, because this is on the direct road leading to that result.

I also want to ask a number of questions. I do not believe the Minister would be in a position to answer them today, but I think the Government should ponder

on them and at some future stage give us, the people, some information on these things. I would like to know, Sir, and I thought perhaps this one could have been given us today, what would be the recurrent cost of providing 2 400 new secondary school places.

There is a lot of talk that the Education budget has been growing by leaps and bounds, although anybody who is a serious Barbadian citizen does not quarrel about the proper use of spending on education, and I stress the word "proper". However, it is imperative that in times like these, when the Government finds itself in very difficult waters in respect of its finances, we should not be incurring new expenditure without a serious study being done in that regard.

For 2 400 new secondary school places, Sir, my recollection is that the teacher-pupil ratio is something like 1:27. It was in my time, but they say 1:30. I do not quarrel with that, it is approximately 1:30 in secondary schools. It is higher or lower, however you work these things out, in primary schools, and I think that in the primary schools it is like 1:35. You can work out then how many new teachers would be required for 2 400 more Government secondary school places. You can also work out, and these things can be done in the Ministry of Education and Planning Section in 15 minutes, the per capita cost of secondary education in Barbados, so that you will know how much 2 400 children in secondary schools will cost on a recurrent basis in Barbados.

The Government has to look, for instance, at the discounting of bursaries that they pay for children in the approved secondary schools, and that will help them to get closer to the overall cost of these new places. I want to make it absolutely clear, Mr. Deputy President, that I am not arguing for a denial of quality school places for the children of this country because you can get misrepresented very easily. I do not think anybody is more committed to that than I am, but we have to make sure that we are getting value for money.
3.35 p.m.

That brings me to two other matters I want to talk about in this respect. One I touched briefly on, and that is the catchment area and the logistics of having those schools there in relation to the general catchment area, transportation facilities, and so on. The other relates to the suitability of standard, secondary education for these additional places.

Let me deal with the second one first. If you look at the figures of the marks that children get in the Common Entrance Examination year after year, you will find that large numbers of them, literally hundreds of them, are not ready or suitable for secondary education, unless you go back to the old system. What was the name of the old Director of Education who introduced.....

(*Aside: Hayden.*)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Hayden introduced this rather ridiculous system of age grouping. So if you could not spell your name and you were the specific age, you must go in Class 7 anyway. That is one of the things that the British inflicted on us and we took, as if we could not think for ourselves. But that has passed.

Do we need secondary school places for a large number of children in the secondary schools? What kind of education is better suited for these children? What kind of school are we building in St. Thomas? Are we building another St. Leonard's, another Parkinson, another Ellerslie? Because if that is what we are doing, in my humble submission, Sir, we are wasting time. Because large numbers of those children who go to those schools, St. George Secondary, the one in Six Roads, St. Philip, are unable to benefit from the kind of education that is being delivered in those schools. Therefore, to go ahead and build new secondary schools — I believe I could use the figures of, say, two or three years ago — for 1 200 children would probably cost close to \$4 million, if not more. And then when you throw in for 1 200 children a minimum of 85 teaching and other staff.....

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: ancillary we are spending an enormous amount of money on a resource that is incapable of benefitting from how that particular money is spent. That again, Sir, is not to say that we must not provide education and training for those people.

I see here that some of the children who did the Common Entrance Examination this year got ten per cent. This ten per cent usually means that they got one question right in the whole paper in English and part of one question right in Maths, and they could have stumbled on that part being right by accident. I am not putting these people down, that is a reality of the system, allowing children to go into secondary schools who literally cannot read. And to build new secondary schools with the same, old system, the literary system, the grammar school system, is doing injustice both to those children and to the taxpayers of this country.

I am asking, Sir, although I suspect it will fall on deaf ears, that the Government give a further thought to this question before they start to build. They have to build, I do not mind them building, but they have to decide what they are building. What kind of institution are they creating? Would it not be better, for instance, if you extended sections of the all-age schools where a number of these children can go to those schools and be taught in remedial education so that they have a better chance of making it in the world when they finish, rather than

wasting their time and everybody else's time in secondary schools where they just cannot comprehend what is being taught and finish up, after three or five years, no better off than when they entered. In fact, they finish up a lot worse, because they are terribly frustrated, they become indisciplined, they become bitter, and so on.

I want us to look at these things, Sir, and I am asking the Government, when they begin to look at these things, if they have not done it — maybe they have done it, Sir, but they have not vouchsafed that information — to bring into their whole planning the teachers of this country. I know that quite often those in Government have a plan, they go ahead and do what they have to do, and it is only afterwards they can say, 'Hey, perhaps we should have done this.' We have enough time now to ensure that this does not happen to the teachers. The teachers are in the schools. They are teaching these children. The teachers at St. George Secondary can articulate far better than I can ever hope to do what are the problems of this kind of student to which I am making reference. Therefore, I would suggest to the Government to bring them into the planning and get their experience before they go off and set up these schools that would be nothing more than targets for vandalism, as is so common at some of them.

Too often we see a school as a building. We put up a new building and put in equipment and that is a school. A school is a community of individuals, and as in any community, there must be some cement that binds that community together. Therefore, there has to be very careful planning, and not only in a school — if you are building a housing area, you have to take these things into consideration, what will cement a group of disparate individuals, both students and teachers, into a unit of inter-dependence in which all can feel a common belonging to an institution. The experience over the years has shown that Governments in this country, in their anxiety to provide the good thing, universal secondary education — nobody can fault us for that, Barbados must be the only country in the whole developing world that has a universal secondary education system. We had a universal primary education system for over 100 years. In the last few years, less than probably five or six or seven years ago, we attained, for the first time, universal secondary education, and we are proud of it — in trying to reach that and to bring education to every child to the age of 16. Governments have quite often had to sacrifice quality for quantity — school places for quality of education, fancy new buildings and equipment for education, instead of equipping an individual to maximise his potential. I think, Sir, we can mark time here now, look at this one and give it a little thought.

I do not like giving the Government any useful ideas, because it is like throwing pearls to swine, Sir, they trample on them.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You know that I am going to get there, too.

When I heard Senator Boxill there talking about something came up last week and I asked that we send it back and look at it again and see whether we might not want to change it, I specifically remember that Minister Lewis, who introduced it, said, 'No, it passed through the House of Assembly and it must be all right. I do not see any reason for us to defer it.'

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Yes, but you see, it was deferred — I do not know if that was a rhetorical question — not because I suggested it as a lawyer of some years experience dealing with a legal problem, but because other Senators said, they thought you had better go along with the suggestion. Only then was the decision switched to defer the matter. That is why I say, Sir, that I do not always think that giving any ideas to the Government makes any sense, because it is like pearls before swine. But I feel so strongly about this one, Sir, that I must appeal to the Government to give it further thought. The Ministry of Education at the moment is not functioning in the way that it has been accustomed to function, because of the weakness of the "policy formulators", so as not to call anybody's name. It is quite possible that this has not been given the kind of thought and that the kind of recommendations have not reached Cabinet that would enable them to move away from the expediency of providing a school for St. Thomas, just to say they gave St. Thomas a school, to the more important aspects of providing what is best at the right price in the circumstances.

3.45 p.m.

I want, Mr. Deputy President, to talk about this catchment area. Has the Government really worked out how many children of secondary school age travel from the north eastern part of Barbados to Bridgetown? I am not talking about the ones that come from St. Lucy on the main highway on the coast. I am talking of the ones who come from St. Andrew and parts of St. Joseph and St. Thomas, which will be the natural areas from which children who are to be taught at a school at Cane Gardens will come. I think if we have not done that particular study, we need to do it, and it has to be worked out in relation to the traffic management of the Transport Board, because this is going to involve a fairly substantial change in bus scheduling in the rush hour in the morning time, and to a lesser extent, on afternoons. I want to know if this has also been considered. It will obviously involve people coming from town and going to St. Thomas, because I am absolutely sure that there are

not enough numbers coming from St. Andrew, St. Joseph, and St. Thomas to fill up the new secondary school at St. Thomas.

This brings me to the question of zoning. Zoning is a word that has been bandied about in relation to education for many a year. When some impact was made on the problem for the first time without any major dislocation, the new Government very unceremoniously and recklessly changed the whole plan. The Ministry of Education, about three or four years ago, decided that there was a need for the rationalisation of travel to schools, that the situation in which somebody who lived in Water Street, Christ Church, next door to the Foundation School, was going to school at Alexandra in St. Peter was a situation that could no longer obtain because it put an inordinate stress on the transportation services of this country. The Minister of Education, Minister Miller at the time, sought to have a hybrid system, because as I have always pointed out, when we make a revolutionary and abrupt change, it causes dislocation in the society, and when we cannot remedy the wrong we did, the situation at the end is worse than what we try to correct. So she introduced this half-way house where you would cater to the wishes of parents who wanted to have their children in what are considered the premier schools in Barbados, but that if they did not reach a certain level, then they should go to the secondary school in their area, and you would not have children who live in St. Lucy going to St. George Secondary, and children who live by the church in St. George going to St. Lucy Secondary. That was changed unceremoniously without consultation, and a massive confusion has set in. Children are going to school later and later because they cannot get buses. Truancy in Barbados has increased as a result of this kind of situation. In the primary schools, the dezoning, so to speak, has caused even greater confusion, because you are dealing with young children.

It is a fact that children who live in West Terrace in St. James cannot get into the school at West Terrace which they can just walk up the hill to get to, no traffic. They do not have any main road. They can walk up the hill 150 yards, and they are denied places in the primary school at West Terrace. But motor cars are being driven from every end of Barbados and are depositing primary school children at that school. The same situation obtains at Erdiston. Everybody in Barbados understands why these things happen. There are a handful of Government primary schools in Barbados that are considered by their records to be good schools. I do not know what they are now, but in my time there were schools like St. Paul's, Wesley Hall, Hindsbury, Eden Lodge, the one in St. Philip was a remarkably good school, and Westbury. Parents from all over Barbados, as a natural instinct, want the best for their children, so they bring them from one end of the island to the other.

I have no problem with that, Sir, but I would expect that you would take care of the children who live in close proximity to the schools in the first place. There are children from Carrington Village, just down the road, who are denied places in Erdiston Primary School, but children come from St. Lucy, St. Andrew, St. Philip, St. John and St. George go there. Something has to be wrong with that system. I believe that if you cater for the local children first, there will still be fairly large numbers of extra places for people who want to come in, because I do not want to deny them the right to come in. All I am saying is that those who live nearby should get the first choice, particularly with primary school children. We are talking about children who are five and six years old, Sir, who have to walk to school by themselves, because there may quite often be one-parent children, and the mothers have to go out and work, and they have to get to work before the children leave for school, and they have to walk to school. It is unfair to ask those children to walk two and three miles to school, or to butt about catching buses at four and five years old when the school next door is available and they cannot get in. I throw this out for the consideration of the Government. I wish that they would give it the kind of consideration it merits.

I cannot sit down before I make mention of some things that are troubling me. The Democratic Labour Party, as the Opposition party, made a big song and dance about the Education Act and certain aspects of it, and put in their manifesto that if they would be elected, they would immediately amend certain aspects of the legislation.

I want to give a very brief background, because I believe my time is short. When the Education Act was introduced in Parliament in early 1981, it was brought after consultation with every single responsible body in the educational establishment — BWU, BSTU, National Parent-Teachers Association, and the Association of Headteachers. Everybody was brought in consultation and went through every single clause in that Act, and every clause that was presented to Parliament was agreed to by every sector of the educational establishment in this country. Nobody put in a reservation to any clause in the final result. The unions were so happy with the result that when it went before Parliament, not a single teacher representative was in the gallery in Parliament, because they figured they had nothing to complain about. They were quite comfortable and happy with it.

But more, Mr. Deputy President, the then Opposition, the Democratic Labour Party Opposition, got up and spoke in favour of the Act and voted for it, and it was carried unanimously without any contention on the floor of Parliament. Some time after the Bill became law there was some confusion about interpretation, and suddenly the Democratic Labour Party, like Pontius Pilot, washed their hands of this Act they had spoken in favour of and voted for, for strictly political reasons,

and said that if they became the Government, they would move to amend certain sections. I do not know what sections, Sir, I really do not know. Two years have passed and they have not amended a comma, colon, semicolon or a full stop. Nothing have they amended, nor have I heard of any movement to amend anything. In the meantime, the problems that cause the confusion remain, and they relate, Mr. Deputy President, to the authority of headteachers in the schools and their authority *vis-a-vis* the Ministry. I think that these things should be resolved, and I am calling on the Government to honour that particular promise, because if they are going to wait until another crisis blows up, then that would be the height of irresponsibility.

3.55 p.m.

Another question arose as to whether it was constitutional for the Act to make teachers under the old secondary schools, who were appointed by governing bodies, civil servants. That has not yet been resolved, but in the meantime, we do not hear anything from the Government in respect of it.

There was the question of the Lodge School and the headmaster and his status. For two years the Government raked the previous Administration over the coals for what was only an unfortunate lapse in terms of the interpretation of the particular action — nothing malicious — they did not even claim that — and they said they would do something about it. The headmaster, the former headmaster or whatever he is — I mean Mr. Smith, Sir — has been in possession of the headmaster's residence — not only possession, occupation — of the Lodge School for two years since the Government changed and they have done absolutely nothing about it.

These things need to be talked about more, Sir, and we need some answers. I am familiar with the system, and I can see down the road that these things will surface again in other instances, and it is a foolhardy Government that is going to wait until they blow up again then to start rushing around trying to put its house in order.

In respect of the housing aspect of this plan, Sir, I want really to find out how it is that a Government that has no capital development plan can be planning substantial housing areas *a propos* nothing. It is not related to anything. You do not, by your own confession, have a development plan, but earlier today we heard you are going to be setting up a housing area at Lancaster in St. James, and now you are going to start another housing area at Cane Garden in St. Thomas, and we do not hear a word about the experts in the Government. What is their input in relation to housing in these areas? How does it fit in an overall development plan in this country?

One of the things that has hurt this country for centuries, and we have the legacy today, is that haphazard planning has caused a lot of problems in this country. The difficulties that have ensued from a lack of clear vision of what you want to do, projection, and looking at long-term consequences have meant that in Barbados we have what is a maze, the settling of houses all over the place causing a lot of problems in this country. We cannot widen roads because houses are too close to where you would acquire land, and the cost of replacing these buildings is so high you cannot afford to do it.

We have a problem, for instance, with tenancies, where people drop houses wherever they feel like, and now that the Government wants to put in sites and services, they cannot build a straight road anywhere, because houses zigzag all over the place and any new road will have to be bobbing and weaving around them. We should learn from that kind of experience, and something tells me that to go ahead and plan for a housing development at Cane Garden in St. Thomas around the secondary school, without a thorough study by whatever you call the committee these days, the Priorities Committee or National Planning Committee or whatever name you give to it these days, and allow all the diverse elements in Government who should have a say in these things, to go ahead and plan without that, to my mind, is a serious error. Again, I am asking the Government that if they have not done that, that before they make headway with these plans, to make sure that just that kind of study is done.

I want to hear, too, Sir, about the Ministry of Agriculture, because increasingly the Democratic Labour Party Government, true to form, thinks nothing of taking prime agricultural land out of production and putting it in housing and other construction. There is a lot of marginal land in Barbados, and I believe that when Government is looking for land for playing fields, housing development and schools and other public buildings, it should pay some attention to the difference in quality of the land that is being used.

I do not know, Sir, the quality of the land at Cane Garden. All I know is that in recent times I have seen an industrial park, a lot of houses, and a playing field at Bridgefield. Some of these things were done when the Barbados Labour Party was the Government and some were done when the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, so members on the other side can feel some comfort in being in good company. But good company or not, and I have always expressed this inside and outside of Government, I have a continuing and abiding concern about the environment in Barbados, and I was saying it at a time when talk about environment in this country was considered esoteric, nobody could understand what you

meant — now it is on the lips of everybody — and I think that careful planning is absolutely necessary if we are to keep Barbados a place that is attractive, beautiful and a place that is easy and comfortable to live in.

Mr. Deputy President, those are my few observations and I wish the Government, if they see any merit in anything I have said, to really give them some consideration and spare generations yet unborn the many problems that we might be creating for them today.

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: Mr. Deputy President, I rise in support of the Resolution, and I want to say that a few things the last Senator said concern me a bit. One is that it is the right of every human being in this country called Barbados to education, whether you be dull, not so bright, bright or whatever the case may be. People have different types of talents and they can develop their skills. We have education for the handicapped and the disabled, and they are able to make a living, so when I hear statements that people will not be any use to themselves or to the society because they get this amount of marks or whatever, it worries me, it makes me feel as though because somebody is not Queen's College or Harrison College material, this person is dumped from the society.

The attitudes to education in this country comes not only from the people who are involved in education. Because of the stigma attached to many of these newer secondary schools, people feel that if you make it to one of these schools, their son has not made it. I heard of a very sad story the other day where a mother told her son that if he did not make it to Harrison College, he had to leave. I understood the boy dressed in his pyjamas one evening and said to his mother, "Goodnight and goodbye". She went to him and asked, "Why did you say goodnight and goodbye?" He said, "Because the exam is coming up next week and there is no point my living." When she went she found that the boy had weed killer to destroy himself.

4.05 p.m.

We here in the Senate have a responsibility not to just speak because we have a mouth. We have a responsibility to encourage those students. Some of them might be our own children, our own cousins, to see that they fall into the stream in which they can do best, and presently I have seen more and more divisions of education being expanded in our country.

Those of us who visited the exhibition at the old terminal building by the Manufacturers Association would have seen work from the handicapped, the physically disabled, the mentally disabled and also the blind that was of an outstanding quality from which many of those people are making a living, and sometimes a better living than people who are teaching, or in the Civil Service and things of that sort.

I also would like to caution that we must be very careful how we speak, because the children are listening, the adults are listening, and in any society it is very necessary not to make people feel, and I have reiterated this, that they are no use to the society. Indeed, we make people feel dumped before we even give them the opportunity. Since it is the right of every citizen to have an education after the children go to the schools, you have to put them in various streams. If the child is technically-minded, the child goes to a technical stream; if the child is an academic-minded person, the child goes to that stream.

There are some things in our society that we need to watch and look carefully at. I would like to see formal grammar on the curriculum of every single school as a separate subject. We do not hear the honourable member for the Opposition talking about this. We do not hear him talking about restoring the morning fellowship at the schools and putting a little God back into the lives of our children. These are some of the things that are affecting the society, because some students are going to secondary schools, they are coming out with advanced level certificates, but after that they are on drugs. What use are they to the society? They are no more use to the society than the child you are talking about dumping with the ten marks; in fact, the child with the ten marks is more use to the society than that child who is a social misfit. So we have to look at our own attitudes as parents and as responsible people in a legislative Council. This is vitally important.

On the question of children going from one school to another, I have found that you have got to put your best teachers in the primary school system. There is no point about talking about this and that and you do not put your best teachers there, and I have seen this Government make a tremendous attempt in putting a lot of the good graduate teachers there. For that I am very happy, and I congratulate the Government for doing that, because there is no difference in pay if they are graduates. Put them there because you know they can teach.

Getting a degree does not mean you can teach. A lot of people have degrees and they cannot teach, and this is another stigma that we have brought about in this society. We are making people believe they are qualified because they have a degree. A degree in what? You must always ask the question. Because I have a degree in Chemistry, am I suitable to teach English Grammar to a child in a school? "No" is the answer. Therefore, this whole class system, that you must make it for this, you must make it for that, is wrong.

We in the Democratic Labour Party are committed to a better life for all the people in this country, and if we are committed to this, we cannot say that we are not committed to those children who are not as bright as the others. We are committed to all of them. We are

committed to see that all of them, within their limitations, use their ability for the better life which we envisage for them in the future. We are also committed to seeing that they use the ability which they have to generate employment for themselves, or employment for other people, by acquiring a necessary skill. This is vitally important.

The whole question of grammar, Sir, is a very sore point in this community. I have heard professors saying, and they have spoken it quite publicly, that they are ashamed, and business people as well, when they receive letters of application from people who have a big degree behind their names. This means that it is not only the ones down there who get ten marks, it is the ones who have gone through the formal system who cannot write a proper sentence.

As for putting punctuation marks, I have had letters that come to me, and many times I put a red dot for a full stop because they did not know where to put a full stop. They do not know where to put a punctuation mark at all in these letters. Sometimes it goes on like one continuous article you are reading. These are things that we must look at.

Even in the news media, with all respect to the news media, you hear some pronunciations that are terrible. The language used is really disgusting sometimes. These are things that are happening in a society.

With respect to the Education Act, I heard in here that we did not do anything to try to amend it. That is not correct. I sit on a secondary school board and it came to us. We sent our suggested amendment to the Ministry of Education, so I want to make it clear that that is not correct.

In that Act, a lot of power was taken away from the head teacher or principal of the school, and what we have tried to do in the recommendations we made was to restore that power back to the headteacher or headmaster or principal. It just said the Minister shall do this, the Minister shall do the other, the Minister, the Minister. Nothing said the headteacher or the principal, and we could not understand how in God's name a headteacher could be in charge of a school, in charge of all the people who work there, and yet did not have the power to do a number of duties that we normally associate with being the principal administrator in a school. I must say that the amendments are with the Ministry of Education, and I am sure that they are going to amend it, and many headteachers are very pleased about the fact that their power is being restored, because they felt absolutely lifeless with the power taken away from them. That is what helped to erode the system and to make teachers feel very unpleasant, indeed, working in a situation where they had no

authority or power or the headteacher had no power to tell them what to do.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. Deputy President, the whole matter of education for all is a very serious business. It seems clear to me that the last Government was not very serious about education when they could stop the adult education programmes in the evening for people who wanted to continue their education. In Barbados, we talk about continuing education for all, and we had in the evening, classes for persons who perhaps did not get their five "O" levels to be appointed in the Civil Service, or who wanted to start from scratch again, or to build on what they had learnt before. They were denied that privilege. I used to teach in that programme and I know it came to an abrupt end. For those persons who wanted to take jobs in restaurants and so on, those courses were stopped too, what we used to call the Canadian Domestic Course, when we were preparing people for Canada at the time.

I understand from the Minister of Education, because I asked him the question — I am very concerned about it, because there are many women and men out there who want to continue their education — and he assures me that this is going to start again. I say thank God for that, because we found that a number of young people have been going to all of these various colleges, paying away a lot of money they cannot afford, whereas the Government was either offering it free or at a very, very small fee. They were also able to remain in their own villages. If they lived in Bawden, St. Andrew, they went to the school down there in the evening. They did not have to come back to town, or wait in town, and then cannot get home at night. That has affected many of them because some of them do not have the money to pay to these various institutions. And sometimes they walk about with books for years and they still do not get anything, because anybody opens one of these places. I have seen some of the people who have opened these colleges, Mr. Deputy President, and I wonder what is happening. And you just hear, 'I am going there, and I have been going there for three years, four years, and nothing has happened.' So we are very happy that the Democratic Labour Party Government has seen it fit, and this is a Government that cares about people, to restart the adult education programme.

I say in closing, Mr. Deputy President, that we are the people who started free secondary education in this country, no matter what anybody says, and as a result of this, many people have been able to do better in life. As I said we did not only start it for those persons who can do well and are geniuses, but also for those persons who are copers, who have been able to work hard at it and have been able to achieve, and by achieving, they have been able to continue, and in continuing, they have been able to get a job and raise the standard of life of their

family. Many a boy has been able to help his mother to repair that house and make it comfortable because of the free secondary education. Again I congratulate the Democratic Labour Party on this wonderful move that we believe in education for all.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, I would not be long. A number of the things I had hoped to say have been said eloquently by Senator Tull.

I have a concern in terms of the school for which this land is being acquired, about the statement carried in the media during this week as to the role of that school, and the increasing tendency, Sir, on the part of the Administration to see a school roll of 1 000 or plus as a desirable target in a school. I would like to respectfully suggest, Sir, that that be reconsidered.

I was chairman for a number of years of the St. Leonard's Girls' School, a school with a roll of close to 1,300, and a school of that number creates horrors for the administration. It can be likened to having a captain taking a large tanker laden with oil through the English Channel, a very hazardous operation. The headmistress or headteacher of a school of that size ceases to be a teacher and becomes only an administrator. The size of the plant means that you do not have a chance for interaction with the students in the school. I have discussed this with a number of school teachers and they hold the view that the optimum number for comfortable administration and to permit them to be teachers, and that is what they all argue essentially, is between 750 to 800. And I share Senator Tull's concern that with the shrinking population base of school children in the country, you might find a situation that you have more schools than you have places for children. If that can happen, then you could perhaps deal with it on the basis of spreading them out more, rather than having schools with too large numbers.

Another concern, Sir, is this, what are the schools teaching? Monday's paper carried the marks for the Common Entrance Examination. When you list them, Sir, the ten older secondary schools are the ones which came out the first, the old ten got the first ten places, with the result that good schools are perhaps reduced to having a number of people sent to them by the computer with very low scores.

Senator Tull made reference to the change in policy in terms of zoning, in that instead of the seven options that forced people to look at where they lived and making choices, after the first island choices, of four which were to be in a geographical area near where they lived, you now have a choice of 15. I do not know if everyone necessarily analyse how to construct the 15,

but I am aware of a parent whose child lives within one bus from Grantley Adams, West St. Joseph School, but because of the random picking marking system, it has now been assigned to the Garrison, to come down to town and go back up, with a mark that in another structure would well have got it into either certainly West St. Joseph or a school nearer to where it lived than is now what is happening.

My concern about education, Sir, is that I think education is really too important an issue for it to be the subject of the political football. One thing done by the last Administration was to provide for a uniform allowance of \$100. With the greatest respect, it is a waste of time. It really means nothing to the overall scheme in delivering education when there are a lot of other things around in the system.
4.25 p.m.

I have a concern, Sir, that in the overall structure of education, a lot of things go by the board in terms of discipline and uniforms. If you stand up outside and see the children coming down and just watch their feet, and they all are coming from the same school, you will see that they are going to be wearing all kinds of different shoes. The socks are all types of shades. There is no measure of uniformity. In the girls' schools, their uniforms have not got what I call "space" in them. They fit like some jeans, that is, you have to get in the bed to put them on.

Sir, could we not look and see whether we do not need more technical places? When I went to school, a part of each school had a technical wing. When the wings were not there, you went to the Technical Institute at Richmond. There is need for children to get a technical vocation without necessarily having to go through the whole system and then leave and go to Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, so that, as an option, it is there early.

The other question is, should we not be looking at another review for entrance into a secondary school at, let us say, age 13 years. In the so-called bad old days when you did every school's examination and you could do it up to 13 or 14, a lot of boys and girls at 14 years got into secondary schools when they were in the senior first grade, because they were late developers, and did very well. But now at the age of 11 or nearly 12, if your birthday is coming in September, you are branded for life.

I have another concern about the teachers in the newer secondary schools. A mother who was at my home last night made this point, "I am the same teacher as the teacher at Harrison College. I am not here to be any remedial school teacher, whether it is St. Joseph or St. Leonard's. So do not expect me to do a job function that my colleague who is getting the same salary as myself is not doing at the older schools." This is one of

the problems in education that we must confront. I do not know how you are going to deal with it, but this is an issue we must confront, and creating and building new schools is not going to address the problem.

Over the last couple of weeks we have seen the results of children who have been successful, and it is encouraging to note that a good many of those who obtained high marks were products of the Government primary school system. But like an observation made earlier, Sir, a lot of those children are bused in or driven in from outside of the catchment area where the schools are situated. I am pretty sure the girl who has the highest mark did not live in the Government Hill area, but she attended the Charles F. Broome School.

To put it in a nutshell, I would like to see a national consensus on education on where we are going and what is the end result. We spend a lot of money on education. We pride ourselves on our secondary education and our free university education. It is an irony, Sir, and I learned this a few months ago, that those who win a Barbados Scholarship are bonded to return and work in Barbados as the condition of the award. There is no bonding requirement for someone who attends Cave Hill, and it is a similar commitment to expenditure as if you had got a Barbados Scholarship. It is ironic that you have got the blue ribbon award hog-tied, that you must come back and pack it back. A parent, some time ago, rang me and asked me for the form of bond that is necessary, because his daughter, who had won the scholarship, had to give a bond that she will return to Barbados. He did not know that bond was required. Those people who are going to Cave Hill should have some obligation to pay back something to the community, whatever it is, or remove the bond from those who win the Barbados Scholarship.

Sir, the St. Thomas Secondary School is something that the Government is committed to, but I would like to think that in the construction of the school, and looking at the whole structure of secondary education, the legitimate concerns raised by Senator Tull should be looked into, and my concerns, too, and the things raised by Senator Fraser. Because I do not think that we should make a political football of education. It is something that all Barbadians are committed to. We might differ slightly in degree, but we should not use it as an instrument to score points.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy President, I would just like to make a few observations on this Resolution to acquire land for the building of a new secondary school in St. Thomas and also for housing.

First of all, I know that when the mover comes to reply on behalf of the Government he will state the

Government's policy on Education. Government in its policy must be committed to the advancement of secondary education for all children in this country, and for that reason, we have to have more secondary schools where we see the need for them. Although some might talk about excess capacity, we must not make the mistake in not providing as many places as possible should the need arise for people to get their secondary education, which everyone in this country is entitled to. We have cases where people did not go to a secondary school, but might be fit and proper persons for a university education. That is a very big possibility. It happened on various occasions that people who did not attend a secondary school were found to be very good people at university level. So a Government cannot play around with its policy by saying that it may become too over agitated at the time and then not provide those places.

4.35 p.m.

I should like to turn my attention to the points made about the newer secondary schools. I think that we should be giving praise to the teachers in those newer secondary schools due to the very fact that we are hearing about a ten per cent cut off mark for the St. George Secondary School. All of those teachers in the modern secondary schools have had to cope with children at that level, and they do make something of them, so I would think that more praise is deserving on those teachers who now work very hard in secondary schools on the kind of material they have been given to teach.

On the other hand, we are a very class society. We always like to praise up all these Barbados Scholars who come out from Harrison College, but we never hear about the other people who drop out from Harrison College and who never get any kind of education at all, and there have been many drop-outs from Harrison College and Queen's College, and the teachers in these schools do not have the kind of people to teach which the other people are subjected to in the modern secondary schools. So if teachers are deserving of praise in this country, we should be more here to praise the teachers in the modern secondary schools for the work they do with the pupils that have been given to them, rather than heap some praises on the teachers who now teach at Harrison College and Queen's College because they get four or six Barbados Scholars a year.

I remember, Sir, that we had a big debate in this country when a move was taken by a former Minister of Education to put all the children in sixth form schools at the Community College in one common sixth form in this country. He got no end of resistance from the people in this country, who felt that their children should not have to go to any Community College in a common sixth form, and they perpetuated the system of all these sixth forms at the older secondary schools on the basis that

this is priority for some people's children who had become very much addicted and elitist in this kind of attitude. We had this problem in this country already.

The teachers in the older schools do not have to work as hard. You give the people in the older secondary schools the best equipment, they get the best pupils, they get the best grounds, they get the best of everything. Nobody looks at the kind of equipment the newer secondary schools have to work with, the kind of environment they work in, and they have to do a job like any other teacher.

You would remember, Sir, that years ago, when we introduced the industrial wings, which was a little step to help with the modern technology, those industrial wings did not go at the primary school level, they went to Harrison College, Lodge School and to schools like that, and when people were already committed to an academic education, they were able to play around and make furniture for their own sport at the time, because they had no intention of becoming engineers or anything like them. I am only showing you how we were so prejudiced in our approach. I would have thought that at the primary school level, when we used to have the kitchen gardens and the little carpenter's workshop, we should have extended those things at the time, so that when a person had to do the Common Entrance at 11 years old and did not gain entrance into a secondary school, our education at that level, should have been geared to that child's education by way of technical education from that point onwards, and whatever Arithmetic or English we teach him, should be geared towards his vocation. But we continue to teach those children at primary school the English and Arithmetic, academic subjects, long after they have failed the Common Entrance Examination up to 14 or 15 years old. That is where the trouble has come from in this country.

We have continued to teach those same children, when they have failed to make the Common Entrance Examination at 11 years old, the same kind of academic nonsense as if they were pursuing some education to become grammarians or something like that. We should at that point channel those children, so that when they reach 16 years in the all-age schools, they would have had some technical idea and know something about measurement, mensuration to equip them to go on to the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic and carry on their education in a technical vein. It means that when you reach the age of 18, you went through the grammar line, you have 'O' levels, and I have eight City and Guilds, too. There is no kind of distinction between you and me. If anything, I will be a better man than you, because I will be able to contribute to the working world far earlier than you can. I will have a useful skill which could be sold to anybody, even by way of emigration, because Canada will take in people who have a technical skill.

Only ten per cent of our population ever see a university, and yet the whole education system in this country is geared towards that kind of education, unmindful of what happens to the other 90 per cent of people who will never see a university at all as long as they live. I know that the Government is committed to building a polytechnic in the south and one in the north, but I think that we should be very busy now trying to upgrade the kind of facilities available at primary schools in order that, early o'clock, when the children have not been able to make the Common Entrance Examination, they can get tuition in how to adjust themselves to a trade, vocation, whatever have you, to make a meaningful contribution to their advancement in later life.

I think, Sir, that where the trouble resides is in the class system which has been perpetuated by the older secondary schools, even in the associations, because we have a Secondary School Association, we have the BUT, and there is always a distinction down the line all the time, and at the end of the day you hear the results are not good. But we have to strengthen the primary school and pay more attention to the modern secondary school and encourage those teachers, because they have to do the remedial work on these pupils. When they get them, they cannot read, they cannot write, and it is they who carry the brunt of the system now, and they are the ones who are mostly insulted. All the praise goes to the older secondary schools because they produce scholars, and once you produce scholars the system is good, but there are a lot of setbacks at the other schools and they do not have to work as hard as the ones who now work in the modern secondary schools.

Sir, I would like to give my support to this Resolution and to reaffirm my belief in the fact that the Government cannot do it piecemeal, we must at this time provide the opportunity whereby every child in this country can attend a secondary school, and at the same time keep the accent on the technological advance, where we should be trying to channel the ones who fail to make the grammar side of education, and put them in a position that they also can benefit under the educational system.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, this has been a very interesting debate, as all debates on education tend to be, and I am not able to respond now to most of the points which have been raised, because they are not only extremely important, but they would require, for a proper treatment of them, considerable research and detailed application. I have made notes in my mind of about a dozen of them, and that is a lot. I shall draw the Minister's attention to them, although I have no doubt that to some of them, his attention is being drawn almost every day.

I, as a general rule, though perhaps not as an absolute rule, do not like to speak on education matters,

because, quite frankly, although I have had some experience of them, I do not feel very qualified to lay the law down. I am not saying this sarcastically, I really listened with great interest to people's views. I have some of my own, and I shall state them very briefly in a few axioms.

4.45 p.m.

In the first place, I believe that when you find yourself criticising an educational system, that is probably one demonstration that the system is a good one, because it has always seemed to me that only a very good educational system could lead you to discover its own defects. This may be a bit of a paradox, but I cannot imagine a thoroughly bad educational system assisting anyone to find out that it was a bad system. The inputs which they would need for application of their powers of discrimination would not, of course, come from a bad educational system, so that I think that *a priori*, at any rate it would appear to me that while we ought not to be complacent, certainly, about the system we have developed, we can take some comfort in the fact that it is good enough to enable us constantly to see its defects.

Something else, I think, flows from that, and that is, it would in my judgement be entirely impossible to devise a thoroughly bad educational system, because to devise a bad educational system deliberately would require, again paradoxically, such a tremendous breadth of intellect that it would be a waste of time trying to make a bad system; you might as well spend that time on making a good one. So here again I think that we ought always to face up to the challenges of the defects in the system, because the discovery of these defects tends to make us produce a better system and to give improvements where these are necessary.

I think that in a democratic society you are faced with several challenges in education. One of the challenges is that you certainly have to make provision for teaching everybody; therefore, you are bound to discover that all of your schools are not up to the same standard, all your teachers are not up to the same standard, all of your equipment is not up to the same standard. This, I think, has to be remedied, but it cannot be remedied overnight, because in the very act of providing facilities for everybody, there will be an uneven balance in that respect.

Secondly, a democratic society requires not only that you should attempt to teach everybody, but that you should teach nearly everybody, or whoever wants to be taught, as much as they want to be taught, and, therefore, you have to provide a wide range and variety of topics. This, of course, leads to the distinction between what is an academic education and what is not. You have to live with that distinction and deploy the resources, according to what is required at any given time, to meet the needs of whatever section of the school population you wish to serve.

The very last point I want to make is a point of general application, and it is how I feel about education. I would not like to see an educational system which, whatever else it had, did not provide for children of exceptional ability, and, I want to stress this, that is why I do not knock the older secondary schools, not because I am a product of one or two of them, but on the general principle that if you do not make provision for children of exceptional ability, you are not really going to make provision for children of any ability, because some section of the society must be the motivating force for the others. Indeed, in order to get to the point where children of exceptional ability can be well served, you have to produce and provide from your resources a very high level of standards for everybody so that the really gifted can emerge. I therefore hope that in whatever we do, we will always keep it before our minds that the educational system is always better off when the truly gifted can be produced from it in larger and larger numbers.

The argument, therefore, about spreading the net them, because until you make opportunities available for more and more, you are not really going to be satisfied that you are really getting at the exceptionally gifted. I am not an egalitarian in that respect, because I believe that the more brilliant people you produce, the more immediately good people will be produced from them, because the motivation to achieve will always be set by those who are clever, and I want to stress this. It is not ever a question of doing for the most brilliant and doing only for them because you cannot do for any others. It is, rather, a question of making your resources stretch in as many directions as possible so that you do not ever lose sight of the possibilities of attending to the children of exceptional gifts, and I would like our society, whatever else it does, to make sure that the brilliant can emerge.

I add a rider here. I do not know if anybody has ever thought of it, but when I was Minister of Education this crossed my mind, but I suppose that in the rush of every other consideration it did not get very far.

We generally speak of the grammar schools or the older secondary schools as producing the academic types. In my judgement, a lot of education is purely academic, so if you had a brilliant nuclear physicist or a brilliant computer technologist of first class achievements and attainments, I cannot see them reaching those heights unless they had firm academic groundings, and Maths, Chemistry and Computer Science are as much, in a certain sense, academic subjects as are History and Geography.

The point I was making is that I had felt that if we were going to make any new experiments in education at all, we ought perhaps to see whether we could not establish in what one would call one of the older secondary schools, but which would, in fact, be a new one which did nothing but train people in the sciences,

in Mathematics and so on, rather than having a system whereby everybody goes through the same mill, and only perhaps in the fifth and sixth forms you see where the drift for specialisation is, and then happily three or four people every year, or perhaps as many as half a dozen come out with exceptionally good results in the 'A' levels and get Barbados Scholarships in Science and Technology. I would rather like to see a school which identified this particular bend from early, from, say, the third form on identify children of this exceptional bend in technology and science, and have a grammar school which was that kind of school, so that just as in the old days when you would have it said that Harrison College and the Lodge School were the schools that really turned out the Latin and Greek specialists, you could have a school of which it could be said this is the one that if the child does show exceptional bend or achievement potential for computers and he is even now in the second form at Harrison College, move him from there over there as quickly as possible and produce some brilliant examples in these fields.

This is how I feel about it, and perhaps it may come to that. If our school populations are, in fact, statistically declining and we are left with a lot of school plant with fewer and fewer children, it may well be now that this may be the urge for us to look at those specialisations, and not only in Maths, Physics, Science and Computer Studies, but it could be even in Music and Painting. There may be children of exceptional talent who are going to become the artists of the future whose talents can be discovered at the secondary level in specialists schools of that nature.

4.55 p.m.

I think that Barbados is the kind of place that can produce this sort of educational system. While we are now lamenting the defects in the system, it could well be that these defects could be used as the occasions for showing us how we could advance along entirely different and entirely challenging lines in the future. So I

do not despair of our system. As I said, it has to be a good one, because everybody is criticizing it, and to me only a very good system could show up its own defects.

I have made a mental note of the points, all about the size of schools, the necessity for correcting the zoning, the transportation problems and all the other problems, and I certainly will draw them to the Minister's attention. But I thought I should share these few personal thoughts and observations with the Senate.

Thank you.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I think, Sir, we have completed today's Order Paper. I want to thank Senators for their attendance and co-operation. I did not quite think we had done as much as we appear to have done.

At this point in speaking I have no means of knowing what will come from the Other Place within the next week or two. I do not think they met yesterday. I believe that there is some Budget legislation to come when they have disposed of it. The most I can do is to adjourn *sine die*, which I now do.

I beg to move that the Senate adjourn *sine die*.

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

CONTENTS

MOTIONS RELATING TO SITTING

Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR 851

Appointment of Acting Chairman of
Committee.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

LAND (ADJUDICATION OF RIGHTS AND
INTERESTS) (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1988. 851

(d.r.)

Senator Lewis, 851; Senator Wickham, 852;
Senator Blackman, 852; Senator Jones, 853.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
LANCASTER, ST. JAMES RE HIGHWAY
2A 853

Senator Tudor, 853, 862; Senator Prescod,
853; Senator Tull, 856; Senator Goddard, 858;
Senator Wickham, 858; Senator Comissiong,
858; Senator Blackman, 860; Senator
Morrison, 861.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE (AMENDMENT) ACT,
1988. 863

Senator Clarke, 863.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMEND-
MENT) ORDER, 1988. 864

Senator Lewis, 864, 873; Senator Tull, 865;
Senator Boxill, 869; Senator Jones, 872.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PROUTE, ST.
THOMAS. 873

Senator Tudor, 873.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS ORDER, 1988 874

Senator Lewis, 874.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CANE GARDEN, ST. MICHAEL AND ST.
THOMAS RE HOUSING AND SECONDARY
SCHOOL. 874

Senator Tudor, 874, 884; Senator Tull, 875;
Senator Fraser, 880; Senator Blackman, 882;
Senator Morrison, 883.

SUSPENSION. 863

ADJOURNMENT 886

SPEAKERS IN THIS DEBATE

BLACKMAN, C. A.

BOXILL, N. W.

CLARKE, Hon. C. D.

COMISSIONG, D. A.

FRASER, V. C.

GODDARD, J. S.

JONES, Can. I. McK.

LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.

MORRISON, A.

PRESCOD, T. A.

TUDOR, Hon. Sir James

TULL, L. R.

WICKHAM, J. C. W.