THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Monday, March 20, 1989

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Monday, March 20, 1989, at 10.20 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator Sir Frank L. Walcott, K.A., O.B.E., LL.D., (President)
His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President)
Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate)
Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State for the Civil Service)
Senator A. Morrison
Senator N. W. Boxill
Senator D. A. Comissiong
Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, B.S.S., J.P., M.F.C.A.
Senator Mrs. G. L. Eastmond
Senator A. J. N. Phillips
Senator T. A. Prescod
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)
Senator A. W. A. McClean
Senator Miss V. P. Brathwaite

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is in session.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRESIDENT: There is a Message to the Senate: "This House has received with thanks the Message of the Honourable the Senate and the sentiments therein and is pleased to accept the invitation of Your Honourable House to attend the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 9th March, 1989 at 9.45 o'clock in the morning to wait upon Her Majesty the Queen for the presentation of Addresses by both Houses of Parliament in celebration of the 350th consecutive year of Parliament in Barbados."

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

The Estimates 1989-90.

The Civil Establishment Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Annual Report of the Immigration and Passport Department for the year ended 31st December, 1986.

The Annual Report of the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for the year 1987.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before the House goes into the business today, I should like to take this opportunity to welcome the two new Senators Senator McClean and Senator Brathwaite.

I hope they will have a peaceful and resourceful period in the Senate.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 45(1) and 45(2) in order to facilitate the work of the Senate today.

The question was put to the Senate and was agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I beg also to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1989.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order No. 1.

Order No. 1 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate it for the service of Barbados for the year ending 31st March, 1990.

SENATOR THE HON. DR. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. President, as we embark upon our debate on the Appropriation Bill and its Schedule, the Estimates, we as Senators would do well to bear in mind that the Estimates exercise is but a means towards an end and not an end in itself.

During the past week, reading the local print media and listening and viewing the electronic media, we kept hearing about runaway expenditure and over-taxation. So frequently did we hear these two terms that the uninitiated would have been left to conclude that these were ends in themselves and not means towards ends.

Revenue raising measures and expenditures are but components of fiscal policy which, along with monetary policy and management of the public debt, seek to achieve as their goals or ends, economic growth and development, the retention of existing jobs while creating new jobs, so that every adult who is seeking a job can find one, and seeking equilibrium in our balance of payments so that by earning the necessary foreign exchange, we can improve the quality of life by having the necessary foreign exchange to pay for those items which we import.

In addition, taxation and expenditure employed will seek to maintain stable prices so that pensioners and others living on fixed incomes do not find their sources of income eroded by inflation.

The objectives or goals also include the maintenance of a stable currency, the seeking of an equitable distribution of national income so that all the factors for production, land, labour, capital and entrepreneurship may share in the national pie based upon their relative contributions.

As we review the Appropriation Bill and its Schedule, we should seek to determine how well these two particular policies will allow us to achieve these objectives bearing in mind that, at this point, we are dealing mainly with expenditure. Revenue and taxation are usually dealt with at the time of the Budget. And the Capital Estimates seek to do nothing more at this point in time than to bring up-to-date and to bring into the short-term that portion of the Capital Estimates as outlined in the Development Plan.
10.30 a.m.

Thus the revenues which we shall examine shortly must be considered at this point incomplete until such time as the Budgetary measures are made known. Thus any shortfalls in expenditure and revenue and how they gap – I say "gap" in the interpretation because last year when I mentioned "gap" I heard about bridging the gap from a Member who is no longer with us – must only be considered in light of their overall impact upon their principal objectives, that is economic growth and development, job creation, stable prices, equilibrium in our balance of payments, distribution of income, and a stable currency.

As we look at the revenues collected during the year 1989-90 and as we anticipate, if we dare, the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement, we would do well to bear in mind, given the objectives, who will bear the greatest burden of the taxes, the nature of the taxes, and are these taxes imposed or to be imposed to raise revenue or as regulatory devices, and will the taxes fall or can those levies or those taxes be shifted from those for whom they are intended onto the ultimate consumer. Where will the final burden of those taxes rest?

Mr. President, with your permission, Sir, I would like to look now at revenue and expenditure as set out in the Estimates for 1989-90. The Estimates of Revenue for fiscal year 1989-90 are $905,194,430 compared with the Approved Estimates for 1988-89 of $753,412,969 and the 1988-89 Revised Estimates of $866,455,178. These Estimates of Revenue for the coming financial year 1989-90 are 20.1% higher than the Approved Estimates of 1988-89 but 4.5% greater than the revised figure of $866,455,178 for the same year, that is 1988-89. When the surcharge on incomes and corporations is excluded from the Estimates of Revenue, the 1989-90 figure is approximately 7% higher than the Revised Estimates for 1988-89.

The following considerations are relevant to the Estimates of current expenditure for 1989-90. As promised in the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement for 1988-89 as delivered by the Minister of Finance, the surcharge on incomes and corporations will automatically

end on March 31, 1989 and any provisions made within the Draft Estimates of 1989-90 are nothing more than late payments made which will be made in the coming financial year 1989-90. It is not an attempt to impose any new surcharge on either new incomes or the corporations.

Secondly, the Revised Income Tax Estimates for 1988-89 are $95.2 million as compared with $80 million in the Approved Estimates. The levels of refunds of income tax have been considerably lower than the preceding year and the gross receipts from taxation have increased by 21.1% so far in this financial year. It is expected that with the continuing growth in gross receipts and a lower level of refunds the Estimates for 1989-90 will be achieved. I should add at this point that the Department of Inland Revenue is making efforts to enhance and improve its methods of collection so that there should be a marked improvement because of the extra effort being made to ensure that defaulters and delinquents are brought into the tax net at this point.

Thirdly, the Approved Estimates for Corporation Tax in 1988-89 were $65 million but the Revised Estimates were $78.5 million which is 8.1% higher than the actual amount for 1987-88. The projection for 1989-90 is 8.3% higher than the Revised Estimates of 1988-89.

Fourthly, the restructured common external tariff is to be implemented from January 1, 1990 which is the beginning of the fourth quarter of the financial year. The likely impact of this development on import duties and to a lesser extent on consumption tax is not fully known since all the new rates have not been determined. It is anticipated that the revenue loss will be lessened because lower rates on certain goods will reduce the need to grant or maintain concessions at the existing level.

Just for comparative purposes and to show how the various contributions of taxes from various sectors are made, I will just go through. Taxes on incomes and profits considered to be direct taxation, in 1989-90 it is expected that from that source you will contribute 22.7% of total revenue compared with 20.31% in 1988-89. The increase between the current financial year based on the Estimates will represent 34.31%. Taxes on property – it is expected to contribute $48 977 000 in the new financial year 1989–90 and contribute 5.41% for the total revenue for the year compared with $33 902 000 in 1988-89 or 4.5%.
10.40 a.m.

The increase between 1988-89 and 1989-90 is 44.47%. These increases, although rates have not been changed, are a direct result of greater efficiency in the collection of land taxes. Taxes on goods and services are expected to yield in the coming financial year, 1989-90, $295 202 885 and contribute 32.61% of the revenues for 1989-90. These figures compare with $237 594 860 in 1988-89 when the contribution was 31.53%. Taxes on international trade are expected to yield in the coming year, 1989-90, $125 million and make a contribution of 13.81%, compared with $123 million in 1988-89 when its contribution was 16.33%. The increase between 1988-89 and 1989-90 is but 1.63% and I outlined the reason why we do not expect a greater increase and that is due to the coming into being of the Common External Tariff.

Other taxes, we expect to yield $88 800 000 in 1989-90 with a contribution to that year's overall revenues of 9.8%, compared with $106 million in 1988-89, or 14.07% of that year's total revenues. There has been a marked decrease of 16.23% on other taxes when the two years, 1988-89 and 1989-90, are compared. Non-tax revenue is estimated at $51 326 353 with a contribution of 5.67% to total revenues, compared with $42 414 417 and a contribution of 5.63%.

The absolute increase between 1988-89 and 1989-90 is 21.01%. Special Receipts are expected to yield $88 780 100 in 1989-90 with a contribution of 9.81%, compared with $55 895 000 in 1988-89 with a contribution of 7.42%. The change between 1988-89 and 1989-90 is 58.83%. Loans and Advances appear to remain fairly constant in 1989-90 and 1988-89, being $1 608 092 and $1 606 592 in 1989-90 and 1988-89 respectively. The contributions for the two years were 0.18% in 1989-90 and 0.21% in 1988-89. The change between the two years is 0.09%.

A quick glance at the tax structure, since most of the taxes are coming from non incomes and mostly from consumption goods, we could state that the system at this point has mainly been a regressive tax system.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to turn to Current expenditures. The Estimates of Current Expenditure for 1989-90 are 23% greater than the Approved Estimates for 1988-89 and 13.3% higher than the Revised Estimates for 1988-89. Staff costs account for 41.28% of Central Government's current expenditure, and when the staff costs component of the expenditure of Statutory Corporations which receive grants from Government are taken into consideration, Personal Emoluments and staff costs will exceed 50%.

Debt servicing, interest and amortisation account for 25.3% of current expenditure. Interest and amortisation of foreign debt is estimated to be $62.814 million and $129.708 million respectively. I will restate that. Interest and amortisation, two items, on foreign debt is estimated at interest $62.814 million and amortisation $129.708 million. Amortisation of foreign debt has increased significantly over 1988-89 because of the redemption of the Japanese Yen bonds series A 1985 falling due on 28th February, 1990, and the first instalment on the principal in September 1989 for the County Bank U.S. $25 million loan of 1985. The redemption of the Japanese bond is at prevailing

exchange rates approximately $78 million and the County Bank instalment is approximately $14.3 million. Goods and services are approximately 9.6% of the 1988-89 Estimates, whereas they were 10.5% of the 1988-89.

What I should like to do at this point is to have a look at the current expenditure by broad economic classification and compare what has been happening over the years in order to put our discussion into some sort of meaningful framework.
10.50 a.m.

I stated earlier that wages, salaries and other staff costs in 1989-90 will account for $407.2 million. This is 41.28 per cent of the total cost. I do not include at this point provision of staff costs included in the statutory corporations. This figure in 1989-90 compares with $358.5 million in 1988-89 or 44.7% of total expenditures in that year. In 1986-87 the amount was $308.2 million and it accounted for a contribution of 45.4%. In 1985-86 the wages and salaries and other staff costs were $283.3 million or 42% of total expenditures. In 1984-85 the sums were $257.1 million or 42.6% and in 1983-84 it was $219.9 million or 41.7%.

In short then, in 1988-89 the share of total expenditure going to staff costs is lower than most years that we have on record going back to 1983-84. Thus wages and salaries and other staff costs account for 41.28%.

For goods and services of 1989-90 $94.5 million will be expended and this represents 9.6% of total expenditures. In 1983-84 the expenditure was $66.6 million or 12.6% of total expenditure; 1984-85 it was $71.9 million or 11.9%; 1985-86 it was $79.5 million or 11.8%; in 1986-87 it was $75.1 million or 11.1%; in 1987-88 it was $98.3 million or 11.8%; in 1988-89 it was $83.9 million or 10.5%. That is, in 1989-90 goods and services, individuals, salaries and wages have fewer and fewer goods and services to work with at any time since 1983-84, and in absolute dollars in 1989-90 it is below what it was in 1987-88.

Interest payments in 1989-90 will be $105.4 million or 10.7%. This compares with $94.8 million in 1988-89 or 11.8%, $95.2 million or 11.5% in 1987-88; $79.1 million or 11.7% in 1986-87; $69.6 million or 10.3% in 1985-86; $64.4 million or 10.7% in 1984-85; $62.7 million or 11.9% in 1983-84. So over this period the contribution of interest has remained fairly constant and in 1988-89 it is slightly lower than most of the years 1988-89, 1987-88, 1986-87 and even 1983-84.

We now come to amortisation, and we have in 1989-90 $143.3 million or 14.6% of total expenditures compared with $69.9 million or 8.7% in 1988-89. In 1987-88 amortisation was $63.7 million or 7.7%; it was $59.5 million or 8.8% in 1986-87; in 1985-86 it was $37.1 million or 5.5%; in 1984-85 it was $35 million or 5.8% and in 1983-84 it was $30.3 million or 5.8%.

I think since we have had this significant increase in amortisation we should take a hard look at it to find out why in this particular year, I alluded to it earlier but I will develop it here further, the Japanese Loan of $78 million which is due for repayment in the current fiscal year is a one shot one instalment payment. The life of that loan was five years, but rather than having five annual instalments over the period, we are confronted now for the first time of making a full repayment of $78 million, a lump sum. This is what has been referred to as a bullet.

If we look at that and we add that on to the $69.9 million you will find that the figures, if you increase it by one-fifth of what it was if you were making annual payments and just subtract the $64 million from this year, you will find that the amortisation could be pretty well in the order of $68 million.

The subsidies and transfers account for 23.9% in 1989-90 and the absolute amount of $235.5 million compared with $189.7 million in 1988-89 for a contribution of 23.7%, compared with $214.5 million or 25.8% in 1987-88, in 1986-87 $156.9 million or 23.1%, 1985-86 $204.2 million or 30.3%, in 1984-85 $175.9 million or 29.1% and in 1983-84 $147.2 million or 27.9%.

Based on this data which I have just read out to you, it will be found that subsidies and transfers, goods and services and wages and salaries and other staff costs, areas over which we have some control in terms of their relative contribution to the total expenditure figure have been kept in check compared with the series which I just gave, and the major area is the amortisation of $78 million because of the bullet payment.

Now if you are looking at absolute dollars, and I think this is what we have to look at at the end of the day, moving from the expenditure level in 1988-89 of $802.0 million and to those figures you add supplementaries which have already been approved through February, it would bring us to about $863 million to which we add the wages settlement of $30 million in the first year and $10 million in 1989-90, which would give a full amount of $40 million, and then the bullet payment.

In the areas in which we have some control, it would be quite clear that the Government has done and is doing all in its power to keep those discretionary expenditures well within control. As a matter of fact, we are beginning to reach a frightening position where goods and services are now about 9.6% compared with the other years of 11%, that is, there are fewer goods and services available to be worked with and to carry out the business of Government.

To look at it on a functional basis, the general public service in 1989-90 will absorb $142 758 794 or 14.47% of the total compared with $110 060 997 in 1988, so that there has been a slight increase over the two years.

Defence and Security will account in 1989-90 for $22 508 481 or 2.28% compared with $21 529 370 or 2.68%, a slight decrease in terms of the total contributions, although a slight increase in terms of absolute dollars.
11.00 a.m.

Education will contribute $195 217 912 or 19.79% in 1989-90 compared with $169 910 950 or 21.19% in 1988-89.

Health will account for $122 073 869 or 12.3% in 1989-90 compared with $99 524 317 or 12.4% in 1988-89.

Social Security and Welfare will contribute $71 255 233 or 7.23% compared with $64 217 327 or 8% in 1988-89.

Housing and Community Amenities, including Co-operatives, Town Planning and Environmental Sanitation will absorb $23 625 835 or 2.4% in 1989-90 compared with $21 239 220 or 2.65% in 1988-89.

Other Community and Social Services will consume $21 883 306 in 1989 – 90 or 2.2% compared with $18 903 656 or 2.36% in 1988-89.

Economic Services will contribute to expenditures $139 533 250 or 13.95% in 1989-90 compares with $126 768 968 or 15.81% in 1988-89.

Other purposes, including public debt, redemption, interest, etc. account for $249 318 000 or 25.28% compared with $169 860 540 or 21.8% in 1988-89.

These figures can be found on page 4 of the Memorandum of the Estimates. The significant factor here is, and I am still at a loss why Education has not yet been considered as part of the economic services because if we think in terms of the production function, or the revised way of dealing with the production function where output is a function of land capital labour and we differentiate labour and capital between human capital and plant and equipment, then, of course, we should begin to see our funds spent on education moreso within the infrastructure for the development of human capital rather than a social welfare contribution.

We turn now to the Capital Estimates for 1989-90. The estimated capital expenditure for 1989-90 is $218.765 million. I believe this is about $10 million more than appears in the second year of the Development Plan 1988-1993.

The major capital works which will be undertaken by the Ministry of Education consist of the Schools and Training Programme funded by the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank and the continuation of the Sherbourne Centre.

The Ministry of Transport and Works is expected to continue work on the Highway Rehabilitation Project and start the financial assistance from Venezuela, a major tenantry and subsidiary roads project.

On the functional basis, I will just like to compare what is projected to be spent in 1989-90 compared with the current year of 1988-89. In this year 1989-90 we had a total capital expenditure budget of $179 231 314 and we are projecting to spend in this year $218 765 267. In this year 1989-90 we expect to spend $9 628 007 or 4.40% of the capital budget on the general Public Service compared with $5 407 807 or 3.02% in 1988-89.

Defence and Security will account for $2 787 500 or 1.27% compared with $2 469 276 or 1.38% in 1988-89.

Education will claim $41 034 863 or 18.76% of the capital budget compared with $18 867 587 or 10.53% in 1988-89.
11.10 a.m.

The major expenditures under Education are the Sherbourne Project of $6 million, the School Meals Programme of $3 million, Technical, Vocational and Adult Education of $9 million, Secondary Schools will account for $10 million and Primary $8 million. These are the major categories under Education.

Health will account for $26 086 896 or 11.92% in 1989-90 compared with $22 552 985 or 12.58% in 1988-89. Social Security and Welfare will account for $2 419 750 or 1.1% in 1989-90 compared with $1 489 400 or 0.83% in 1988-89. Housing and Community Amenities will account for $24 631 808 or 11.26% compared with $22 800 000 or 12.72% in 1988-89. Other Community and Social Services will account for 0.70% or in absolute dollars $1 525 000 in 1989-90, compared with $1 695 919 or 0.94% in 1988-89. Economic Services will account for $110 651 443 or 50.58% of the budget in 1989-90. This was a slight reduction in terms of the share when compared with the 58.0% in 1988-89 at which time the absolute dollars though were much lower $103 948 340. That is on Economic Services, the absolute change, the increase is 6.45% in 1989-90.

If we were to add, as I suggested earlier, if we were to view Education as nothing more than an infrastructural development of human capital on the total list, then of course we will find that in terms of economic services, we are looking closer to something like 68% close to 70% of the capital budget for economic development in this year.

And this compares favourably with 58% and 10% last year, 68%.

Next, Mr. President, I should like to turn to the fiscal deficit. The gap between current expenditures and current revenue is $18.98 million and the total deficit when Capital Expenditures are included is $299 744 517.

I have attempted in my opening remarks to put in perspective the whole exercise, that we are dealing with as a means towards given ends and that deficit budgeting of itself is not good or bad, a surplus budget in and of itself is not good or bad, or a balanced budget in and of itself is not good or bad. It is at the end of the day what impact that would have on the total economic objectives which I have already enumerated.

I remember a year ago, at page 692 of the Estimates Debate in the Senate on Monday, March 21, 1988, I forecast then that the Barbadian economy would perform as follows. And at that time there was much talk about the sizeable gap, deficit at that time, because gap is some place where you live and has nothing to do with reality. I thought that the deficit was something that was realized once we had all the pieces together. And at this point you are only looking at one blade of the scissors until we know what the revenue measures would be that would be put into place. But at that time at page 692 I stated that I believed we would achieve economic growth of between 2% and 4% in 1988. And the best figures I have at this time are the actual growth based on the most recent figures for the Calendar Year, December 1988, estimated at between 2.5% and 2.8%. I said then that we would strive and the budget was so designed that we would try to maintain a low level of inflation and in the year just ended, on an average basis, we have achieved a 4.9% rate of inflation and on a point to point basis, that is December 1987 compared with December 1988, the figures I have available to me, it was 4.4% while the average rate of inflation in 1987 was a slightly lower 3.4%. A year ago I said we would seek to maintain and/or increase our foreign reserves to cover at least two or three months of imports. And at December 29, 1988 based on the Central Bank of Barbados' daily position, the ratio of external assets to average monthly imports stood at 2.48. I think the preceding year's figure was closer to 2.78, well within the figure projected.

Furthermore, I should hasten to point out of the recent Japanese Loan of $80 million that the proceeds are not included in the foreign reserves since those funds I believe are being held by the Treasury.

At that time, one year ago, I said that we would create more jobs in 1988 than we did in the previous period. And at the end of the third quarter, I regret I do not have any figures for the fourth quarter, I tried to get them, at the end of the third quarter, 1988 100 700 people were employed. These figures are based on the Central Bank's figures, the Monthly Bulletin for January. This represents the highest number of people employed at the end of any fourth quarter. But I am comparing here a third quarter with a fourth quarter which I didn't want to do. I was trying to get the most recent. Anyway I will just compare what I have at this point.

In 1981 at the end of the fourth quarter we had 100 000 employed. In 1982 at the end of the fourth quarter we had 96 000 people employed. In 1983 we had 93 900 employed. In 1984 we had 91 200 people employed. In 1985, these are quarterly figures, at the end of the fourth quarter 92 700. In 1986, 95 800. In 1987, 98 300. And at the end of the third quarter 1988 100 700 people.

It is true that we have scarcely made a dent in the unemployment figure. And I remember last year I also said that, as jobs become more readily available, as you create more and more jobs, people who might have withdrawn from the labour force sometimes, because of the frustration of finding a job, may re-enter the work force and find employment. So while you are actually creating new jobs and retaining old ones, the hard core unemployed tends to remain. But more jobs have been created. And this is one of the objectives of the whole exercise of budgeting.
11.20 a.m.

We said that we experienced growth and we do not operate in a vacuum. Most of our trading partners in CARICOM, especially MDC's, did not record any growth rate. The LDC's did better and I think the Government should be commended especially after the bottom fell out of the market with Trinidad and Tobago that we have been able to at least sustain and achieve a modest growth rate.

Perhaps this was not only achieved by Government's actions but also by creating a climate in the economy for the private sector to, and I will come back to this later, make its contribution and one of the areas we can look at was Government's ability to hold the interest rate fairly constant in the year – the bank rate. That is the rate at which the Central Bank lent to commercial banks. In Barbados, it remained at 8.0% for January through November 1988 – the last figures that I have – while the Treasury Bills rate, the rate at which Government borrows short term actually fell from 4.85% in January, increased slightly to 4.91% in February, again fell to 4.79% in April falling further to 4.71% in May and still further to 4.67% in July where it remained until November, the last date in which I have the Central Bank figures. This is Table E-2 in the Central Bank's statistics, pages 50 and 51.

By maintaining low rates of interest, the cost of money for investment purposes remained fairly low and this would act as a filip to induce companies to invest. If this is true, then we should not be at all surprised to find that gross capital formation actually increased in 1988 from $466.7 million in 1987 and the most recent Estimate I have in 1988

will be $541.7 million. This is the highest level since 1981 when gross capital formation was $525 million.

Perhaps I will go through and compare the various contributors to gross domestic product over the period. We have the projected figure for GDP in 1988 of $3 057 956 000 of which we expect personal consumption expenditure to contribute 62.7% or in absolute terms $1 915 971 000, Government consumption expenditure to be $537 328 000 or 17.6% in 1988, gross capital formation that I just read of $544 million or 17.7%, exports of goods and services $1 536 832 or 50.3% and the imports of goods and services $1 475 493 or a negative contribution to GDP of 48.3%. That is in the external sector. In the external sector there was a 2% increase or contribution to GDP, gross capital formation contributed 17.7%, government expenditure 17.6% and personal consumption expenditure 62.7%.

Now if we were to compare these figures with what happened the preceding year in 1987 and we can find these figures at Table 3-2 in the Economic Report for 1987. The 1988 figures are provisional, but in the Economic Report for 1987 we can find the figures for 1987. We had personal consumption expenditure of $1 915 518 000 or 65.7%. That is in 1988 there was a fall in personal consumption expenditure in terms of its contribution to GDP when compared with 1988.

Perhaps I might as well deal with it at this point. Some might want to attribute this to the imposition of the surcharge. I do not know that this is the whole story as I will show later that savings over the period actually increased and if we accept that disposable income goes into consumption and savings then, given its contribution to GDP in this period 1988 compared with 1987, individuals, and this is on the surface, tended to consume relatively less and saved more than taking the full amount out of savings to maintain the consumption level.

Government contribution in 1988 to GDP in 1988 stood at 17.6% compared with 17.1% which is an increase. Similarly, gross capital formation as I said earlier was at its highest level. In 1987 it was 16% of GDP, in 1986 16%, and in absolute dollars we go from $525 million in 1981 to $450 546 000 in 1982 and $421 181 000 in 1983, $373 947 000 in 1984, $374 844 000 in 1985, 1986 $423 798 000. Exports of goods and services – in 1987 exports from goods and services accounted for $1 354 405 000 or 46.5% contribution to GDP and the imports of goods and services must be read together with that in order to find the net contribution of the external sector of the economy – total $1 320 474 000. The difference between those two was 1.2%. That was the external sector of the economy in 1987 which contributed 1.2% compared with the 2% which we anticipate will be its contribution in 1988.

The increase in current market prices GDP in 1988 we expect will show 5%, although we have already determined the real rate which will be somewhere between 2.5% and 2.8%. These figures for 1988 are very provisional.

Mr. President, perhaps now is as good a time as any to rest the bug-bear of runaway Government expenditure. Going back to the numbers I just read out in Table 2, we find that the Gross Domestic Product is equal to personal consumption expenditures plus gross capital formation plus Government expenditures plus the difference in the external sector of exports minus imports. If there is to be growth then within the economy, net exports contributed in 1987 a meagre 1.2% of GDP and 2.2% provisional figures in 1988 while gross capital formation contributed 16.0% in 1987 and 17.7% in 1988. Then were it not for the level of Government expenditures of 17.1% in 1987 and 17.6% in 1988 and the maintenance of such an economic climate so that personal expenditure consumption contributed 65.7% in 1987 and again 62.7% in 1988 then the end result would be fairly clear that we would have not had any positive economic growth at all. We would have gone back to the stagnation that we encountered during the middle of the 1980's.

As I said earlier, to the extent that disposable income was reduced in 1988 because of the surcharge and other levies, people preferred to reduce the relevant share of disposable income going to consumption while at the same time increasing their savings. If we turn to Page 29 in the January-Central Bank Bulletin, we will find that commercial banks savings deposits by private individuals stood at $661 865 000 at November 1987 compared with $746 840 000 at November 1988, an increase of $84 975 000 or 12.84%. These figures can be found at Page 29 in January-Central Bank Bulletin.
11.30 a.m.

Given the savings position and stable interest rates which Government was able to maintain throughout the period, and the excess liquidity in the banking system, it was no surprise then that we found a significant increase in gross capital formation, that is, the cost of money remained fairly low and constant and with increased savings the availability of money was there, which made it a very, very conducive economic climate.

We heard so much about the negative impact of our policies last year, and in the same vein it is almost a replay of the theme that I heard last year. I should like to look at the performance of some companies which traded on the Stock Exchange over the period, comparing the figures of 1987 with 1988 and to compare the gross sales figures of 1987 and 1988, and their profit margins before taxes for the period, and also look at their retained earnings.

In 1987 A. S. Bryden had a gross sales of $80 382 000, compared with $84 852 000 in 1988, a net

increase of 5.6%. Gross profit before tax in 1987 was $6 249 000 compared with $5 369 000 in 1988, a decline in the profitability before tax, and the retained earnings for the two periods 1987 for Bryden's $3 011 000 compared with $2 070 000 in 1988. Banks Breweries, in 1987 had gross sales of $23 058 000 compared with 1988 $24 381 000, a 5.7% increase. Profit before tax $7 477 000, 1988 $7 916 000, retained earnings $3 377 000 in 1987 and in 1988 $3 179 000. I did not get a figure for Barbados Dairy Industries, but B.E.T. in 1987 gross sales $45 116 000, 1988 $48 888 000, an increase of 8.4%. Profit before tax $19 073 000 in 1987 and $20 125 000 in 1988. Retained earnings $6 911 000 in 1987 and in 1988 $3 519 000. Barbados Light and Power, gross sales in 1987 $110 550 000 in 1988 $111 507 000, a 0.8% increase. Profit before tax $16 109 000 in 1987, compared with $19 110 000 in 1988. Retained earnings $7 314 000 in 1987 compared with $8 133 000 in 1988. Barbados Shipping and Trading, gross sales or turnover $332 534 000 in 1987 compared with $399 309 000, a 20.1% increase, 1988 over 1987. Gross profit 1987 $23 613 000, compared with 1988 $24 592 000. Retained earnings in 1987 $10 518 000 compared with $10 170 000 in 1988. Barbados Telephone Company $89 097 000 in sales in 1987 compared with $80 777 000 in 1988, the rare occasion where actual sales went down by 9.3%, a decline in sales in 1988 compared with 1987. Gross profit, however, in 1988 for Bartel on slower gross sales margin was $6 356 000 compared with $3 033 000, almost double its gross profit before tax on a smaller turnover in 1988 when compared with 1987. Retained earnings in that company in 1987 was $220 000 in 1987 and more than four times as much in 1988 of $885 000. BICO had gross sales of $8 585 000 in 1987 compared with $9 049 000, an increase of 5.4% in 1988 over 1987. Profit before tax was $964 000 in 1987 and $655 000 in 1988, retained earnings for BICO $344 000 in 1987 and $189 000 in 1988. Cave Shepherd & Co. Ltd., $66 640 000 in 1987 compared with $71 784 000 in 1988, an increase of 7.7%.
11.40 a.m.

The profit before tax was $3 909 000 in 1987 compared with $4 545 000 in 1988. Retained earnings amounted to $1 755 000 in 1987 and $2 141 000 in 1988.

Goddard Enterprises $215 402 000 in 1987, in 1988 $233 188 000; profit before tax $7 306 000 compared with $11 211 000 in 1988. Congratulations to the store for that sterling performance. In 1987 retained earnings were minus $43 000 compared with the positive figure of $3 819 000 in 1988, an excellent performance.

Plantations Limited $125 849 000 gross sales in 1987 compared with $107 899 000 in 1988; profit before tax $3 662 000 in 1987 compared with $2 426 000 in 1988; retained earnings $1 988 000 in 1987 compared with $1 496 000 in 1988.

West India Rum Refinery $7 062 000 gross sales in 1987 compared with $7 304 000, an increase of 3.4% in 1988 over 1987; profit before tax $1 243 000 in 1987 compared with $1 368 000 in 1988; retained earnings $836 000 in 1987 compared with $593 000 in 1988.

West India Biscuit $12 532 000 gross sales in 1987 compared with $12 832 000 in 1988, an increase 1988 over 1987 of 2.4%; profit before tax $1 211 000 in 1987 compared with $1 263 000 in 1988, a 4.3% increase and retained earnings $920 000 in 1987 compared with $812 000 in 1988.

The performance of all the companies has been profitable of those listed. They have all been able to make contributions to the capital base through retained earnings, so it is not accurate to say that the impact of the surcharge on profits in 1988 actually hampered companies to the extent that sales were retarded and/or their profitabilities impaired. Not one company was unprofitable in the period.

Against this background I come back to the theme of my presentation today that what we are looking at are expenditures as means towards an end and not as an end in and of themselves, and based on the figures which we have presented to you here today, I will again stick my neck out, as I did a year ago, and state that we should expect a minimum real growth rate in the economy of not less than 2 per cent. We would expect to improve the performance in the external sector of the economy through increasing exports at a faster rate than we do with imports; we expect to create more jobs and maintain existing jobs. We will ensure that there is a stable price level and an interest rate regime if we are to encourage gross capital formation. We will strive to ensure that there is a greater distribution of the national income so that all may have a fair share of the economic cake.

Finally, and this is an area in which we have been rather remiss really, there is the management of the public debt. We have not been as aggressive as we ought to have been in the management of the public debt and in the year ahead of us there will be a more aggressive management of the public debt so that interest payments can be reduced and principal payments more evenly spread out over longer maturities.

On those notes, Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, for two brief moments once at the beginning of his speech and some time towards the middle of his speech, the Honourable Senator Clarke flattered rather briefly, I will say not to deceive but to disappoint. I began to display some interest in what he might have been saying when he indicated at the outset that the Estimates are but means towards ends and not ends in themselves. I most

wholeheartedly agree. And again when he said that a fiscal deficit is not necessarily a good or bad thing in and out of itself, it depends on the overall economic circumstances. He didn't add that part; I add that part. I agree with both of those statements, and I must say that I would like to commend those statements to the Minister of Finance, because it is quite evident that statements emanating from the Minister of Finance in the last Budget debate and even in these Estimates debate indicate that he has a different view.

Our Minister of Finance believes that a current account deficit is something to be avoided like the plague, and so last year when he perceived a $48.6 million current account deficit, he concluded that the economy was headed for the rocks and he endeavoured to correct that situation with $55.6 million in net tax increases. As it turned out the economy was not even headed for a deficit at all. The figures which are now available and to which I will make reference later clearly demonstrates that the economy was on a path which would have generated a surplus in 1988-89 in the absence of any adjustment to the pre-existing tax regime. And so partially because of bad revenue estimation, because of the under estimation of revenue by at least $57 million last year and because of the view of the Minister of Finance that a deficit can only be financed by borrowing with severe repercussions throughout the economy and for other short-comings of his which I will make reference to from time to time, Barbados suffered some of the most draconian tax increases in our history last year.

We had a reversal of Government's own policies which were advanced in their manifesto as a solemn pledge and formed part of a social contract. We had a reversal of those measures and we had the odious surcharges, and so I am pleased to know that at least there is another opinion residing in the Ministry of Finance, an opinion which economists will share, an opinion held by the only economist at the political level in the Ministry of Finance, that is, that Estimates are not a means in themselves but a means towards an end, and even more fundamentally a budget deficit on current account or an overall deficit is not necessarily bad or not necessarily good; it depends on the circumstances. So someone must disabuse the mind of our Minister of Finance from the view that the over-riding consideration of any Minister of Finance is to balance the budget. That is a false and mistaken view.
11.50 a.m.

The budget is one of the most powerful instruments of economic policy available to a country such as Barbados and it should be seen as such and it should be used as such. We must not have any simplistic notions derived from the works of Charles Dickens as expressed in the mouth of Wilkins Micawber, that if you spend a cent more than you earn you are in distress. That does not even operate in the private sphere because we know that we can go and spend more than we earn over a finite period, therefore, income cost is such that we can repay our debt so that McKenzian or Micawbian view of budgeting which never pertained to a nation but to a household does not even pertain to a household but it informs the thinking of our Minister of Finance and that is a dangerous thing for this country.

It is the greatest threat to the well being of this country, the false views of the Minister of Finance regarding what constitutes proper budgeting and so I want to once again express my firm agreement with the honourable doctor, Senator Carl Clarke, that a deficit is not necessarily good or bad. It depends on circumstances.

We will return to that again this year because we have a projected deficit of $80.9 million, almost $81 million in current account in these Estimates and we have capital expenditure projected at $218.8 million and so if our Minister of Finance should continue, in his view, that it is his job to cover that current account deficit by taxation and then generate some funds on top of that, in order to make a contribution towards the capital expenditure, Barbados can look forward to tax increases in the budget of not less than $100 million this year and that would cripple this economy and so that must be avoided.

In standard opposition politics, Opposition members might be sitting back and waiting for that stupidity to occur because you know the ultimate result, the embarrassment of the Government, they will lose the Government and, therefore, the traditional stance of Opposition people is to sit back and wait for such to occur but I am not cast in that mode.

It makes no difference to my attitude of things whether I am here or out there as I was a few years ago and so I am cautioning Government to back away from such stupidity and recognise that you have to analyse the total situation. You must know when to tax and when not to tax. You must know when to run a deficit and when not to run a deficit and, in the present circumstances, this year is one when Government must project, for current account deficit, in relation to the Estimates as presented.

I want to point out one thing further by way of making contact with the view of our Minister of Finance. His idea that current account expenditure should normally be met from taxation is one that economists would give expression to. It is one that I would give expression to. It is one that economists espouse but when I say that, we are not speaking of a current account deficit such as the one expressed in this document. We speak moreso of a current account deficit giving expression in this document published by the Central Bank and used by IMF and other places like that.

In our antiquated expression representation of current account and so on, we have in here amortisation. This year it is over $143 million and we have lending by Government

and those items should be excluded and so we have a situation where if you change no figures at all but the Estimates as presented here show a record deficit of $80.98 million and if the Central Bank were asked to reformulate this document and present it in their style it would show a surplus of, I think, over $60 million, a record surplus on current account so on the Ministry of Finance you have a record deficit, on the Central Bank's view you have a record surplus relating to the same figures.

We should be pleased about the performance based on the Central Bank figures but, of course, this is nothing more than movement. We were going on the rocks last time. This time you must be going for a volcano or something so, basically, I am saying that we need to get it across to the Minister of Finance that his understanding of fiscal policies is flawed. His principle of taxation is totally wrong and it must be abandoned immediately.

Beyond that, it is predicated on a flawed understanding of current account if you want to talk about financing current account expenditure from taxation and that is where we need to start. But, going beyond those two insights by Dr. Carl Clarke, which could not be otherwise because I do not think there is any self-respecting economist who would express a different view. No matter how frequently he has a conflict of a view with his Minister of Finance, no self-respecting economist could say other than Dr. Clarke has spoken on those two points.

I want to say, however, that even in the Honourable Senator Clarke's understanding of the matter, there is room for a little refinement to which I will direct attention, that is, that the Estimates are only a matter of a means to an end. There is also a statement of priorities.

The idea behind that is that we live in a situation of scarce resources and there are myriad things out there that Government can think of and want to do today just as you can think of all the things you would like out of life but your budget cannot reach that far and so we are confronted with choices and the Estimates of Expenditure are expressive of those choices made by the country.

It is expressive of the priority ranking of matters and so when you see something excluded from Estimates or only a limited amount of resources devoted to it, it does not mean that there is a view that that thing is undeserving of cultivation or what have you. It only means that given your scarce resources, and the alternative claims, that is the best you can do and sometimes the best you can do at times is nothing for the time being so that quite clearly, is something that must be understood in relation to Estimates.

The other thing that must be understood in relation to Estimates is that you will have to relate, ultimately, to a kind of financial budget constraint. You cannot adopt the view of our Minister of Finance and believe that you go about and you formulate your Estimates and bring them in with 23% growth, or if you take out amortisation this year and last year and adjust them 15% growth and feel satisfied that because your Ministers have put larger proposals before you and you have cut them down.

The quality of your performance as a Minister of Finance does not relate to what you cut down. It relates to what you approve and you could cut down the moon. Once you approve more than you should your performance is flawed and you cannot hope when you cut it down as a kind of mitigating plea in relation to what you have done and so what we have before us is a set of Estimates that are excessive.

The present Government came into office on a Manifesto which is now known as the New Path Manifesto by virtue of references to the new path in that Manifesto and the whole intention to move Barbados along a new path. We set out a particular strategy as far as budgeting was concerned and that strategy was that if we want to enhance the growth of this economy, we have to take away the overburden of taxation from the economy and to do that you have to contain the rate of growth of current expenditure so that Government expenditure will grow not as fast as the economy in nominal terms and over time this will lead to a faster rate of growth in the economy and Government expenditure will then be able to grow faster in proportionate terms from year to year but representing a smaller amount of an enhanced economy.
12.00 noon.

At the end of the day, Government will be spending more money than if you try to take it all up front and kill the economy. And everybody would be better off. That is the fundamental philosophy behind the Manifesto. I am talking as though I know something about it? Anyway, so basically – any economist ought to know about it. I spent a lot of time studying about development so I can speak on it with authority. Have no doubt about it.

So the basic point therefore is we now have a Minister who abandons that idea of containing expenditure within the rate of growth of the economy. If you have removed amortisation, as I said, rate of growth is fifteen point, I had the figure here but it is 15.1% current account and the nominal rate of growth for the economy, if you allow for 2% as Senator Clarke has indicated, they projected that the economy will grow by 2% this year, and you are going to keep inflation down, that has been 4%, so the nominal rate of growth for the economy is about 6% and you are increasing the Government expenditure by 50, forget your amortisation part of it, by 50.1%. Twice and a half as fast as you should be doing it. So something basically is wrong. And if you continue that trend, and this is not the first year that it has been the trend, if you continue that trend, you are going to bring this economy to the same form of distress as the Jamaican economy and as the Trinidadian economy. So

that has to stop. And if Government cannot come to its senses, well, we might survive for two more years. And if we cannot we will have to give the public a chance to express itself on that matter. But it has to stop. It is totally unjustifiable. So that is another dimension to the matter of Estimates. It is expressive of correlatives and it has to relate to financial constraints. You cannot behave, as the Minister of Finance has advocated, that if the revenues are less than the expenditure, well then you must stimulate the revenues. No way! The course for budgeting is to put realistic limits on the amount of revenue that you can extract from the economy, having regard to the rate of growth of the economy and what is a reasonable tax effort. You project the highest amount of taxation that is reasonable to extract from the economy in a given year and then budget within that. If you cannot confine your budget to that figure to generate a surplus in current account, then run a deficit on current account. That is why it is neither good nor bad. You make an independent judgment as to the upper limits of taxation, you try the hardest to stay within that, and you say, but we need the money to do these things, you say well go ahead, we will run a deficit, recognising that somewhere down the line, you have to reverse that situation. But we have a Minister who says, I am not running any deficit. I am spending well above the growth of the economy, for whatever reasons, I do not know, and if taxation is not adequate, I am going to stimulate the revenues. And in the process, he will destroy the economy.

Last time round he slowed down the rate of growth of the economy. This time if he should endeavour to raise $100 million in taxes, there will be no growth. So I am saying that that is another adjustment which must be made to the views expressed by Senator Clarke, by way of extensions. Senator Clarke indicated that as far as the ends of fiscal policy are concerned or at the time he was speaking more specifically of the Estimates – but I suspect he intended the remarks to be related more generally to both expenditure and revenue to the overall budget – he listed certain objective sections of economic growth and development, job creation, balance of payments equilibrium, stable prices, stable currency et cetera. In other words, he listed all of the objectives of economic policy.

And I want to point out that you have to distinguish between the objectives of economic policy and the objective of fiscal policy of the budget. The budget is one policy instrument. It is a multi dimensional policy instrument. You can use it with your various aspects to it. And therefore it can be a fairly complex problem. But it cannot deal with all of the objectives of economic policy. And there are other economic policy instruments that must be dedicated to solving some of these problems. I am going to indicate quite clearly that as far as the balance of payments is concerned, fiscal policy is neither necessary nor sufficient to deal with that. But I am saying it is not necessary because you can solve that in other ways, through the use of monetary policy. It is not sufficient because no matter how you try and you have the wrong monetary policy, your balance of payments is going through the eddoes. So fiscal policy is neither necessary nor sufficient to solve a balance of payments problem. And therefore it should not be used as such. You should use your monetary policy to deal with the balance of payments problem, and focus your fiscal policy on internal considerations such as job creation and expanding the economy and so on.

Last year we had an error in that direction where the Minister of Finance believed that he had to use fiscal policy to stop Barbadians from importing so much of consumer goods and so on and to protect the balance of payments. The actual figures indicated that Barbadians were not increasing the imports of consumer goods by any significant amount anyhow in relation to GDP. But somewhere along the line, somebody gave him that idea or he got it from out of the skies, and he set about to use fiscal policy to protect the balance of payments. So we had double motivation for the injury which he inflicted on the country, his arcane idea about current account balances and his desire to use fiscal policy to protect the balance of payments. Double motivation, double reasons for error.

So you need to distinguish clearly between the objects of fiscal policy and the objects of economic policy, whether in strict economic terms any one policy can only deal with one set of objectives, and we need as many policies as objectives which we need to fulfil. You cannot have one policy swinging left and right, travelling north, travelling south, up and down at the same time. Just like you cannot have one man playing full back and goalkeeper and everything else. We need as many men as positions that you want to control. The same with economic policy.

So this is one of the fundamental errors that was made, not only by the Minister of Finance. Other people make this error too feeling that you must use fiscal policy. Every policy must be thrown at everything. That is not so.

Now going beyond the question of the objects of fiscal policy and so on, Senator Clarke drew particular attention to the question of amortisation. And the question of amortisation looms very large in this year's budget exercise. It looms very large because of the fact that the loan repayment escalated considerably in order to pay back over $143 million in debt redemption so to speak, to pay off our debt. And this is particularly reflected in our current account position. Senator Clarke has explained that this is largely attributable to a bullet loan, not quite a bullet, but a bullet loan, that is the Japanese Yen bond Series A 1985 which you have to repay in one instalment of $78 million and then another loan where the first instalment, a fairly substantial one falls due this year, County Bank 1985 Loan first instalment $14.3 million.

Senator Clarke went on to indicate that they are going to endeavour to avoid this in the future by better

management, better debt management and so on. I have a feeling that that process has already been started by the former Minister of Finance in the Errol Barrow Administration. And I am glad to hear that it will be continued.
12.10 p.m.

But what I want to say is that although it is bad form, put it that way, to engage in bullet loans of such magnitude, it is not fatal. Because what you recognise is what you are doing when you have to deal with that $143 million. It is that you have to re-finance it. You have to borrow to cover it. You cannot get it out of taxes. One of the things which you must observe is that in having to pay back $143 million in loans this year Barbados can borrow $143 million and do not modify the public debt by one iota. The public debt will be the same if you just borrow $143 million and pay back $143 million. So for the public debt to increase this year you are going to have to borrow more than $143 million. So any level of borrowing this year must be viewed in that particular light. Right – that particular light. So do not feel or be concerned if you come to the country and say you are going to borrow $200 million this year. After all last year you went to borrow $160 million from Japan and you did not get it. You had approval for it.

SENATOR THE HON. DR. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. President, I think it has been made quite clear. Mr. President, with the Japanese loan we went for up to an amount based on the market conditions and I think it is erroneous to keep saying that we went for a specific amount. The total was known and I think that I should make this clear. I mean I am sorry to interrupt you really. I did not want to, but I think that I have said it over and over again and I cannot sit back and allow it to pass.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Yes, Mr. President, that clarification is not a matter of substance because quite fairly the idea of "up to" makes you borrow less without cutting. You are not tied to borrow a precise number. But we know that is your target basically and you cannot really say that you want to borrow up to $160 million and $80 million is just as good. If you say that, something is wrong with your head. That is very false budgeting and planning. You must have something very close to that figure in mind. So that point is technically correct but basically of no consequence. So you endeavoured to raise the $160 million and you did not get it and you must agree that that constituted a measure of embarrassment to the country. So we suffered in that way. But it is fortunate in another way that they did not get it, and do you know why? Do you know why it is fortunate they did not get it? If you look in this year's Estimates in the Memorandum on Page 2, you see here Sources of Funds and these are the funds used to finance the deficit of $206.5 million which they are now projecting and you have all your various sources there coming on down under Foreign Loans and Domestic Financing. The last item under Foreign Loans is the Japanese Bond Issue for 1988 of $80.4 million. But if you look right at the bottom of this Schedule here, you will see a separation from deficit from domestic financing and then you have an item of 1988 Japanese Bonds special deposit ($79 844 501). This line here indicates two things – (1) That the overall deficit of $206.5 million was over-financed by the extent of $79 844 501 and it also means that the funds realised from the Japanese Bond Issue are still held by Government in some special deposit.

In other words, Government borrowed this money sometime around May last year and up to the time of the presentation and I suspect up to today and maybe down into next May you will not have any need for it. You will not have any need for it because to the extent of over-taxation in the last Budget because of the extent of the underestimation of revenues in the last Budget, they had a bonanza. They had all sorts of money. They did not know it. So they went and borrowed $80 million that they did not need a year in advance, and do you know what that means? I would like Senator Clarke to indicate to us what rate of interest they are obtaining on this particular loan. It may be fortunate that loans or interest rates in the Japanese market are low and they probably paid 6 point somebody per cent on the original loan. I do not know where they are holding this money now and what they are getting on it. But to the extent that they are getting something less than the rate of interest on the Japanese loan, what we are doing here would be akin to someone going to a commercial bank, borrowing $10 000 at 12% and putting it back into the savings deposit at some low rate of interest. If you leave it there long enough, you would not have any money in the savings deposit as you draw down to pay the interest off on the loan and you will still owe the bank the $12 million. In other words, we lost money. When we get the figure, we will know what it is. We are losing money by virtue of this matter here and, therefore, when you are talking about improved debts to management, this is the first thing that you have to address. You have to make sure again that we never find ourselves in the position of borrowing $80 million and having no use for it for over a year. You have to ensure that we do not borrow this money and we have no use for it for over a year, because if you do that you just simply lose money by way of interest expense on the resources that you are not using. Worse than that, you are incurring a debt in some foreign currency which either you have to pay some kind of money to cover your foreign exchange position or you have a measure of exposure during the period that you do not need the funds anyway.

What I am saying here now is if perchance this deposit is not also held in Yen at the moment, the exchange rate can move in such a way that over and above the interest charges we can make capital losses and you need to protect against that. For the alternative you have to buy the necessary type of protection which is also another expense to the country. So this is another manifestation of the errors that were made

in last year's Estimates and in last year's Budget, and Barbados deserves more.

Any Prime Minister or Minister of Finance who did this to the country you should fire that Minister of Finance and, therefore, I call on the Present Prime Minister to fire the present Minister of Finance. I am not talking about Dr. Clarke. I am talking about the one and only Minister of Finance. He ought to be fired by the Prime Minister, otherwise the country will have when they get the chance to fire the Prime Minister, and we hope that chance will come fairly soon. By all means if you are a captain of a team and you are bowling, and you are not getting any wickets, take yourself off and put on a good bowler ..... the same thing with any other Captain of State. So he should fire himself. That is what I am saying in clear and unambiguous terms. 12.20 p.m.

Let us shift now and have a look at the document information provided in the Estimates here. One of the salient observations which can be made from these Estimates – I have already touched on it in a certain kind of way – relates to the poor fiscal marksmanship in terms of projecting revenues during the last year. It should be recalled that during the last year persons who were members of the majority party in Parliament drew attention to those errors repeatedly and they were ignored. Persons outside of Parliament, yours truly included, drew attention to those errors and they were ignored, and a number of the errors are patent.

If you have, for instance, an actual situation where the stamp duty in 1987-88 on Customs produced virtually $100 million, and you turn around and project stamp duty in the following year – this is before you take adjustments, before the Budget – at the same figure of $100 million, you know you are doing something which does not make sense. If you are at the same time saying that the economy is projected to grow, which they were saying, both the direct component and the indirect component of the tax structure are progressive. The direct component is progressive in the sense that you know as you earn more income you pay proportionately more incremental tax. The indirect tax system is also progressive because you pay more tax on motor cars than you pay on a bicycle and things like that. You pay more taxes on prestige items than you pay on basic necessities, and therefore as the economy grows and people get more income and they shift their expenditure pattern towards buying more prestige items and things that attract higher taxes, there would also be this element of progressivity in the indirect tax system. Those people who claim that indirect taxes are regressive do not understand what they are talking about.

So that if you are projecting that the rate of growth of the economy is going to be 7% in nominal terms, say 3%, 2.5% growth and 4.5% inflation or something like that, almost certainly most of your taxes will grow at a faster rate than that if they are not changed, or if for some reason the people do not start engaging in massive tax evasion, or if the Ministry of Finance does not kind of forgive the tax or what have you. So that type of estimation is widely in error. That is yet but an example, but there are others like that.

The estimation of income tax is very much in that vein. Where you saw that income tax is producing in gross terms over $90 million, but out of that you deduct the refunds and it comes down to about $50 million, about $40 million in refunds or something like that, and you know the same principle of growth will operate and you are projecting income taxes at the low level indicated here. Attention was drawn to that and it was ignored. What is indicated here now, based on the Revised Estimates, is that corporation tax which was projected last year at $65 million, about $7 million below the amount received last year, is now revised to produce $78.5 million or 13.5% more than last year's projection of $65 million. That is a percentage of 20.8.

I do not want to do exactly what Senator Clarke did and bore you with statistics, but I need to mention a few. Attention was drawn to that. I on more than one occasion pointed out (1) you are getting more than that this year, (2) you got more than that the year before, (3) a lot of companies that had loan losses used them up in the last two years, and if they make the same profit they have to pay more tax, and (4) if you do not increase taxation in the country the economy is going to grow and they are going to be more profitable over and above what they were the year before, and therefore there is no way that $65 million could represent the thing. No way! Do you think they listened to that?

I think the error in itself is bad enough, but when you make that error in the face of the evidence, and when you make it in the face of persons having drawn that evidence to your attention, that is something sinister, something irresponsible, something fundamentally unfortunate, something for which someone should be held culpable. The Minister of Finance should be fired by whoever has the competence to fire him. Only two people can fire him, the Prime Minister and the country, any time when you get elections. I am saying he should be fired.

Now when you get to income tax, they projected $80 million, 95.2 your now revised projection, and I would not be surprised if they out perform that, $15.2 million under estimate, about 90% error in relation to the original estimate. Even a thing like land tax, they were 20% out, 25 and 30. Last year the land tax brought in $25.5 million and they are projecting 25 for the following year. In circumstances where property values and so on are going up, they are projecting that kind of thing. People are building, you know, there is a construction boom and so there is more land development and that kind of thing. It did not only start last year, it was going on for the last two or

three years, so the tax base is growing, and unless you plan to reduce the tax rate you would expect more revenue. But no, they could not see that.

It seems as though there is some kind of system. The percentage error is another 20%, 20.8%, 19%, 20%, it seems as though there is a system, some kind of systematic factor working here to give you that kind of adjustment to the true figure, which is easy to estimate.

The property transfer tax estimated at $8.5 million, you got $14.9 million, 6.4% off. Again the relationship between that estimate and the performance was out. I think they got more than that the year before. In circumstances where again in the context of economic activity people are engaging in more buying and selling of property at higher prices than before, and that anyone should have expected to continue during the year, so anyone should have known that you should have had a higher estimate. No, but they had 8.3, 8.5. 14.9, the error is 75.3% of the original estimate. Even the training levy, 24.1% off, the employment levy 34.5% off and so on.

Those that I mentioned are taxes that were not in any way modified by the Budget and therefore the overall question of estimation should be simpler than when you have to figure in tax changes, and the actual outturn would be less than if you did not increase taxation, because when you increase taxation you reduce spending in various areas that would have attracted taxes such as I mentioned before, and that reduction means that the tax collected would be less than if you did not increase the taxation so the under estimation figures are understated, because the Budget would have modified the amount you were targeting for, but I have not included that factor, just leave it as it is there.

Consumption tax. Subject to the Budget, this displays another type of error in the estimation of these things. You had an original estimate of consumption tax of $155 million in relation to about $147 million collected in the previous year. That rate of growth is a bit low, having regard to what I said about these taxes outstripping the normal rate of growth of the economy because of the progressivity in them, so that is probably under estimated about $10 million originally. Then they brought in the Budget, consumption tax basic rate going from 6% to 9%, all other rates 5% up, $71 million in consumption tax they say they are going to get off the top. Then the consumption tax on gasolene, on petroleum products, another $12 million, $83 million they plan to increase consumption taxes by, from $155 million to $238 million.

This is a fundamental error which the Ministry of Finance makes in estimation all the time. In my previous sojourn in this Honourable Chamber I drew attention to it repeatedly. Every time Budgets come around and it is done I draw attention to it. When the Democratic Labour Party was putting up their proposals in relation to the effects of the Budget of their proposals on revenue, they spoke about net effects, taking into account something I drew attention too. But the officers in the Ministry of Finance never operate like that, they operate saying if you are going to get $155 million from a tax and you increase that tax by 50%, you will get 50% more money, as though the money for that is going to fall like manna from Heaven and you just catch it and give it to the Government and carry on as before, no change. It does not work that way. If you have $1 000 to spend on a tax free item or items, and you are going to spend all that money, you spend the $1 000 and buy whatever you can buy. If taxation is increased you do not have any more money to spend, you can only spend $1 000, but it is not going to buy the same.

12.30 p.m.

So the tax base is going to shrink; so you cannot just do that simplicit thing of saying the tax is projected to yield $155 million, this is a virtual 50 per cent increase and therefore you are going to pump up the thing by virtually 50 per cent, $71 million and you are going to pump up the other thing like that. You must make major errors when you do that because the tax base is going to shrink, and in the case of these draconian increases, you are going to do something else. You are going to increase the incidence of inflation, so you get natural and legitimate shrinkage and you get illegal shrinkage when people do not worry to pay income tax, and that should be known. Do you know what is the outcome of all that? The Government was projecting that they were going to increase consumption tax from an estimated figure of $155 million and saying that should be one-sixteenth or in that region to $238 million. Do you know how much they got or projecting they will get now? $189.4 million. That is $48.6 million less than the $238 million that they thought they were going to get which is an estimation error of minus 20.4% in relation to that $238 million. That should not have happened.

Now do you know what is the significance of that overestimation of the tax effects of increasing consumption tax from a basic rate from six to nine and all other rates by five? The Minister of Finance believes when you do that you have $83 million not recognising that in actuality you will only get about $30 million. If he knew that doing that would only bring in $30 million, I don't think Senator Clarke would advise him to do it; so this is a particular bias in the type of estimation that has been coming out of the Ministry where you under-estimate the performance of the taxes that are in place indicating that you need to do something about boosting your revenue, and then you over estimate the revenue you will get, which means that if you say this will bring me $71 million and this other one will bring me $30 million, you can say it is not worth the light, don't worry with the candle. You are not going to do that; so you induce on the one hand a false appearance of deficit and on the other instead of false deficits and tariffs of all this abundance in the increasing of taxes into doing stupidness. Some Ministers of Finance never went that way.

We have had a number of Ministers of Finance who were capable of doing such analyses and doing their own thing in a way as far as deciding when to tax and when not to tax, and the country is the better off for it. That is no longer the case and the country is suffering.

The next thing is the stamp duty and customs tax. Originally estimated at $100 million, somebody told the Minister of Finance that fiscal policies will do all these good things for the economy. You went and promoted CARICOM. I don't know if this economy has such a good relationship to promote CARICOM as such, good relations and so on, so we took on those stamp duties against CARICOM in one fell swoop. The Barrow Administration would say we are phasing this thing down gradually, but no, we have taken them all off so that Trinidad and Tobago will open the markets to those who have markets, and we will take off these taxes from raw materials of manufacturers who register with Customs. Up to now I don't understand what that was intended to do. Quite clearly it seems not to be working anyway. Anyway you do these things and you estimate that one is going to cost you about $30 million, the other $25 million making a total loss of revenue of $55 million, and you are down to $45 million from that source, and that is additional motivation for the $71 million jack up in consumption tax because you are saying you are $48.6 million in deficit already, you want to be good to your CARICOM neighbours and you take off that, you lose either $20 million or $35 million, one of those figures, but then you want to compensate and you want to do something for your local manufacturers, you take off their stamp duty too on raw materials to make them more competitive with their CARICOM neighbours and you lose another amount totalling $55 million. So you add that $55 million to the $48.6 million and you see you have to raise over $100 million, so you set about increasing taxes, $110 million thereabouts.

But do you know what happened? The outturn on stamp duty, Revised Estimates, shows $80 million instead of $45 million. The revised estimates exceeds that $45 million by 77.8%. If that were known there would be no need to raise stamp duty from 6 per cent to 9 per cent and all others by 5 per cent. This is not a new revelation. Attention was drawn to this point at the time of the budget by people within the governing party and the Opposition benches and by people at large. It made no difference.

Sir, Government will be well advised this time around to incline their ear to what people are saying, to use reason and not other forms of emotion in considering things like those. So the errors are gross; the errors were anticipated by others, the errors were drawn to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and you know in spite of this the Minister of Finance felt he did a good job. That is the measure of the problem confronting us. We are in a parlous state, absolute parlous, so I think somebody has to tell the Prime Minister to fire the Minister of Finance.

Now the consequences of that type of estimation was over-taxation, and the consequences of over-taxation is a slowing down of the rate of growth of the economy. I cannot for the life of me understand how the Minister of Finance can have some quite competent economists and professional staff as the public service staff here who can advise him on these matters, there is the Central Bank who can advise him on these matters, and he has Senator Clarke as a political ally, either his left hand or his right hand man, his lieutenant who can advise him on these things, and the Minister of Finance persists in believing that his fiscal measures did something to stimulate growth in this economy.

Taxation does not stimulate the economy. Taxation retards growth in any kind of economy; it does not stimulate, so if you see growth it is in spite of taxation, not because of it, and the growth is less than it would have been if the taxation was not there. Now in addition to the question of retarding growth in our type of economy, taxation also increases prices beyond what they would have been. Senator Clarke has indicated to us that the inflation rate is over 1.0% over what was anticipated a year before. Whatever it was, even if it was lower, part of that inflation rate would have been attributable to the tax measures, and that is basically another element of the price that this country is paying for fiscal management, and somebody has to disabuse the Minister of Finance's mind of feeling that he did something great to this economy by imposing taxes, and that he put the economy on some growth path as he keeps on saying. Somebody has to disabuse his mind that he saved this economy from going on the rocks. That was evident from way back, but up to now we have not had a clear statement as to in what form he saved the economy from going on the rocks.

I heard someone out there making all sorts of pretty statements that he saved this country from devaluing the currency and all that kind of thing. That is not true. He has not yet indicated how his fiscal measures saved the economy from going on the rocks. I think the most generous construction you can put upon it is that he believes that a current account deficit would have taken the country on the rocks. Senator Clarke has indicated that that is not so. Current account deficits are not necessarily good or bad; they don't put you on the rocks or take you off the rocks necessarily, it depends on other things.
12.40 p.m.

So there is no basis in reason for the Minister of Finance to feel that he saved this country from going on the rocks. What he is doing is steering a course for the doldrums right now. It will take some time to get there. That depends on the level of taxation this time.

The reason why we made some progress in terms of growth is because of the strong stimulus that was coming from the new fiscal arrangements introduced two years

before and, also, the tax measures, although there were tax increases in 1987 which modified the tax structure in such a way that taxes on imported goods were increased relative to the taxes on locally produced goods and, thereby induced expenditures switching away from the foreign goods to the local stimulating economic activity in the manufacturing sector and economic growth, employment and so on. Coupled with the impetus that came from the 1986 Budget Barbados was on a powerful growth path with a lot of people willing to invest money in this country both local and foreign and he descended upon the country with the greatest indignity which has ever been perpetrated on this economy and he believes that he has done something to put this country on a growth path.

Someone must tell him that he has slowed down the rate of growth and if he repeats his approach to fiscal budgeting and gives us another dose of correction away from the rocks, we are going to the doldrums, not away from any rocks. Someone has to take the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister too and educate the two of them but, basically, that is the type of consequence of those errors.

We come now to the question of this year's Estimates and we have here a most alarming thing $986 174 680 in projected current account expenditure and $280 765 267 in capital expenditure, over $1.2 billion in an economy which is going to be somewhere on the high side of $3 billion nominally. I do not think it reached as far as $3.6 billion so Government is planning to spend as much as 1/3 of our GDP so that if between us we have $2 to spend Government would be spending 1 to match everybody out here.

If you consider the services provided by Government and the services provided by the overall economy, ask yourself if what the country gets out of Government compared in economic terms, if what you get out of the whole rest of the economy, if those services are worth $1 for every $2 you spend on everything else we get economic-wise in the country.

I am not drawing attention to the fact that things like the Sanitation Services can ever be valid because if you do not have them you would have epidemics and so on. I am talking about the cost for providing those services in terms of any realistic understanding of productivity in costs and so on and I am saying that Government is endeavouring to spend too much money.

When you consider that even the kind of enterprise sector of Government for the most part is loss-making, you will recognise that Government expenditure has to be extracted from the rest of us, from the private sector and in a certain sense every individual employee is a part of the private sector and the employers in the private sector also, they are extracting from us more than the economy can bear. There is a danger of killing the goose that is laying the golden egg.

The basic philosophy behind the New Path Manifesto is that Barbados was on the threshold of that and it was so and Barbados was on the threshold of that not so much because of the mismanagement of the late Tom Adams but because of the failure or his successor to appreciate where he was going because the late Tom Adams was going precisely where the New Path Manifesto went and he set up the situation in advance in 1984 in his mini Budget and the 1985 one where he increased his consumption taxes substantially to create that cushion of revenue that he could take off the income taxes and win the elections.

The other people did not have the same insight and understanding of what the late Tom Adams was about to do and they were diverted by the public servants and they did what they did but persons within the ranks of the Opposition had that understanding and they did it. They offered the country what Tom Adams would have offered the country and they won the elections and people went all around to suggest that these policies could not work and, I believe, at the time, members of the current administration had the understanding that they could work and they were able to appreciate that all of this thing against it was just political propaganda which could be countered with argument and in the fullness of time with performance.

The performance is there, crystal clear for everybody to see. It has only been clouded over by the 1988 Budget but the evidence on over taxation in 1988 – in fact, you did not have to increase taxation in 1988. The fact that you did not have to increase any taxes in 1988 to achieve better than what you increased the taxes to achieve is a clear indication that the policies have worked. The economy was heading on a good course with the prevailing Trade Winds and perceiving the waves ahead to be heading to some sort of rocks. The Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has steered to the doldrums so that, basically, is the particular situation which confronted the country at the time.

Now, in these Estimates of Expenditure here, they have to be reduced in all reason. Now, having said that, I will say this. If they are not reduced and Government decides to finance the whole deficit of $300 million by borrowing, the country will grow and grow fast because expenditure contributes to growth. Taxation does the opposite. But it might grow in an unsustainable way and you do not want that so you need to be cautioned against it, but if people feel for political reasons that you cannot reduce this money here, either by embarrassment or whatever, keep it but do not try to recover any $100 million in taxes.

My advice to you, however, is that you should reduce because you cannot forever keep on doing this. You can do it this year. You did it two years ago but thereafter your

chickens will come home to roost and your last state would be worst than your first so, basically, do not go that path. Go the prudent path and cut back on this expenditure but, for sure, if you do not come back do not tax because you would be doing more harm to the country.

The NDP would win the next election but we do not want to win that way. We want to win on a different basis. We do not want to win over the ruin of the economy. We do not want to win by default. We want to win by the positive aspects of our programme so we are cautioning you not to go in that particular direction.

Now, the question always comes back, what are you going to cut? Remember what I said already. The Estimates are, essentially, a statement of priorities. What you cut should relate to your priorities, not to the NDP's. If you want us to cut, give us the Government and we will cut in accordance with our priorities so I do not have particularly to advise you on what you can cut but what I can indicate to you is what you would have to cut if you want to be prudent.

Now, I can give you certain indications of what you are spending on, where the increase in expenditure has gone.
12.50 p.m.

Senator Clarke regaled us with a whole lot of statistics about so much percentage of overall expenditure last year, you know, economic services was X percent and now it is X minus A percent, and the next year's and so on. That is no information. That whole discourse there giving the numbers could have been forgotten. Not only because it bored his own Members and so and after a while it bored me. And that takes a lot. Not only because of that, but because the whole thing was misplaced. You wanted to get a better insight as to how these proportions are going, you should have excluded amortization from the analysis in all the years. Because the whole thing is biased towards other expenditure, including the main thing there is amortization. So everything is looking as though it is going down because amortization has gone up so much. But if you had taken those things out, those proportions would give you some basic idea as to how the relationship between the remaining items moves. But you must rest assured that if something goes down, something will go up, because you must add back to 100%. So this business of proportions as an end of itself, does not provide a sufficient insight.

What you should be looking at is the rate of growth of the various items. We spent so much last year on economic services, we are spending 10%, 20% or whatever cent more. That type of analysis would have been rather more instructive. And then we would be able to ask the question: Are you doing anything more or are you spending the same money to do the same? And depending on the answer we get it would indicate well that is prudent or imprudent or downright stupid. So your analysis is a bit off and I suggest that you should go back and do that form of analysis.

But getting back to the figures, some of which Senator Clarke directed attention to, we look again at the memorandum on Page 2 where you have at the bottom current expenditure and the details of expenditure and it indicates to you that personal emoluments are projected to increase in this year, *vis-a-vis* last year by 13.6%, Other Charges by 30.5% for a total expenditure of 20.5%.

The first thing you have to observe here is that the rate of growth of expenditure is attributable not so much to salaries and so but to Other Charges. We can make modification of the figure to exclude amortization and so on and the rate of growth of Other Charges would have declined because the fastest growing item in the Other Charges is amortization which grew at about 84% or something like that. Or even then the Other Charges would have grown significantly faster than the personal emoluments. When you examine the Other Charges, Senator Clarke told us that a component in there is wages also for the statutory organizations that are financed by Government out of the Consolidated Fund. And it is real to presume that the personal emoluments component of the subventions to those people would not have been growing at a faster rate than let us say, that same 13.6% for Personal Emoluments. I suggest less, except perhaps with Parks and Beaches, also known as the National Conservation Commission. Most of the others would have experienced a slower rate of growth. I will tell you why. But before telling you why, let me indicate what is the significance of that point. That means if you exclude the salary component payable to public servants outside of the direct Civil Service employed by the statutory boards, financed by the Consolidated Fund from the Other Charges both this year and the previous year and we work a percentage, it is going to go up, but it is going to be higher than would be indicated when you include the salary component in there.

So Government is planning to spend considerably more on things other than provision of salaries, in terms of increases in expenditure than they are on wages and salaries. That expenditure is discretionary. It may be important, it may be necessary, it may be all sorts of things, but it is discretionary. And it bears examination. And to the extent that you admit of an upper reasonable limit on Government expenditure, it bears reduction in areas in accordance with your priorities, not mine.

But let us look at the personal emoluments also. In relation to the personal emoluments, there are three factors here which work to increase this figure. One is the increase in the salaries as negotiated or as legislated, negotiated by the Barbados Workers' Union and legislated for most of the public servants. Two will be the incremental increase in salaries, you know, as people go up the salary scale and so on. And the third would be the expansion in numbers

employed or the numbers which you contemplate employing. And it is quite evident as the wage increases range between 4% and 8% that the average as a result of the new wage structure would have to be rather less than 8%, probably falling somewhere close to the median of that figure, close to the mid point of that figure, dependent on the amount of skewness in the distribution of salary scales and so on. So let us say that is 6%. The Ministry of Finance should have a more precise figure. They have the data. They can work it out. Let us say it is 6% or six point somebody percent. It means that more than half of the projected increase in personal emoluments would relate to the other two causes, the increment and the increase in employment. An insight into the distribution between these two things can be found by perusing the Estimates, both the main document and the personal emoluments document thereto and you discover something, that, in these documents, you have the statutory emoluments, those emoluments which are associated with established posts in the Public Service and so on, and you have the Other Personal Emoluments, those that are associated with temporary staff. And it is the other Personal Emoluments in many instances that are outstripping the Statutory Personal Emoluments a long way, by a long margin.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator McClean, I mean I do not want to stop you. You are dealing with the Appropriation Bill and you have to point out to me – the Appropriation Bill is before me – you have Cabinet, Judiciary, Parliament, Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of International Transport, those things you are dealing with, point out to me where they come within the Bill.

This is the first thing. I gave you wide latitude. This is the Appropriation Bill that you are dealing with. That is the point you are raising in the Appropriation Bill to draw my attention to.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Thank you, Mr. President, for your guidance on that matter. But what I would say is that the comment that I was making is a general comment which runs throughout the Estimates. This is a Schedule to the Appropriation Bill. And this is what we are really considering. And this is what Senator Clarke was discussing. This is what I was making a general comment on. It has a list of specifics, I can give you some areas right now and specific line items that reflect what I said in a general way and I intended coming to those.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But we are only dealing with the Appropriation Bill. We cannot deal with the Estimates as the Estimates. We are dealing with the Appropriation Bill.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, the Appropriation Bill is intertwined with the Estimates. All of the items reflected in the Appropriation Bill.....

1.00 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, this is an explanation of what the Appropriation Bill is. You see it is signed by the Speaker. This is a Money Bill that comes up to you as an Appropriation Bill from there. You made your general comments from the beginning, but if we are going to have a whole thing on the whole gambit on that, we will discuss it longer than a year because you are not now dealing with the Judiciary. You can go to Parliament. You can go to the Prime Minister's Office. You spoke about the Prime Minister because I want to know that point. These points you are raising now do not deal with the point. We have a Bill before us. You see in this loose way that you want to discuss things in the Senate, I have to draw your attention to the Standing Orders. You are dealing with this matter before you. This is what is before you, not the Estimates as Estimates. You have before you the first Order – Senator the Hon. C. D. Clarke, the Second Reading of a Bill to grant the sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate it for the service of Barbados for the ending of March 1990. This is what the Appropriation Bill is.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I am hoping that I have 2 hours to speak and I hope that.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, I am not talking about the time that you have to speak. I am talking about what you are dealing with.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am dealing with the Appropriation Bill.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is what I mean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: ....The Appropriation Bill to which the Estimates are a Schedule and there is little or no information contained in the Appropriation Bill *per se*. You have to look at the Schedule to get the details. The details of what we are called upon to vote here today will be contained in the Estimates.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, I am not objecting to you looking at the Estimates. I am only drawing to your attention if you look at how the things are set up that you are dealing with coming from the Governor-General down to the end of the Appropriation Bill, those are the things that we are dealing with. Remember that. We have a thing before us. We are not just dealing with everything under this Act. If not, we will just carry the debate from point to point. The Estimates is the guiding thing that you can draw attention to whenever you like, because in the Appropriation Bill, you deal with it. But we have to clear up what we are dealing with.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am wondering whether this might not be the time for us to refresh ourselves and if Senators do not mind,

I propose a suspension if this is all right. Very well, Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2 o'clock.

The question that this Sitting be suspended until 2 p.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator McClean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, the Appropriation Bill as we know, deals with that component of the Estimates for which there is no statutory provision of the projected expenditure and that will cover such things as charges and personal emoluments. I intend in the process of time to direct attention to particular line items which affect the Appropriation Estimates. Such line items are to be found on pages 16, 18, 22, 30, 53, 139 and 147 in the Estimates. But, by way of general comment on all of those line items and indeed on others, by way of general comment on the overall Appropriation Bill, I was indicating that the increases in expenditure indicated in respect to certain other charges and other personal emoluments quite clearly exceed the rate of growth of the statutory component of the personal emoluments in many instances and indeed the average rate of growth in the overall Estimates if you exclude the amortization. So essentially the point behind that is that such expenditure is discretionary and entirely within the competence of Government to make a determination as to whether the expenditure is entirely prudent, having regard to the total set of circumstances pertaining to social and economic conditions in Barbados. I was suggesting that in my considered judgment there is room for expenditure reduction, if we are aiming at overall efficiency, not only today but into the future, because you must remember that the budgetary process and life in Barbados will not come to an end with this Budget but will continue. The problems that we create for ourselves in the area of over-expenditure could return to haunt us in the worst way. If we do not adhere to certain fiscal discipline as far as expenditure is concerned, the time will come when we will have to pay and pay most severely. I was suggesting that, as a limit to the amount of taxation, that you can impose on a country, Barbados has reached that limit in all discretion.

There is a limit to the level of Government's expenditure *vis-a-vis* overall economic activity; in the economy and Barbados has reached that limit. If we exceed the limit, the country will not be destroyed in a day or a year. But if we exceed it and repeatedly do that in the fulness of time, the country will be brought to a state of ruin.

With that I would like to direct attention to line items and the first is to be found on Page 16 of the Estimates of Expenditure. On Page 16, the Head pertaining to Ministry of International Affairs – it is International Transport and Telecommunications and Immigration. I am sorry, you have here under Subheads 7–12 Operating Expenses have been increased from the Approved Estimates in 1988–89 from $67 000 to $266 612. That might be entirely warranted, but it would seem only to be warranted if there is some change in activity. No indication was given about that by Senator Clarke in his opening address and I would direct that to his attention for comment. I cannot say whether it is too substantial an increase, because it is such a substantial increase that it probably indicates some type of structural change. If there is no structural change and if that money is not going to be used to do other things over and above what the previous allocation was doing, well quite clearly, this is a case for reduction.

The next page is page 18 and there again is another matter of Operating Expenses in the Cabinet Office going from $25 000 to over $1/2 million. The Explanatory Note indicates that this item includes provision for the cost of refreshments served at Cabinet and other meetings, postage, and other incidental expenses on the 350th Anniversary celebrations and it may be that we intended to spend $1/2 million on such celebrations, or it may be that we intended to spend a $1/4 million on those and the other $1/4 million on something else. But again I would suggest that that bears explanation and I would crave the indulgence of Senator Clarke or any other Member of Government to provide us with the explanation.

On page 22, this is one for comment rather than for explanation. Here we have Subhead 9 under Social Security and National Insurance Department and we see some rather substantial increases there, and it is quite clear that is going towards major organizational changes within the National Insurance Department. Given the level of inefficiency which now characterizes that Department, such changes are entirely necessary.
2.10 p.m.

I cannot say whether the changes warrant such increases, because I rather think we are not getting the maximum mileage out of existing resources. We might need to look at that aspect of it, deployment of human resources, whether the right people are in the right jobs at that institution.

But the comment which I want to make is that perhaps the time has come for that item not to be financed out of the Consolidated fund. The National Insurance Scheme should be self-financing and self-managing. In the early days when the Scheme was just about starting, you could not necessarily risk to pay the salaries of the employees out of it, because the Scheme might go bust before it started, and so it was properly a charge against the Consolidated Fund. By now that Scheme should have matured and it should be self-financing and self-managing. In other words, employees within the National Insurance service

should be able to operate with some higher degree of autonomy than would be currently indicated, and for sure the funding of it should be entirely from within. That should not be a charge against the Consolidated Fund. At this stage you know you cannot change overnight, that would call for legislation and so on, and beyond legislation for careful planning, so I do not anticipate that that change will come now, or maybe even next year, but it is something to be noted, something to be changed.

The next page is page 30. Again under Subhead 1, I have an asterisk against Other Personal Emoluments going from $403 200 to $605 000, something of the order of almost 50% increase, which is clearly above the increases in others. Operating Expenses going from $4 500 to $396 737 and professional services from zero to $120 000. The first thing is a query, some information as to these increases which clearly are above average, and in my view anything that increases inordinately should be explained. I know that within the Estimates some of them represent relocation of certain activities. I am not so sure that this has any aspect of that in it.

The point about professional services, the amount is not unnecessarily large and we know that the nature of that line item is that some years you might have certain projects and other years you might have no projects. The comment I want to make on that is, I should like to query the extent to which, not only in relation to this particular line item under this Head for professional services, but throughout the Estimates you have other provisions for professional services. I myself did not take the time to identify everyone and tally up the figures, but if perchance Senator Clarke can give us the total amount provided against professional services within these Estimates, that would be an interesting figure for us to be aware of. The next thing I would like to know is what proportion of that really it is anticipated would be used to hire local and Caribbean professionals as opposed to professionals from remoter places.

I think the time has come really when we must pay rather more careful attention to such matters and make sure that we make maximum use of local and regional professionals. This is not a mere matter of trying to enhance the levels of income generated within the economy for locals and so on, that is an important aspect of it also, but more and more the quality of service that you can expect from competent Barbadian and Caribbean professionals will be far better than what you will get from the visitors from afar.

It takes you more than a week or two weeks to learn the streets around Bridgetown. You cannot come in here in a week or two weeks and do a serious analysis of any problem at all we have. You will have had to have been studying that problem for many years before to handle it adequately, and the professionals that you import do not have that time to look at them. They are probably hearing about Barbados for the first time, and they come with a pre-determined framework into which they are going to slot a few figures and a few ideas. They go around, they scavenge for ideas, come to the University, go to the professionals all around the place to get ideas and fill out a report which has sometimes no deep meaning, and for sure it is not as good as many local professionals can produce.

We in this region still suffer from a complex in that particular area. I think it is rather more important to make sure that we make full use of our professionals rather than concern ourselves with such things as keeping out McDonald's from providing fast food, because I am sure that in terms of the benefits to the country McDonald's would be better for Barbados than a lot of the foreign professionals. So if we are concerned about things it is not McDonald's we should keep out, it is some of the imported professionals who give you five minutes of their time and less of their attention and draw your funds.

Page 53, Mr. President. Here we have another example of Other Personal Emoluments increasing from a figure of $843 989 to $1 807 410. This is in excess of a 50% increase again under the Ministry of Agriculture, Markets. The Schedule of Personal Emoluments indicates that new staff will be employed and new activity – we know that – new markets will be brought on stream and so on and we will expect an increase, but this Honourable Chamber would have no way of knowing whether that increase was reasonable or necessary until we get some idea as to the scale of activity to which this expenditure would relate. If information is available now or at any time in the future, I would always welcome that.

Page 139, Mr. President. Here we have under the Ministry of Employment, Labour Relations and Community Services, Community and Environment Services, Subhead 12, Child Care, Subhead 15 National Conservation Commission, Grants to Public Institutions. The public institution here identified is the National Conservation Commission, and the grant will be increased from $10 million to $12 million. That is a 20% increase above the average.

Senator Clarke gave us a lot of percentage increases and all sorts of percentages. He did not give us this one, and I would not mind his not only telling us the increase, which I know, between this year and last year, but give us a little of the history, go back to 1983 and so on and let us see how there was increased expenditure on that item.

2.20 p.m.

The public will therefore have an awareness as to whether the perceived improvement and the extension of the quality of service provided by the National Conservation Commission warrants this expenditure, and if perchance you can decompose that expenditure into the

personal emoluments components and other, we would like to know. I think it is when expenditure gets to this level, wherever that expenditure is, that institution must be brought under careful scrutiny, and I think it is true to say really that expenditure in this area is growing perhaps faster than expenditure, not perhaps, most definitely faster if you go back over a three or four year period than expenditure on amortisation. This holds the record and therefore it bears explanation.

Again I remind you that Estimates are entirely a matter of priorities, and therefore that estimate for instance bears comparison with the estimate under subhead 14, Youth and Community Development. You are spending $12 million on National Conservation Commission and about $1.355 million on Youth and Community Development. Well that is expressive of your priorities. I don't know if Youth and Community Development is a smaller problem to tackle and does not need funds in relation to an aspect of community development that is just keeping your department in a tidy fashion. I do not know if all the other aspects of community development and new development do not require any more resources as indicated here *vis-a-vis* what you have to devote to the National Conservation Commission. That is expressive of the priorities of Government and I know how Government thinks about these things. I know how the Ministers view the vote for Parks and Beaches, I also know the National Conservation Commission, how many jobs they will control and so on, but jobs are created in other places. People can be put to work in youth and community development in all areas; wherever you spend money there are jobs. The jobs may not be the jobs that the politicians can control in the way that they want to control them, and maybe that is the price we have to pay for politics. We need some kind of explanation of that.

On page 147 is the next heading. Before passing on to that next heading, back to the National Conservation Commission. It has been reported that a Minister of Government, not the Minister responsible for this portfolio in the Other Place commented that someone allegedly said that money voted for the National Conservation Commission should be given to the University. I never heard anyone made that statement and certainly I never made it, but what is important is that the money spent on the National Conservation Commission bears comparison with the money spent on the University, and if you find yourself spending more money on parks and beaches than you are spending on tertiary education and that high level research and that kind of thing, something is wrong with your priorities. You don't have the interest of the country at heart.

Turning to the next page, 147, Cooperatives is another example of where there is new activity, other personal emoluments growing from zero to $345 552 and this apparently has to do with certain development in the area of the Ministry dealing with cooperatives. Quite clearly it is a good thing to try to foster development of cooperatives, but we are in a world where we have to deal with cost and benefit, and we are in a world where we have to proceed incrementally, and I would like some comment as to the reason for this level of expansion at this time, having regard to the financial constraints facing Government. It may be that this is the critical minimum that you can be engaged in if you want to go from doing nothing to doing something, but I rather doubt it. Also there seems to be a kind of suggestion which one can draw or inferences which one can draw from the Estimates that almost invariably when you come across to the idea of doing something new or different, you look to staff it with new people and so on. In a dynamic situation things that you were doing before, sometimes some of them you can abandon or do them in a different way or to a lesser extent. In other words from time to time you will notice that over-staffing may be more within certain departments in the civil service, and before you just willy nilly say I want a new unit and it will take ten people, so you want money for ten, check to find out if there are ten people somewhere in the public service who are under-utilised and can be redeployed. We have to do more of that. When we see it we will appreciate it. The type of redeployment that I see if taking something from a Ministry and putting it under a different Ministry and putting it under a different name, but doing the same thing. That is a redeployment of departments from one Ministry to another or something like that, but not redeployment of the staff across the Ministries cutting down staff in one Ministry and increasing it in another, not because you are transferring activities but because of new activities and so on; but we would need to get some deeper insight into that, because all of this would reflect back on the efficiency of management of the public service, and it would also reflect on the question of priorities.

Now moving beyond that, there are a number of special issues which I think come out of the type of comment you get in the Other Place where you identify, pages 105 to 125, the Ministry of Health. We are dealing now with the Appropriation Bill, Ministry of Health. My colleague is the Shadow Minister of Health and I will leave most of the comments there to her, but I think it would be a bit remiss of me if I did not say but a few words on the matter of the chicken-Taitt affair. This is a hyphenated word, chicken-Taitt, not chicken Taitt. The chicken and the Taitt affair because the Honourable Minister of Health has a problem and the country has a problem with the chickens; so this is the chicken-Taitt affair. What I want to say is that this whole thing engenders three crises of competence in the country. (1) is the competence in the matter of chickens; can we eat chicken or can we not eat chicken? The other one is a crisis of competence in the Ministry; is all well within the Ministry? The other one is a crisis of competence in the Minister, and it is in the interest of the country that all these crises should be resolved.

Dealing with the crisis surrounding the Minister.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not think you can discuss the Minister.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am not talking about the Minister.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have given you a lot of latitude, and you are moving now on the question of a Minister! I thought you were dealing with the Appropriation Bill and matters relating thereto. What is the competence of the Minister to do with the Appropriation Bill. Enlighten me on what this has to do with the Appropriation Bill.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am endeavouring to indicate. I am dealing now with that aspect.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I don't want you to go on too long. I want to know what part of it you want to enlighten me on.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am saying that the matter pertaining to health is a crisis of competence in the country. This has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of the chicken.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well bring a motion on that. That is not before you. There is no motion concerning a crisis in health in the Island and you are therefore dealing with that. You should deal with the Appropriation matter. Don't go around the subject to deal with that. There is no motion in this Chamber dealing with a crisis in the Ministry of Health. This Chamber is not dealing with that motion, so you can't get around it like that. You have to deal with it in a direct way.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I think I am dealing with it rather directly.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You can't deal with it that way. I would not listen to it. That is not before the Chamber. I cannot have a Member of the Senate get up and want to have a motion against a Ministry. That is a substantive motion in itself.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, is it appropriate for me, dealing with the head pertaining to the Ministry of Health.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is not appropriate for me to hear you say you are dealing with a crisis of competence in the Minister. That is a substantive matter that must come before the Chamber. It is not a matter you can deal with in passing. 2.30 p.m.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, at least you should hear the question I am asking.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, No. It was not a question that you were asking.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I accept your guidance on that point.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot ask me a question. You have to come to the Chamber – when you are dealing and you feel you have to put a substantive matter, I am not here for questioning. You have to put a substantive matter before me. I am not a question and answer chairman.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I will put three substantive matters. I will deal with them one at a time. I will make one of them under your guidance but the substantive matter on which I want to comment briefly is the fact that the country is concerned about the quality of chicken. Can I speak on that matter?

Mr. PRESIDENT: The quality of chicken does not deal with anybody. You can deal with it in justifying what you are dealing with it from.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: There is a crisis of confidence in relation to chicken and the fact of the matter is that Barbadians have become scared to eat chicken. I do not want to recount all the incidents around that but the Ministry of Health is bound up in the reasons why the country has become scared and I am saying that Government must address that problem.

My particular suggestion is that Government must find a way quite urgently to restore confidence to the country in relation to the quality of chicken even if that involves a more comprehensive inspection as specific certification of actual chicken being inspected and passed as good but we cannot persist for too long in a situation where people do not know whether it is safe to eat chicken or not and the Ministry of Health has a role to play in that.

The Ministry of Health has a role in the solution and the Ministry of Health is part of the cause. I will not make reference to the Minister. That is all I will say on that particular matter.

The next matter is the Examination Centre on page 101 in the Estimates of Expenditure. In the Capital Estimates we notice here that there is a proposal for $5 million in structures and $1.5 million in professional services. This compares with a provision in the approved Estimates last year of $1.1 million in service for structures and $300 000 for professional services and a supplementary estimate in the said year of $11 million for structures, $1 million for professional services and revised expenditure of $4 million for structures for 1988/89 and half a million dollars for services and the note quite clearly indicates that this provision is required to commence planning and

construction work on a conference and examination centre at Sherbourne, Two Mile Hill, St. Michael.

I believe that note should have been changed in some regard because, I believe, construction has commenced even if planning has not been commenced so it may be planning but you have to delete the construction and I would want to indicate that this is a clear example of an area of expenditure that most Barbadians would regard as low priority expenditure and if you are looking for savings you should have anticipated you were in a mode where you had to save all along.

The requirement to engage in expenditure restraint is not a today requirement. It was day before. This project should never have been contemplated. Of course, you heard it was contemplated as far back as 1971 but that should have been forgotten history. It should not have been resurrected and I would really like Senator Clarke or any other Minister to persuade me of the merits of this particular proposal. Tell us the need for that type of accommodation for examinations. Tell me about the type of conferences that will be held there whether you can hold large conventions or what. Tell me about the amount of preplanning that went there before you cleared the site and started the construction work, how much planning has been done. Tell me about when the plans were approved and all that type of thing.

I say this because this came like a thief in the night to the public. We heard suddenly that this thing was going to happen and that is not good. We heard too, via the Press, that it would probably cost $25 million. We have already spent $4.5 million and we are proposing $6.5 million, that is $11 million, so we probably have another $14 million if what we heard is true and by over-runs it will probably go beyond that but we need some of these specifics

This seems to be a most unfortunate affair and there is one little aspect of it that I want to say in undertones, not for any pronounced public indication, on my view on the matter but I will ask people particularly to look at the location of that building.

You will notice that it has an uninterrupted view of Ilaro Court and all I would say on that matter is that it would require the same amount of surveillance and security measures that one would apply to Ilaro Court whenever such measures are deemed necessary for Ilaro Court. That building should not be there and it is not to late to forget about it, if you understand what I am saying. If you get my drift you get my drift if not forget about it. I will talk to you privately.

I am concerned about the aspects of that particular project and we should really be enlightened and I think that this is responsibility gone wrong. This is worse than the Central Bank Building. The problem with the Central Bank building was that it cost too much. The problem with this is that it cost a lot and it is worth nothing. It is a waste of resources.

Next I want to direct attention to page 94. This expenditure is quite in order, quite laudable – Structures under Secondary Schools $7.45 million and I think that two schools are going to be built, one, I think is Queen's College and some other school. If I am wrong Senator Clarke or anyone else can correct me at the appropriate time, but what I am saying is that to the extent that that is intended to start more than one school at this time or even to complete more than one school, I would point out that there should have been some possibility, or maybe, it is still possible now, I do not know, to phase the construction of those schools.

Let us say you wanted to have a school in St. Thomas starting next year or around the same time that Queen's College will occupy their new premises. That school, quite clearly, is a new school and will build up gradually in numbers. You would not be able to get from first to fifth form full numbers all the time so you build a new spanking school and give them and it will only be utilised for a number of years.

If Queen's College is not in that building anymore, even though you might have other plans for it, at least, *pro temps*, for a year or two, you could start the new school in there and then when you finish Queen's College, start building the other school, open both the new school the moment Queen's College move out and you would get a better sequencing of your expenditure, but a phasing of the expenditures and no-one would have suffered really and it may be too late, the amount of money you have committed yourself to contractually and so might have foreclosed that option to you but if it is not so foreclosed, it should be given consideration and, at least, the general approach is something you should note for the future because you will confront this thing time and time again.

Then I come now to page 8 of the Estimates, Mr. President, and I am directing attention to subhead 10 Grants to Public Institutions. This is the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, almost $2 million.

One million, nine hundred and ninety-eight thousand, six hundred and eighty-eight dollars, that grant is to help out Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation with the projected losses.
2.40 p.m.

In a certain way, the National Democratic Party should, if we want to be selfish and view politics in the way that some people view politics, we should be grateful to CBC because they are making sure faster than anybody else that the Government will lose the election the next time. For one thing, even the messages that the Government

wants to put over CBC, the people do not listen to them any more. They do not listen to CBC because they know all they get over there is Government propaganda. And that pains me because I have devoted a lot of my time and effort for CBC over the years, including over a number of years doing Guttaperk at one time for a whole month myself for free. And everything I have done for CBC is for free because I see it as a Government institution that should be promoted. It pains me to know that I, who was one of the first moderators on Guttaperk, do not listen to Guttaperk now. That is unfortunate. CBC has fallen on sorry times. And I do not want to place the blame on anybody, and the responsibility for cleaning up the mess falls on the Government.

It is about time that we have a Government-owned station which does not fear of allowing contrary opinion on it, contrary to Government or giving normal and fair exposure to the Official Opposition or any other kind of Opposition we have in the country. The country deserves no less. And the pain I feel, all of the people in the country feel, except those who would promote and condone that, a small number of people! We must always remember that what we do not like for ourselves, we should not do to others. All the Members of Government if they put themselves in the shoes of the rest of the country, they are going to like it. And if they feel that they are promoting themselves by non-aligning CBC, they are wrong. Governments tried it before and they suffered. This one is trying it and it will suffer. So in a sense, you are helping the NDP. But we do not want that kind of help. We want Barbados to be a place that everybody can be proud of. Have a Government owned station with the highest standards. And I exhort you to turn around. You are behaving in a worse manner than any Party has behaved. I am not making any specific reference to anybody. But whoever right now is influencing decisions at CBC is behaving in a worse manner than ever before. And that is not good enough.

Mr. President, I am unclear as to how much more time I have.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Very little. I want the Clerk to indicate to me, if you have not exceeded the time. How many minutes?

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I have fifteen minutes?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I heard five minutes a long time ago.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: If he said five then, I will not wind up. Thank you very much for giving me five minutes over what I probably had. I have five minutes?

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Clerk told me five minutes and I will give him five minutes by my watch which I think is a better time than the time in here.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Essentially, Mr. President, what I am saying is that we are engaged in a rather serious exercise here. We are engaged in an activity which is going to have a fundamental effect on economic conditions in Barbados during the coming year and way beyond that. We have to be responsible for what we are doing. And to be responsible, we have to base our decisions on the best information available, and if at any time that information is seen to be less than the best, discard it and replace it with better information.

We should base our decisions on the highest level of motivation and concern for the country. We should not use the Estimates as a party political issue. We should not do that.

I am afraid that if there is any sense in this document, it seems to relate to a situation where the Estimates are being used as a party political document for an imminent election. We would welcome the election soon. It is time the country gets better government. But at the same time that is not a proper purpose. What is at stake is far too high. We have to put the country before Party whether you are the Ds, the Bs or in the Nationals. And that is what I am exhorting Government to do, to take another look at this in a dispassionate way, recognize that this budget is grossly in error – it is not what the country needs at this point in time – to have the courage to change it, or waste our finance, pride themselves on having the courage to tax the country when he feels that taxation is right. He does not want any easy solutions, tax you if you have to be taxed, and face the consequences. Well apply the same courage to reversing yourself when you are shown to be wrong. Do not hang on to a false position and tax the country in some false show of courage. We do not want that. We want proper government, not falsely courageous government.

I thank you, Mr. President.

Applause.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, this annual Parliamentary exercise of the Appropriation Bill and Estimates is the one occasion that we are afforded an opportunity of reviewing the affairs of the country at large as a whole.

But I hope I am permitted, Sir, to make brief observations, however, as to the manner in which we are required to do so. And I should like to suggest that perhaps some consideration be given to reviewing that process and procedure so that we can improve on the way we approach these debates for the future.

As the Standing Orders stand, Sir, they provide that we are limited to speak for an hour and speak on all the Heads at one swoop, with the main speaker for Government and the Opposition being provided two hours.

I should like to suggest, Sir, perhaps that we look at it in the Standing Orders Committee, which was appointed in July 1986, that it be convened to look and see how the Standing Orders of this Honourable Senate be adapted to limit the main speeches to say half hour, but give an opportunity for detailed consideration of Heads, fifteen minutes speeches on the Heads that you have an interest in. So that at least the Minister can reply to points made Head by Head rather than be obliged to look at everything in one swoop at the end. I think if this were to happen, Sir, it would lead to more meaningful participation or contributions by Honourable Senators.

I next, Sir, turn to the Head Parliament under the Appropriation Bill and the Estimates. I should think, Sir, I may have had opportunity, occasion to say in this Chamber in the past that the way we have conducted our business in Parliament has not changed much in the 350 years we have been observing and marking in Parliament. And the way how Parliament functions in Barbados is akin to a description I have heard applied to the United Kingdom which perhaps has more application here than there, that we are fast moving to an area of an elected dictatorship. Because Parliamentarians outside of the Frontbench are used purely as what I call voting machines. They vote when they are called upon to vote and are not given any opportunity to make any meaningful input in the course of the affairs of the country outside of election time and outside of when you are called upon to vote.
2.50 p.m.

I would like, Sir, to suggest that perhaps as one way of effectively in a material way improving the quality of Parliament in this 350th year that consideration be given to Parliament looking at some form of joint Committees of both Houses constituted of the Back-benchers. So that all of those who are not Ministers on that side as well as the Independents and the Opposition and the Back-benchers in the Other Place could constitute Committees of Parliament to mirror each Department of Government. My luncheon guest, the MP from the United Kingdom, says that there is a Committee in the United Kingdom's Parliament to match every major Department of State in which all MP's and Members of Lords participate and it gives MP's an opportunity not only to question Ministers but to question the public officers on the functionings of their Departments and to examine them on the Estimates in a way that perhaps some of the concerns raised by Senator McClean could be ventilated and looked into. So that we would be better informed when we come to this annual exercise than we are. In fact, Sir, I have a complaint. I think that as a basic principle the Government Departments, the public servants, treat Parliament and threat the Senate in particular with a fair degree of contempt in that there are questions which remain outstanding and unanswered for periods in excess of a year. Some questions are in my name and one of which is over a year old at this point and others approaching that period of time.

When one examines the pattern that has taken place in the Mother of Parliaments in the United Kingdom, we have seen committees of that Parliament at work over diverse issues, whether it is the matter of the Ministries of Agriculture and Health looking at the chicken and listeria issue in the United Kingdom of the environment or the matter of unemployment – matters looked at by Committees and I suggest that we do give this sort of consideration. I like to say now, Sir, that later during the course of this year I will bring a resolution which I hope will be supported which will call for the Senate to approve a resolution for the institution of a committee system to mirror the Departments of Government so that we can give the Departments some sort of scrutiny that they now lack. I hope that they will be looked at and supported by all Senators regardless of party, creed or philosophy.

Sir, I next turn to the revenue issues under the Estimates and when I have examined, Sir, as an appendix to the Appropriation Bill at IV, I am alarmed at the projected increase in Income tax and Corporation tax which is envisaged and I say so without any boast but with some trepidation. As a fairly substantial taxpayer of this country, I am afraid of what the implications are in the projected increase and I really cannot afford to pay very much more than what I am paying. But in looking at the revenue, Sir, I am concerned at where the shortfall in the abandonment of the surcharge collections is going to fall both in Income tax and Corporation tax. I am concerned and I thought that I would be constructive and, so as to ease the burden that might be placed upon those who pay income tax, to point the Minister to areas of revenue which seem woefully underestimated and suggest that perhaps some consideration be given to more effective collection of revenue.

On the same page IV, Sir, under the Heading – Taxes on Properties – there is an item called Land Development Duty. Sir, on November 16th I gave Notice of a Question in relation to Government's policy with relation to Land Development Duty. The question remains unanswered and so I have no means of knowing, Sir, whether the concerns I raised have any bearing. The question is Question 9 standing in my name on the Order Paper. It is a document of the House so I do not have to read the question. But Sir, I am concerned that the Estimates project an income of $250,000 for 1989-90 for Development Duty. In circumstances where there is a highway opened on which major appreciation in property values has occurred, there is no expectation in the Estimates of any improved revenue to accrue to the Treasury of this country in this Head.

Sir, the Land Development Duty Act was made an Act of Parliament in 1962. It came into force on August 30, 1962 and it provides, Sir, that whenever the Government undertakes or proposes to undertake in any area expenditure from public funds which in the opinion of the Minister responsible for Finance is substantial, it shall be lawful for the Minister by Order to declare any such area to be a Special Development Area under the Act, to specify the base date which shall not be more than one year before the publication in the Official Gazette of the Order and to specify the development date which shall not be more than 10 years after the specified base date. And then it goes on to say, Sir, "No Order shall come into force unless it is approved by Resolution of both Houses." The maximum rate of development duty under the Act, Sir, shall not exceed 50%.

Sir, in the history of the Act since 1962 several Orders have been made and Orders recently expired in relation to the Spring Garden Highway and Heywoods. Orders are still in force in respect of the St. Barnabas area when that road was widened and that Order was made in March 1985 with a base date of April 1984 and expires on March 31, 1994. There is an Order in force, Sir, in Parish Land, Christ Church made in May 1985 and it relates to a base date of May 1, 1981 and expires December 1991 and there is an Order right now, Sir, at Belair, St. George made in April 1986.

There are people, Sir, who bought land in the Warrens area at 23 cents a square foot some while ago. Government I understand acquired the land at $1.00 a square foot when the road started and have now sold that land at $7.00 square foot minimum and in some cases $12.00 a square foot and other transactions are pending.

I am aware, Mr. President, that a minimum of $1.4 million may be lost to the Treasury for failure to make the Order before the end of the current month or the end of next month at the latest. The question arises that failure to make the Order is simply this. Is it due to negligence on the part of the Government? Is it due to imcompetence on the part of the Public Officers or is it due to any element of dishonesty? Because the questions have been raised by others to me – is someone getting a piece of change for failure to make an Order or to defer from making an Order? I raise this, Sir – I raised notice of a Question in November. I have given several private intimations to the Minister of my intention to raise this matter on the floor during this debate unless I saw evidence that an Order was being made. So I do not think I can be claimed to be unfair in raising it at this time.
3.00 p.m.

I say no more. I hope that the Treasury will be enhanced to the extent it is entitled to be enhanced, because it is a road for which a lot of money has been expended. It is the one development area to which duty ought to be applied, because the new highway, call it what you will – ABC, Airport to West Coast Highway – has opened up vistas and development land that were not available before in this island in the past 20 years. The East Coast Road, which pioneered the concept of the Development Duty Act, did not have the same impact of opened up lands for development, but from the airport area to Warrens and beyond has opened up land in the area of the Belle and in the area of Balls and Newton that was not available for development before. It was land locked and people are now appreciating and getting handsome sums and the Act is not being utilised for the purpose for which it was intended. I wonder why.

Sir, I turn to page V of the Estimates. There is an item there called Travel Tax. There is currently travel tax of 15% on tickets when people travel out of the island but with a ceiling of $300, so really on anything over $2 000 you are getting a reduced rate of levy. I wonder if it is not time for Government to look at the removal of the cap, because it will not – and I hasten to say – affect the average person who is going on a holiday to New York and anywhere in North America. The business person is going to have to pay that sort of figure, it is going to be deductible in any event, and perhaps that ought to be looked at.

At page IX, Sir, I also have a question in relation to revenue. The Hilton Hotel is shown as not making a contribution to revenue. In 1987–88 it made a contribution of $66 248. There is no provision as to where it is making a contribution for 1989–90.

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I appreciate the *sotto voce* remark coming across the table, but one of the things I found in going through the Estimates is that provisions were made and things were shifted, but there is no note telling you where to look. There is an area I saw, for example, and I wondered why parking fees had gone down. They were not there under Transport and Works. Then in going through it almost page by page I found they had been shifted to the Police. It would help for the appreciation of the Estimates if this sort of note could point you to where they could be found.

Sir, I turn to page XIV under the Head of Expenditure, Ministry of Health, Queen Elizabeth Hospital 071 501, 071 502, 071 503. I note, Sir, and in researching this I find, that the last time any adjustment in fees at the hospital was made was in April, 1982 and they have not been changed since, not what my perusal of the laws indicates. To the extent that these are private paying fees, most people now using the hospital are having their fees paid by some sort of insurance cover, so it is not really hurting anyone's pocket. The insurance companies are paying it and they are being subsidised to the extent that they are not paying anything approaching the economic cost, and a lot of people are

going into the non-paying wards too, because the treatment is as good and there is no cost anyway, and at least you see a nurse more often and you have somebody else to talk to and watch TV or play cards with if you are not mortally ill.

I am concerned, Sir, to reduce the burden up at the top, what income tax you are going to look to soak those whom people feel free and always willing to soak.

Sir, I now turn to the Head of the Judiciary, Head 11. I notice under the Capital Head that there are plans provided for the construction of a judicial centre and I ask the question to the Minister when will they start that construction. I think the actual provision for the Capital Head for that should more be Legal Affairs than Judiciary, but it is related.

Secondly, I ask the question of the Minister under the Head of the Judiciary. When is it proposed to bring into operation the separate Court of Appeal for Barbados? I understand that there is a constitutional concern whether the Constitution provides for appointment of a Court of Appeal, and I would like to suggest that the Committee which is currently meeting in the Other Place to consider amendments to the Constitution could usefully look at putting that thing in place at that time.

If you examine the Report of the Registry for 1987, at page 4 of that Report there is an incidence of substantial increases in the number of matters going before the courts over the period. In 1985 there were 1 320, 1986 1 405, 1987 1 653, and my understanding for 1988 it was close to 2 000. There were also 75 magisterial appeals in 1987 as compared with 67 in 1986 and 46 in 1985. There is, however, a greater problem in relation to the magisterial appeals, and that is, that a lot of the magistrates, and I am going to say so at this point, Sir, are not sending on their grounds for appeal and there is a lot of hardship being suffered by litigants.

In fact, there is a case which is almost a scandal where a judicial officer has left this jurisdiction and is now far away working in another Commonwealth State and neither his notes, reasons nor books can be found and there is concern as to really what is going to ever happen to those appeals. Those who are now serving on the magisterial bench are equally delinquent in having outstanding matters in this respect.

Sir, I turn to Head 13, CBC, and I want to share the concerns raised by Senator McClean in respect of the provision of $2 million for that institution. In fact, Sir, the provision for CBC represents 132% increase over the previous year. But I probably take a different view of CBC than Senator McClean. I think that there is really absolutely no purpose for Government to own CBC and to keep on coming back to the public purse for subventions of this kind.

3.10 p.m.

I think CBC should be privatised. I don't think any mature confident Government ought to be concerned about controlling instruments of propaganda or information. You can have enough control in the licences as VOB and Rediffusion have been licensed. The provisions of their licence, and I sought a copy from them, give Government a right to time. The conditions under which Government can have access to the media are known as Government reserve time and the Government also has the right to require a licensee to broadcast over its transmitters any matter which in the opinion of the Government should have full island coverage for reasons of emergency, or great national interest or for such other reasons as the Government may deem fit.

There is really no reason why CBC should continue to be a haemorrhage on the public purse of this country. I think it should be privatised. You may want to put in safeguards to ensure that no one organ of information can control both print and electronic, and I have no problems with that, but I don't think we should keep on having a situation where we come back to the bottomless well of the public purse to maintain an institution that has no economic significance to Barbados. It is information, yes, but you can control that and you do not have to say you must own it to ensure that that end is realised.

While on the point, Sir, of electronic media, I want to say, Sir, that I think there is a need for the electronic media to display a greater sensitivity in the treatment of tragic events. There was an incident a few weeks ago where a young woman tragically lost her life, and the child's name was broadcast on the radio before her family was informed, so the mother was met on the road and asked "did you hear about so and so?" Now that is not right, Sir. When you read the papers and hear the newscasts in the developed countries of tragedies, they say the name of the victim has been withheld pending notification of the relatives. That is the sensitive correct way of dealing with tragedies in our community. Would you like, Sir, to be driving along on the road with your car radio on and hear a newscast: we interrupt this news to tell you that... you might crash; it could be your child, your daughter. Whatever it is, they should hold it until they can find you and tell you rather than to hear it blared over the radio. All of them, CBC, VOB, Rediffusion, do it because they all want to catch the news first; but at what cost? I say that they need greater sensitivity in treating the news in this fashion. I think that to the extent that the Government agencies are responsible, they should be spoken to.

Sir, I turn to Defence and Security on page 10. Sir, it is interesting looking at this Head. Do you know when one analyses the figures for this Head, 13 (F) Defence and

Security, it shows that over a period when Defence and Security provisions have been made in the Estimates to the present time that a Head that is perhaps one of the most contentious Heads in Barbados has seen a growth in percentage terms, I will give that first and then come to the real numbers, of 836 per cent between 1978 and 1989. In other words, it has gone from $2.4 million in 1978-79 to $22 508 000 in 1989-90, and much as we say it has a role to play in the structure of things, the way how this Head has escalated in that period of time is something. I will pass the figures so that you can check them. If you look at page 4, I am dealing with the totality of the amount spent. Page 4 gives the figure of $22 508 000; page 10 just deals with the general administration cost.

The next thing I turn to is the Ombudsman's report. I have three comments to make, Sir, in relation to that report. One is that I would like to compliment that office for the timeliness of the report. This report was laid in this Chamber, I think three weeks ago, at the beginning of the month of March, so it came within the 90 days of the end of the calendar year for which it reports, and it is a model on which some other reports can be based. I saw a report from the Prison that was such a model of disinformation that I wonder why it bothered to come.

There are two comments in the report, Sir, that I want to draw attention to. On page 8 of the report at paragraph 27 he makes mention of a review of certain financial procedures, and I think, Sir, that the point made there needs to be emphasised, because people who deal with Government departments in terms of payment have a problem in falling between two schools as to know who is going to pay them, and they get shunted from not me that Ministry, and it creates a crisis of confidence as to Government's *bona fide* in entering into commercial transactions.

The other comment he made, Sir, is on page 23 and it is paragraph 13 which is a complaint against the Registration Department. I have an interest in this matter because it relates to the activities of the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Association. Now somewhere in the Head under the Ministry of Legal Affairs there is a provision for a part-time Secretary for that Committee. This is a provision, Sir, that is a cause for concern. When I was President of the Bar Association I made representation to the then Attorney General and it has been made by my successor too to all the Attorneys-General since then and it has been observed in the breach, and it is this, Sir; the Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court functions as the Secretary to the Disciplinary Committee. He has other duties and as a result the work of the Committee suffers. If there is no Secretary there is no one to service the Committee. We have asked the Bar for a while for someone to be identified and be paid from funds to service the Committee independently of the Deputy Registrar; so this complaint is not really fair against the Registrar, but it is really due to the lack of appreciation of the public officers or the Minister to fund the Committee in a way to do its job as it is required to do under the Legal Profession Act. As Deputy Chairman of that Committee, I give the assurance that any complaints are looked into and looked into indeed seriously and diligently, but we need the staff to effect it and I wish that the Attorney General would respond to this and so obviate the need for the Ombudsman to complain or look into a complaint that really is not a fair complaint if the matter was dealt with correctly.

3.20 p.m.

Sir, I now turn to Head 20, the matter of revenue collection. Last year the Minister of Finance in his Budget, at page 36, subsequently reflected in the Income Tax Act amendment of 1988, introduced certain measures to reduce the carry-forward provision for tax losses.

This, I think, one of my colleagues will have somewhat more to say about but the impact, Sir, of reducing the carry-forward period of tax losses is to, sometimes, harm companies who need the assistance in that companies who might have built up large losses over the period are finding that they are now being taxed as soon as they are coming into an area of profitability and, further, the other provision that was made, 50% restriction would have serious negative effects on companies that are trying to move from a loss to a profit position and requiring them to pay taxes on profits that have not yet been made.

There are two things. One is – I see the Minister looking puzzled so I will clarify. The reduction in the time period allowed for corporations to carry forward financial loss from 7 to 5 years, and a limit to offset losses up to a maximum of 50% of the taxable income has a serious impact on the companies. It means, Sir, that companies, as I said, who have been servicing loans are hard-pressed to meet sufficient working capital purposes would have no hope of meeting their tax payments and/or of expanding and, also, they would now have to pay taxes on losses which they say they have now effectively wiped.

I have held the view that the losses that had been accrued before this legislation came into force were accrued rights and may well have interfered with people's constitutional acquired rights but that is something on which I am to be suitably retained to argue it properly.

It is not unusual for a new venture to incur losses in its first and second years and this is offset when profits are made and since losses have to be financed, lending institutions would be reluctant to advance funds to businesses to pay taxes before the business becomes a viable entity and in that context I ask that consideration be given to some ease.

I also suggest that you look at a graduated form of corporation tax depending upon the size of the venture so

that it does not bear a flat rate irregardless of the venture in which you are in. Under this Head of revenue there is also something I want to say in relation to the International Business Companies Act. I repeat an observation I made in the past year about the need to probably use that as an area of licence for a licence fee to be paid.

At page 2 of the Economic Review Report of the Central Bank for December 1988 observation was made that mid-year the number of IDCs had gone from 79 in 1986 to 335, a growth area, but, as I have said before, Sir, IDCs operate on the basis where they work for a full year and then they have to get a tax certificate from the Commissioner and they have a difficulty also sometimes with that and I think the Treasury could be enhanced if they were provided with a licence up front and payable for a renewal fee on an annual basis.

I do not think the Government appreciates the degree to which the external industry has made inputs to Barbados. Last week there was a newspaper article from the President of the Exempt Insurance Committee to the effect that $20 million had been earned in that industry during 1988. That industry is at some risk and at some danger because we are about to lose the Federal Excise Tax Exemption we had under the Government Taxation Treaty and I want to say on this point that the Government has been negligent in waiting for the U.S. Treasury and the Bermuda lobby to take away from us what we had and start to make representation after we have lost it.

The first public announcement from the Minister of Finance on the issue was in November at the Miami meeting when, to the best of my knowledge, there was an opportunity before that expired for us to do something about it and we have lost something with the result that some companies might leave Barbados and all that that has implication for us and, certainly, no new ones may come, and there was a spin-off for tourism. There was a spin-off for jobs and services.

There is one company which is still holding on where there is a board of 70 directors who plan to have a big meeting here within two weeks. They are coming for a week and they are having a meeting at the Central Bank and they are bringing their wives. The direct benefit for tourism that these companies generate is significant and I repeat an observation I made last year that the Ministry of Finance should identify a specific Minister to have overview of this area. It is a growth area and it is being neglected. There are occasions when time runs out on you because everything goes up to the top and it creates problems.

I had a situation last December where a request was made for a certificate early December and it went on and on and eventually they said I must come and get it before the end of the year. I flew down over Christmas and we got it the first working day after Christmas and what was embarrassing about it was that at the end of the day it was a printed form that required a signature being put upon it and it was really a matter that could have been delegated to a public officer but it was reserved for the exclusive purview of the Minister of Finance and it did not impress the investor who said, "well, is it worth it to deal with Barbados if we have to be kept back so long at that point?"

Sir, I turn to page 41, Head 24 – Pensions. I have a concern, Sir, about pensions. The Estimates show that $33 1/2 million will be spent on pensions in 1988/89. Since the fiscal policies of 1986 when pensions were exempted from income tax, people are looking forward to their retirement. They seem to be better off but the number of people who are left to bear the burden of taxes in this country, Sir, is shrinking and I wonder whether, as a country, we can afford to exempt all those who get a pension in excess of $15 000 a year from income tax.

I wonder, Sir, if, perhaps, we could not have a situation where you gave them a discounted rate but still require them to pay tax. I wonder, Sir, how many other countries in the world exempt pensioners from income tax. I think it is a luxury that I ask, can we continue to afford?
3.30 p.m.

I turn, Sir, to Head 34 Education and I raise a question, page 86. There is an increase, of Subscriptions to Contributions on that page from $85 000 to $3.6 million, a substantial increase, Sir. It does not say what the institutions are going to receive by way of the subscriptions. It seems a very high increase and I wonder and I will throw this suggestion out to the Minister, if he could perhaps look at the way the matter is treated on page 135, where the Grants to Institutions on that page are detailed. So you know how it is shown. But whether .....

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Well I can only go on what I have.

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: When you ask the question. In that case I ask the question, can we afford $3 1/2 million more from the Treasury in 1989-90 for the BWU Labour College, the Extra Mural Department, the Astronomical Society, the Girls' Industrial Union and the NUPW? How much are they going to get? When you go from eighty-five and a half thousand dollars in 1988-89 to $3.6 million who is getting the largesse? I ask the question.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have to change your phrases.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: It is a significant increase. I share the concern of Senator McClean, Sir, at page 101 with respect to the Sherbourne Conference

Centre. I share those concerns. I think my time is contracted and I would not repeat them. But I think that in addition to the matters to which he has politely alluded, I raise the issue too of traffic congestion. I wonder to what degree the utilization of that centre is going to require the expenditure. And in this connection, Sir, I refer again to my Question. There is a Question in my name on the Order Paper, Question No. 8 asked on the 16th November which remains unanswered in relation to Sherbourne. And I would appreciate a reply.

Sir I turn to page 102, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. And I just say it briefly, Sir, in passing that there is a Committee, I would not dignify it by calling it a Commission, there is a Committee of Enquiry looking into certain matters relating to that Ministry. Sir, any Committee of Enquiry not set up under Cap. 112 of the Laws of Barbados, Commissions of Inquiry Act is a waste of time. It has no power, it has no teeth, and all it does is provide an opportunity for people to travel at the taxpayers' expense to get nothing. Because they have no powers of compulsion to appear to give evidence and it is a waste of time. And if the history of past Commissions of Enquiry is anything to go by where we have one where the Reports are never even laid in Parliament, then I ask the question, why waste time and money in this exercise?

Sir, I turn to page 122 and Head 78 Ministry of Health, Capital Works, St. Joseph Hospital. Last year, Sir, during debate on this issue, I suggested that the St. Joseph Hospital be privatized, be leased out. Nothing has happened to it, Sir. But now I see they have provided here in the Estimates $3.6 million for the commissioning, refurbishment and equipment for the hospital to serve as an acute care hospital in the north. The question which arises, Sir, is this. We are creating another situation for haemorrhage. We can have another hospital in the north and make it a condition, like I said for CBC, of those who operate it to provide certain services to those as a condition of the licence. But why must we add another drain on the public purse in this hospital?

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Well I should be grateful if a statement is made in response to that. Because it has not been said or said so far.

And on this issue of privatization, Sir, the comments made in the Other Place relating to a crematorium being created and the Minister saying that his Government's policy is to own a crematorium. For what purpose? There is no money in dead bodies. And certainly not for the Government to get into the business of building one. If people want to be cremated let them pay for it. Let the private sector do it if they want to do it. But not, for God's sake, for us to be in the business of looking after the dead.

Aside.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: The Ministry of Transport and Works, Sir. There is a provision there for $10 million in subsidy for the operation of the Transport Board. Under the Ministry of Education as well there is a provision of $2 million for subsidies to bus fares. And I wonder what the totality of that number is. Is it ten plus two or is the two part of the ten? When I looked at Education there was a provision of $2 million for subsidies. And is it a totality of $12 million or is it $10 million in total? I ask the question.

Sir, under the Head of Tourism there is concern that Government put in place adequate legislation for protection of those who use the sea from jet ski operators and the like. And I think that one of my colleagues probably has more to mention on this and I would not steal his thunder.

The other Head, Sir, I want to refer to briefly in the time left to me is Housing and Lands, Head 37 at page ...., well it covers a series of pages over 125 and on. And I wish, Sir, to draw attention to a failure of Government agencies to carry through a development that they contracted to enter into with the St. George Glebe. There is concern that an agreement made some ten years ago for the development of the St. George Glebe is not now fully implemented and that the way how the development is going forward would seem to leave in place what is known as a low class slum with a deteriorating chattel house development with inadequate roads, inferior drainage, a series of banjo water pipes leading to the main road, subhuman health standards with the middle and high income housing developments on the outskirts.

There was a well thought out heads of agreement made in 1980 which now seems to be in abandon.

I should like to commend to the Minister the reconsideration of this agreement which was made between the Government and the Anglican Church. The church needs to maximize all of its opportunities for revenue. And this is one which was entered into where lands were given up in turn for certain action on the part of the Government. The church has kept its part of the deal. Government seems to be backing away from its obligations.

Mr. President, there is a slogan that comes on the TV every now and again which says, "Tourism is our business, tourism is my business." I see it, Sir, in the context that this exercise is that Barbados is my business. And my approach to the Estimates is to be constructive and where critical to make it constructive, critical criticism. It is in that context I have made my contribution to this debate and hope that it will not be a question that, when we return for the exercise next year, a lot of the concerns remain unanswered because

they are not regarded for the simple reason that they emanated not from the other side. I thank you.
3.40 p.m.

Applause.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, Sir, before dealing in detail with the area of Education which I consider my special interest, there are some more general comments which I should like to make in dealing with the Appropriation Bill now before us.

I do not necessarily share quite the view of other persons on the matter of Income Tax except that I would certainly agree that it is about as heavy as the country can bear and possibly too heavy. What I am, therefore, concerned about, Sir, is ways in which we can seek to reduce the load in terms of interest payments and amortization payments and consequently reduce logically the need for increased Income Tax.

When I look at the Estimates, 1 or 2 things strike me immediately – one is that we do not really have enough or adequate information to make a judgment in terms of the figures about what has actually happened. For example, we have no actual figures for the year preceding the one with whose Estimates we are dealing and I recognize that this has not been so in the past. That is, the provision has not been made for it. But it seems to me that we should be able to do better than this. It seems to me that we ought at least to be able to have with the presentation of the Estimates a statement of the actual expenditure of the preceding financial year at least up to the end of January. It is my understanding that there is a Central Planning Committee which holds regular meetings and which looks at the demand for payment and it seems to me that it should be possible out of that to provide this honourable Chamber and the Other Place with far more concrete information than we now have.

There are a number of things that I want to look at and I turn first of all to Head 76 – 09 where we have an amount of some $7,450,000 dealing with structures. This is in terms of Capital, Page 94. This is in terms of Capital Expenditure, Mr. President, and one would wish to know how much of the Revised Estimates was actually spent on how many schools and so on, and is it reasonable to anticipate that about twice the Revised Estimates under this Head for last year can actually be spent in this year? This is the kind of question that I would like to ask about a number of Subheads. It is by no means clear exactly where we are. For example, if we take Head 76–16 on Page 95, we have maintenance for the Community College included as Capital Works. Is that recurrent? If it is not recurrent, then why is it not included under Head 76–15–23. That kind of question I think needs to be asked. It is by no means clear.

If you look at Head 76–23 – the page for that, Sir, is Page 96. We have a similar question and one could ask the same kind of question. If I turn to Head 76–38–23, I have it in Subhead so I have got to find the page numbers for Your Honour. Page 101, Sir – this question was already raised. But since I have got it noted myself, I would like to re-emphasize it. How much of the Revised Estimates was actually spent? How much of the 1989 Appropriation is a revote of the unexpended portion?

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, Dr. Shorey is asking the same question everytime. Revised Estimates only means the Ministries assessment of what they hope to spend up to March of that financial year. What you see is what you will get as a reply that they expect to spend that amount. I hope that will give you the information you require.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, if I continue and look at Head 78–07–23, the kind of question that I wish to ask there, Sir, ... would it not be desirable that the proportion of the $6 plus million being appropriated for the QEH extension should be reviewed in light of provision already made in Item 78–01–23. If you look at 78–08–23, I have another question to ask. Is there more duplication here? Why were these polytechnics excluded from the polytechnic programme in Item 78–07–23? How much of the improvement described is really deferred maintenance? If I look at 78–10–23 where we are talking about refurbishing and repairs, should these be identified as recurrent items? It seems to me that there is no clear demarcation between what are described in the Estimates as Capital Expenditure and what would be referred to as more legitimately as recurrent expenditure. These are the kinds of concerns, Sir, which I think in general one needs to ask about the Estimates as a whole and one would hope that the Government would be prepared to give some serious consideration to them.

Let me turn now, Sir, to the matters on which I would wish to make, I hope, more substantial comment. I turn first of all to Education and in particular I wish to start off with what is listed on Page 81 as Pre-primary, Primary, and Special Education and in that connection, Sir, I wish to deal first of all with the whole matter of allocation of students to our schools. When I look at this, Mr. President, I find something that disturbs me tremendously. Information passed out, Sir, to the schools following last year's so called Common Entrance Exam more correctly known as Secondary Schools Entrance Examination showed that there were 4 schools – Harrison College, Queens College, St. Michael School, and Combermere School – all of which received youngsters with scores above 75%.
3.50 p.m.

There was a gradation, and at the bottom there are four schools – Princess Margaret, Grantley Adams, St.

George and St. Lucy – all of which received youngsters who fell below the cut off point for schools above them of 30%.

It seems to me, Mr. President, and I must say that I put this in my memorandum to the Minister, because he asked for memoranda and I stated this, that we are quite rightly annoyed and very angry at segregation in South Africa on the basis of race. I am suggesting that we are performing, and continuing to perform, segregation in Barbados on the basis of youngsters' performance, and I have drawn attention to specific examples.

Mr. President, I would perhaps be a little less annoyed and upset about this as a professional in education if we really had any grounds for believing that what we do at 11 is based on any knowledge of what the youngsters are capable of, but I am contending, Sir, and I think with very good reason, that none of us in this Honourable Chamber, nor in this country, nor anywhere in the world knows anything about what a youngster is capable of. All that we know on the basis of this examination is that the youngster performed in a certain way on a certain day. There is not a single one of us who can look into the future and say that that youngster who performed badly will not become Prime Minister 25 or 35 years from now. Not a single one of us can do that, and I am therefore saying that when we look at the sociological evidence in terms of the implications of this and the self-fulfilling prophesy that results, that we get what we expect, and the poor self-images of the youngsters that result and of the teachers that result from this segregation, I am suggesting that there is urgent need for us to change our allocation procedures.

I wish, Sir, to take another aspect. Last year on July 13 I posed to the Minister a Question about the way in which marks were treated at the Common Entrance Examination. I got a Reply which acknowledged in statement 2 that the Minister was aware that the proposal I referred to should be carried out, but that the Minister, and I quote: "was not aware that there is only one method of legitimately combining marks" and then he proceeded in the reply to state how the measures were done.

Mr. President, there is in my view absolutely no excuse and no justification for the use of an incorrect and invalid procedure. I have before me extracts which I made from just a few of the resources which I could pick up, and the bibliographic references are available here. I quote a few of them. "Scaling is necessary when marks on different topics on different examinations are to be combined." This is another one. "All that matters for the comparison of marks is that the several distributions are converted to the same scale." Another quotation. "A candidate's mark in one examination cannot be directly compared with his mark in a different examination." I go on with another one, "There is the practical consideration that scales for different tests should be comparable." Finally, Sir, and this is very crucial, "The rank order using standardised marks may well differ from that obtained using the raw marks."

Mr. President, the Minister's Reply was in part that the marks are ranked using the average and essay grades, and I have just read a comment that the rank order may be different if the marks are standardised. What I am saying, therefore, is that in fact the people of the country are being misled, because they are being led to believe that the procedure used is a valid and justifiable one. I am contending, and I have supporting evidence for it, that the procedure used is invalid and therefore the rank order that results, and the basis on which youngsters are assigned to schools is incorrect and can be shown to be incorrect.

I wish, with due respect, Sir, to you and to the other persons in this Honourable Chamber, to challenge the Minister to provide his supporting evidence from educational authorities that the procedure the Ministry is using is correct. I have provided here and in other fora my grounds for my argument. I invite the Minister, to use a more gentle term, to present his evidence for the grounds on which the present procedure is used.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. President. Senator Shorey said he was quoting from authorities. I hope he makes those documents of the House.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, I have great pleasure in making these extracts documents of the House. They are for the record, a book on Principles of Examining by James M. Thyne who was Principal Lecturer in Psychology at Jordan Hill College of Education in Glasgow, by J.P. Guildford, who is an acknowledged authority in the area of measurement, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education and who is Emeritus Professor of Psychology at the University of Southern California, and there is a wealth of other resources, Sir, which I shall be only too happy and willing to make documents of this House, or to make available to any persons interested in the matter. I shall be very happy indeed to do that.

I wish also on this matter to make the point, Mr. President, that when we are looking at youngsters' performance we need to take other things into consideration. I think I made this point last year, but I wish to make it again for the record. If youngsters have difficulty in reading, then the results of their examination may tell us more about their inability to read than about their knowledge of the subject. I put it to this Honourable Chamber that if in the next five minutes each of us was given a simple problem written in Russian there is probably not a single person in this Honourable Chamber who could answer that question, and I do not think it would indicate that we are incapable of carrying out the arithmetical procedure, but if we cannot understand what it is we have to

do, then we cannot do it. I am contending that a lot of our youngsters, and the evidence for this is available in a report, I think, called Survey of Reading in Barbados 1984, prepared by the present Principal of Erdiston College, who was then attached to the Ministry of Education, dealing with all primary schools and all grades in primary schools in Barbados, which found that – and this is a very close approximation to the statement, a very close paraphrase – 46% of the youngsters found difficulty in reading and 26% found very serious difficulty.
4.00 p.m.

I say that when we have that kind of situation and youngsters do not do well, say, on the English paper or on the Arithmetic paper, what we are really finding out is that they cannot read. We know very little as a result or we are very unwise to make harsh and strong judgments about their actual subject knowledge in other areas.

I turn now, Sir, to secondary education. What I find is equally unbelievable. We have over the years persistently refused to the best of my knowledge to enunciate a clear education policy aimed at equalising the staffing resources for secondary schools. Let me be very clear, Sir. I am not saying nor am I implying that there has been no improvement in the staffing in terms of qualifications in the secondary schools. I am not saying that. What I am saying is that if we take the so called older secondary schools, and I think everyone in this room knows which schools would fall in that category, and the so called newer secondary schools, then what we find must be alarming. What I have before me, and this is a simple analysis, is that if we take the percentage of graduates in the older secondary schools way back in 1976, that was something like 76.7 per cent; in 1989 the percentage for the newer secondary schools is 56.9 per cent. So that after thirteen years the percentage of graduates in the newer secondary schools overall has not yet even reached what it was in the older secondary schools thirteen years before. That is what I mean by no evidence of a policy aimed at equalising. I wish to be fair and to indicate that over time the proportions have changed in both types of schools and have changed upwards. I am not denying that. I am merely saying that when one looks at the figures, what one finds is that between the two groups there has remained a clear gulf fixed and that that gulf has not been bridged, and as a professional educator I find that situation in our national system totally unacceptable, and I consider it also indefensible. I believe it is one of the matters which the Ministry of Education owes it to our country to give more and serious consideration.

When I look at other matters, Sir, I find equally disturbing disparities. Let me hasten to say that neither with respect of the disparities I propose to note now nor with respect to the disparities I have noted previously, with respect to neither am I suggesting evil intentions or imputing evil intentions. What I believe has happened and continues to happen is that we have lacked the will to give thought to the necessary measures to change the situation, so I think these continue to happen by default. There are faults of omission perhaps rather than of commission if I may put it that way.

These documents, Mr. President, let me say I am quite happy to have them submitted as documents of the House.

Sir, if I look at the figures at the back of the Estimates, Appendix B, there is quite a lot of data there that is pertinent. On each page for each of those schools it gives on the left hand side the number of the teaching staff and the number of the non-teaching staff for each of the Government secondary schools from Alexandra to whatever the last one is. If we look at those figures, Sir, we find some enormous things that must disturb anybody. Let me take one or two, Sir. If I look at Ellerslie, Ellerslie according to those figures has a teaching staff of 79 and it has a support staff, a non-teaching staff of 21. Queens College has a teaching staff of less than half, 37 but it has a support staff of 26. Springer Memorial has a teaching staff of 80 and Foundation School has a staff of 60, two-thirds the number; but Foundation has 27 support staff as against Springer Memorial; so it has two-thirds the teaching staff and once and a half the support staff. One can go down like this. You can look at Alleyne which has 40 teaching staff and Ellerslie has 79, just under twice the number; but Alleyne has 15 support staff and Ellerslie has only 21, and I can go on making comparisons.

I would not be silly enough to suggest, Mr. President, or rather to ignore that some of the institutions have larger playing fields and so on than others, but surely I am entitled to ask for evidence of a rational provision. I would like to ask, for example perhaps the Minister would be willing to say, whether there exists a clear statement saying that it is the Ministry's policy that for every 100 students there shall be so many square metres of playing space, that for every 100 pupils there shall be so many square feet of laboratory space, and if that provision does not exist, then I am asking questions about the rationale on which we make provisions for our secondary schools, because what is here is clearly haphazard and in my view totally irrational.

I find it very difficult to see how we can continue to perpetuate a system of this sort. In fact if one rank orders the schools by those provisions with but a single exception, St. Leonard's Girls', all the older secondary schools fall at the top of the provision scale and all the newer secondary schools with but one exception fall at the bottom of the scale. I have argued about this before in this Honourable Chamber and I have argued about it in other fora, but Government seems to see this as unimportant, and yet these, Mr. President, are all the nation's children or let me put it more appropriately, all these are the nation's children, not just some, and I do not understand the grounds on which we can seek to continue these obvious disparities.
4.10 p.m.

I turn now, Mr. President, to other concerns and these are concerns at the level of the university.

Let me hasten to say that I am very delighted indeed to find that the provision for the university in the Estimates has been increased. Last year you may remember, Sir, that I raised serious questions about the diminution, according to the Estimates, of the provision, very considerable diminution but I note, with pleasure, that it has been increased.

There are, however, Sir, a number of matters which I still feel uneasy about. A few years ago, a committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir Roy Marshall to advice on changes desirable within the Cave Hill Campus in this country. That committee made recommendations which, to the best of my knowledge, some of them, at least, have been totally ignored. If they have not been ignored, then I would be happy to learn that steps have been taken to implement them.

I refer specifically to two matters in which, in my view, and I said this way back in 1979, some ten years now, we have wasted and continue to waste our money by running two programmes that should long since have been discontinued. I was delighted that so distinguished a group as the Marshall Committee should have supported that contention. I refer to the two programmes called the NI Programme, the Introductory Programme in Natural Sciences and the Use of English Programme.

The Marshall Committee in the extracts that I have here stated that the committee has "concern over the campus' continued involvement in this level of teaching, this is the Use of English" and they specifically "recommended a phasing out of the preliminary Science Programme as early as possible since the Campus can ill afford to use its limited resources in remedial work." That was with respect to Natural Science and with respect to the Use of English Programme, what it called Remedial English, it said "we likewise question the campus' continued involvement in providing Remedial English. We consider that the limited resources of the campus could be better employed and, moreover, the retention of the Use of English Programme will not be in the long-term interest of the school system. We, therefore, recommend that the preliminary programme of the Use of English be phased out."

How does this concern this Honourable Chamber? The answer lies in a statement made on Page 8 of that report "by its control of the purse strings now legally sanctioned, the Government has the power to direct the course of development at the campus" so that Government cannot absolve itself from its responsibility to keep a close and watchful eye on the use or mis-use, and in my view, the wastage of public funds in this matter. There is no justification, in my view, for the continual expenditure of funds in this matter.

Once, again, I am not so naive as to believe that one can wave their wand and say that with effect we are in March 1988 and that with effect from September/October 1988 we will discontinue the programme. I worked in the institution for 20 odd years and I would say that I learned a little bit about this organisation. I did not agree with a lot of what was done and said but that is a different matter.

What, I think, is needed and what I have strongly advocated and what clearly is implied in the words of the Marshall Report is that steps should be taken immediately to bring those programmes to an end and what I am suggesting that the Government should, in fact do, is to give due notice to the university to say that after, say, two years, we will no longer pay for this programme. You must make arrangements to restructure your staff accordingly.

If we take the view that we can never close off the programme, then we are, in fact, saying that when once a programme is begun it must continue forever which is clearly nonsense. It does not make any sense so, obviously, there must be provisions which can be made for the discontinuance of programmes and what I would wish to see, as a member of this Honourable Chamber, is evidence that concrete steps are being taken so to do. So far I am not aware of any evidence in that connection.

Sir, also in that connection with respect to one of those programmes I raised another matter which I have raised in this Honourable Chamber before which I have raised elsewhere and I wish to tie it in with something that I said earlier on with the responsibility of the Government, in fact, and of this Honourable Chamber in helping the Government think through the economic problems of our country.

One of its responsibilities is to find ways and means by which the economic development of the country can be promoted, stimulated and encouraged. I think it is generally recognized, Sir, that one of the things that is needed is a set of funds, venture capital, if you wish to call it that, as it is being called elsewhere, which would provide a means for people who have ideas to have the ideas tested to get them started and pushed off the ground.

It is my recollection that some years ago, maybe two years ago, there was a paper prepared and circulated by the Central Bank of Barbados on precisely this point and one would wish to ask exactly what has happened to the paper, whether, in fact, any steps have been taken and so on.

Certainly, there is evidence from the high impact of the agricultural project programme and its experience that there is need for this kind of financial support. Inevitably one is faced with the question of where can the money

come from and this gives me an opportunity to make a case for something that I have argued before and will continue to argue for.

I believe that a poor small country such as ours cannot afford to continue to do what we are now doing, that is, to provide university education for all persons who gain admission to the university here without some kind of charge. I recognize that this is not likely to get much support from the present Government but that has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of the issue. Government can make any decision it wants on that matter. It has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness or the cogency of the argument.

I wish, therefore, to put the issue in a slightly different light to explain what I am trying to get at.
4.20 p.m.

Let me hypothesise that there are two students both of whom leave the Community College, one of whom goes to the University and pursues the least expensive of the courses, Arts and General Studies. I understand that the cost of that is something of the order of fourteen thousand odd dollars a year. And it takes him a minimum of three years, let us assume he is successful or she is successful, so you are talking about three years. You are talking about forty-two plus thousand dollars.

However, his or her fellow student goes into the business world and has an idea that really has a great deal of potential and wants to get some money to borrow to get it going. I ask you to consider what are that person's chances of getting $14 000 in year one, or year two or year three, let alone an investment of $42 000.

I am saying, Sir, that if we look at our youngsters across the board then we have to ask ourselves, if we are serious about this, how we can justify a situation in which one group of students has the largesse of a minimum of $42 000 over and above their secondary education placed at their disposal, whereas others do not have access to similar assistance to help them to become presumably more productive members of the community.

I do not think we can shrug our shoulders and say, oh, they are going to do degrees. Degrees give no guarantee that anybody is going to be a productive person. We have a whole lot of productive persons, highly productive who hold no degrees. And it is very easy to find persons who hold good degrees, who by no stretch of the imagination could be called particularly productive. So the possession of a degree is in a different context, but the appropriate words are, it is really a means to an end. It is no guarantee of hard work or willingness to work.

Ten years ago, as I indicated, Mr. President, I made this suggestion. Admittedly the figures then were lower because the costs were lower. But I have before me here a projection of what the outcome would be at present rates. The figure I obtained from the Campus indicated that there were some 360 students in last year's – I think my figure is 1987–88 – about 360 graduates.

Let me hypothesise that only 85% of those would repay the money. Let me hypothesise that there would be a running cost, an administrative cost, if you want it, of 10% of the total intake to operate it. I use that figure because that is the figure the University uses. If we reduce 360, take 85% of that, I make that 306, if you multiply that, and if they pay back that 14 400 over ten years, that is 1 400 plus a year, you only have to multiply that by 3 or 6. I make it $440 640. You take off 10% and you are ending up with $396 000. If you do that for 10 years, because they are paying this for 10 years and every year you have another group coming in, in year 10 you do not have 306 people, you have 3 060. And keeping this figure unchanged which is unlikely, certainly it is likely to increase, in year 10 the income is going to be $3.96 million. That is at 10%.

If we allow 15% because Government's administrative costs would be higher, the projected income $3.745 million. If does not take much to calculate it.

I am suggesting that those funds would be very appropriate funds to help contribute precisely towards this venture capital to help other people, theirs parents who do not have this largesse here available. So that persons who are arguing that we have to help our country's people have to ask themselves questions about what means they are having available now to counter the facilities made to those who go into education. And I would be very interested to have somebody come up and present comparable evidence that those who do not go into education, higher education, have comparable facilities available.

Sir, the next point I wish to touch on is one of an entirely different matter. I have before me a reproduction of a page from the Barbados Advocate of Thursday, October 20, 1988 and I bring this matter in because it concerns something that was written by a member of the University staff. And this Government meets the running cost of that University, so it concerns us.

I am concerned about the possible and, I think, likely misrepresentation of the facts. The person in speaking, it is an article by Mrs. Kathleen Drayton called, "The colonial 'gift' of education". In speaking – oh a document of the House, Xerox copy for a document of the House or the original, it does not matter to me – she is talking and the word "gift" is in quotes. That suggests that it is a play on the word. She is talking about the reasons why the colonial powers gave education:

"As my final piece of evidence"
and I am quoting from what she said:

> "that the purpose of education was social control, I want to quote from a famous Colonial Office Dispatch to the colonies in 1847. The Dispatch advised colonial governments to"

And this is what the Dispatch said:

> create a body of men interested in the protection of property and with intelligence enough to take part in that humbler machinery of local affairs which ministers to social order."

She goes on:

> "A journey through the records is instructive in illustrating how subject peoples and oppressed people are taught to accept their lot or are colonised."

Mr. President, my concern about that is not that it is untrue. The vicious thing about it is that it is half the truth. And half truths are often far more difficult to counter than outright lies. The writer there, to the uninformed could easily give the impression that those attitudes were peculiar to persons in the colonies. I have six, seven, eight pages of extracts here which I will make a document of the House. I would not read all. I would just read a few. They are taken from two sources, one is Frank Smith's "History of English Elementary Education 1760-1902." And the other is from a well-known person who has worked in the Caribbean for many years, Shirley Gordon's "A Century of West Indian Education." Listen to Gordon, bearing in mind I have just read from Mrs. Drayton. Gordon:

> "One of the circumstances of slavery is that the slave workers are kept ignorant. If they are not instructed in any arts or skills other than those required for their unpaid labour, they are less likely to contemplate alternatives and so resist their masters."

No doubt about it, that was the attitude which informed the behaviour of the slave owners. Listen to Smith – we are talking now about education in England:

> "The Bishop of London thought it necessary, in his Charge of 1803, to expose the doctrine maintained "by men of considerable ability" that "it is safest for both the government and the religion of the country to let (the lower classes) remain in that state of ignorance in which nature has originally place them."

It has nothing to do with slavery. It is Englishmen talking about Englishmen and precisely the same attitude, and the word, the give away phrase is, 'lower classes'.
4.30 p.m.

A writer in the Gentlemen's Magazine in 1797 expresses clearly this point of view. I quote: "Industry is the duty to impress on the lower classes. A little learning makes a man ambitious to rise. If he cannot by fair means then he uses foul. His ignorance is a bomb that soothes his mind into stupidity and repose and excludes every emotion of discontent, pride and ambition. A man with no literature will seldom attempt to form insurrections or form an idle scheme for the reformation of the state." That is in England. Let me go back to what Gordon said: "They are less likely" – about the slaves – "to contemplate alternatives and so resist their masters. "I am saying therefore that when a professional makes a statement like this one has I think of three options. You can either believe that the person did not know, in which case it calls the person's competence into question, or you can say the person you know was careless. But this is carelessness of a gross and indefensible and unpardonable order, or you can draw the conclusion that the person intended to mislead. I leave it to you to draw your conclusions. I have given you the options.

Let me continue. I want to read 1 or 2 more. This is Britain: "The people said birth must respect that property of which they cannot partake. They must labour to obtain what by labour can be obtained and when they find as they commonly do the success disproportion to the endeavour, they must be taught their consolation in the final proportions of eternal justice."

I continue, in the Quarterly Journal of Education in 1831 the following comment: "Knowledge is the bulwark of the state and the interest of the poor and rich are one when rightly understood. The three R's are indispensible but they are not enough." This is about England please, not the slaves. "The poor must be taught the rights of property and realize that degradation of rank and fortune are as natural to society as differences of sex, strength, or of colour." And finally again from Britain, Robert Lowe who became a Minister of Education: "The lower classes ought to be educated to discharge the duties cast upon them and a comment by the writer of the book, and this is very relevant....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Shorey, I do not want to stop you in your stride, but what are the relevances?

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, may I explain my relevance. The relevance that I am making, Sir, is that I am discussing the Head "Education. I am saying....

Mr. PRESIDENT: ... in Barbados.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: ... in Barbados. I am saying that we provide considerable funds for the university.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But what does it have to do with England?

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, may I continue?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I want to know the relevance.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: You have asked me to explain. Will you give me the permission to explain?

Mr. PRESIDENT: What is the relevance with England now?

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, will you give me a chance to explain, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: I would like you to get back here. Do not let us ramble all over the globe to deal with this matter.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think that I have been very kind to you.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: But you will not give me a chance to explain, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I thought you would explain briefly, but you see you want another half hour to explain.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: The relevance is that statements being made by persons at the university are misleading to the community.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That has nothing to do with the debate we are having here, Senator Shorey. The university is a free agency for expressing opinion. You cannot get vexed with them for expressing their views. But it is what the Members of the House say. I thought you were replying to a Member of the House. I was giving you the freedom. I thought you were saying that you were replying to someone who had made a statement. The university is free. You should know that by now.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: If that is the ruling Your Honour makes, I will accept it. I continue now, Mr. President. There are just 1 or 2 other points I wish to make in my remaining I think 3 or 3½ minutes. I would like at this point to offer commendation to the Extra-Mural Department because it has been dealing with a problem that has only recently been publicly acknowledged, the fact that we have a serious illiteracy problem among adults. My understanding is that during the past two to 2½ years some 100 adults who are completely illiterate have registered and I think that that needs public commendation. I am of the view that there is a strong case for some kind of special subvention to assist with that programme.

On the question of legislation, Sir, there are 2 areas that I would like to speak on in general – one is the question of rape. I raised this already, I believe, in this Honourable Chamber, and I wish seriously to present the argument that there is a strong case for the cat o'nine tails where you have cases of assault of youngsters of the age of 3, 4 and 5. There is no possible excuse that the person thought that the individual was above the age of 16 years and it seems to me that there is a strong case for strengthening the legislation to provide far more severe penalties.

On the question of Health, Sir, I am concerned and the Minister's own statement will bear this out that there has been clearly, I think, laxity in the enforcement of the law, what one could call legitimately infelicities and one hopes that serious attention will be given to this. I therefore, regret the comment made by a Member of the other Chamber who was critical apparently of the dissemination of information through the media. It is my own view, which is obviously very different, that the media did the country a service in bringing this matter to light and indeed I think that the person who what I would call "blew the whistle" ought to be strongly commended for doing so, otherwise the majority of us would have continued in ignorance of the appalling state of affairs.

Finally Sir, I would like to share the views of those who spoke on the matter of the Caribbean Broadcasting Station, Senator Blackman and Senator McClean, especially when one bears in mind that the legislation requires that the institution should in fact be self-financing if one looks at Section 11 of Cap. 276. There is clearly a lot that needs to be done. There is an enormous challenge for the Government. We have limited resources, very limited resources and we have to find some means of making sure that those are most appropriately used and that persons who benefit from them, that more persons benefit from them, and that those who do, do not misuse their prestige, authority, and position.

4.40 p.m.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I have been listening to all the debate so far. I am not an economist, but I have just been noticing one or two figures that I should like to ask some questions about. I have been looking at some figures of actual expenditure over the past five years and this is what I have observed.

If you look at page 9 where we have Statement of Current Expenditure for the ten-year period 1978-79 to 1987-88, I observe that the annual expenditure in 1984-85 was $595.4 million, in 1985-86 it was $663.1 million, in 1986-87 it was $685.2 million, 1987-88 $817.7 million and 1988-89 $984 million. It was $986 million but it has been reduced to $984 million. Between 1984-85 and 1985-86 the actual expenditure rose by $68 million. In 1986-87 from 1985-86 it rose by $22 million. In 1987-88 it rose by $132 million and in 1988-89 $167 million.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in three years the Government spent $321 million more in actual expenditure than they did in the years before, and that comes to around 47% more. It seems to me that that is rather exorbitant. It seems to me some controls should be used there as far as the expenditure is concerned. I do not know why it jumped like that, from $22 million to $132 million, then $167 million, and I hope to hear something about that.

Another section that causes some concern to me is the taxes on property. That comes on page 2. I observe there that in 1988-89 it was $33.9 million, the revised estimate is $45.9 million. That is an increase of 35% in property taxes without any increase in the rate. That struck me as being a little strange, and that seems to me to be due to one of two things, either an under estimate of revenue from that source, or a larger tax base from the new constructions that have been going up. I do not know which it is, but I would also like to hear something about that. Then last year the Minister of Finance budgeted for increased taxation of $55 million and the revenue was $100 million more than had been anticipated from the 1988 Budget. Again, Sir, that seems to me to be a clear under estimate of revenue.

But what causes me more anxiety than any of those other things I have mentioned is this. Looking at the very first page, the cover of the book itself, we could say that the recurrent expenditure is almost $1 billion. It is $984 million, but let us put it in round figures. This country seems to me to be very small to be expending one thousand million dollars per year, with a population of just over 250 000 people? If you work that out I think you will find it means that we are spending about $4 000 per person from the smallest child to the oldest person. I understand per capita here in Barbados is estimated to be U.S. $4 000. I may be wrong here, but I think I did read it is somewhere around U.S. $4 000 per person, because remember once they wanted to graduate us out of loans because they felt we were making too much money. If that is so, it means then that our current expenditure is 50% of our per capita income, and that seems to me to be a very uncomfortable position to be in economically, if we are going to be spending 50% of our per capita income.

Sir, they talk about tourism. I agree with them. "Tourism is our business: Let's play our part" is the slogan that you are hearing all the time. It sounds good. The airport seems to be doing very well, but certainly not the sea port. The Board of Directors of Barbados Port Authority reported in 1987 – I have not seen any report for 1988 – that despite the increase in tonnage of 541 000 tonnes as against 526 000, or 2.8% increased income after taxation, the income after taxation in that year was $16 151 as compared with $1 576 000. That really struck me. The Board of Directors reported this, that despite the increase in tonnage, still after taxation the income was $16 000 as against $1 million. They went on to say that that was a result of loss of trans-shipment. We have lost a lot of trans-shipment to other ports and the most we have now are ship stores for cruise ships that come inside here. That is all we have, and we may soon lose those too if we are not careful.

As I said, I do not know if the 1988 report is out, I have not seen it. I have been asking for it and I cannot get it. The Barbados Workers' Union got an increase in wages for workers, so the report says, but there was no increase in productivity. In my view, Sir, the sea port has a major role to play in the development of our national economy. We are doing very well at the airport, I do not see why we should not be doing well at the sea port too.

But, Sir, we have something here called the gantry crane that cost over $6 million and is lying there idle. The report says that "the gantry crane has potentially far reaching ramifications for port operations and that it must impact on rationalisation." Whatever that phrase means, it does not make a lot of sense to me, "it must impact on rationalisation." Discussion on rationalisation is still going on, as far as I have been able to gather, but I think discussion on rationalisation must cease and the crane must be put to work as soon as possible. When we lose the shipping, as we are losing it now, we never will get it back again. So the slogan "Tourism is our business: let's play our part" sounds good, but the sea port in St. Lucia and the sea port in Antigua and I was in St. Lucia a couple of weeks ago, and I can tell you that they are certainly playing their part, taking away most of our shipping, although we have been told that we have better facilities here in Barbados than they have in any other part of the West Indies as far as sea ports are concerned. That is what I have been told by people who work at the port. We have better facilities, only that we have not got the things moving. So St. Lucia's sea port and Antigua are getting trans-shipment from us, while we are dragging our feet as far as activating this wonderful gantry crane. I understand too that we have to rent a crane – if I am wrong I would like to be corrected by the Minister – but I have been told that we have to rent a crane from Miami to do some of the business that the gantry could do six times as well.

4.50 p.m.

Mr. President, if we have the good of this country at heart, then I am urging the Government, the Barbados Workers' Union of which you are the treasured General Secretary and the Port Authorities to do whatever has to be done to get that multi-million dollar crane working; get it off the ground.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I should like to say that when you are debating a question you should not invoke the President in your arguments in that way. I am the President of the Senate. Do not invoke the President of the Senate.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I said the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You don't know what you said?

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I said the Government, the Barbados Workers' Union of which you are the President and the Port Authority.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes; so I say do not invoke me in your argument that you are using.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I withdraw that remark. I will say the Government, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Port Authority, to do whatever has to be done to get the multi-million dollar crane off the ground. If some people get hurt, in my opinion so be it. Let us think of what we can do for our country. In my opinion Barbados comes first; it comes before any party, it comes before any people, it comes before any Union, it comes before everybody. Barbados first. I will remind you of what the President of the United States said once: think not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country. What we all need to do for this country of Barbados is to get that Gantry crane working. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, the reluctance of Honourable Members to speak at this time is remarkable since this is a speaking Chamber. I do not really have very much to say except to say what I keep saying at every recurring Estimates, that is, that we are presented with volumes of figures and books and people make very learned speeches, but we have no means of judging the performance of what we do. We look at these figures for 1989-90, but leaving aside the question of how much money has been spent, we do not know how well that money has been spent. I will give you about two or three examples.

Under the Head of Archives, the actual expenditure for 1987-88 that is the last year for full figures, was $5 428 under Library. Now the approved amount of the Estimates for that year was $7 000, which means they spent about $2 000 less than what was approved. If you have any idea of the Library of the Archives you will wonder how it is possible to spend less than was approved. There is a lot that they do not have. I would have expected the money to be overspent. It seems to me that something has to be wrong when people spend less than they got in a department which is as disadvantaged as the Library of the Archives.

The same thing is true with supplies and materials under the National Library Service. I don't know how many people attempt to use the Reference Library at Coleridge Street; there are books on the floor; there are newspapers that there is no access to because they are in such a fragile state. In 1987-88 $48 529 was the actual expenditure out of an approved total of $71 000; $23 000 was not spent, and this is a department which needs microfilm. The answer I get every time I ask for access to a document is that you can't have it because it is fragile, we are waiting on the microfilm. Something has to be wrong; so we need to be able to look at the performance of these votes. We continue talking and beating our heads every year when nothing can be done unless we know how people do their work.

Now several of the Government departments do in fact return reports. Those reports are easily done because they consist of a set of statistics, and we know when we look at the Prison Report what a bad report can be. But when it comes to a thing like Library, the number of books in the Library bears no relation to what use is made of it. A report from the Library and Archives would be very useful indeed. We would be able to see what people are reading, the demands they make on the library service, what use they make of the archives, and since every publication has to be registered, we would be able to know what people are writing, what people are asking for. We have none of that information and yet we under-spend money by something like $23 000. These are mysteries to me.

Another mystery to me is the question of the nurses at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. For private reasons I have had fairly close contact with the service of the hospital for the last two years. Relatives of mine have been served by that service, and I can speak without any hesitation about the dedication and the sense of service which I have seen and experienced by the nurses in the hospital. I cannot understand why they are so badly treated. At present there is one ward of probably 20 or 25 beds which has only two nurses. That is a pay ward, and the bell rings and the nurses are scampering around, taking all the criticisms and yet having to smile and deliver service to people who are sick.

Mr. President, I cannot understand how we can look cheerfully at what is happening. The last copy of the Official Gazette that I received which is about two days ago, I saw two staff nurses resigning, and there is an exodus of trained staff. I don't know what steps are being taken to train more staff, and we do not know what treasure we have in a body of dedicated servants. People come from all over the Caribbean to our hospital and we are doing our best to prevent young people from coming into the service and getting rid of those whom we have trained. It is a total mystery to me and it is a mystery which these Estimates do nothing to answer. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, before I get into my main address, Sir, I would like to seek your permission, although it may be a little belated, to congratulate Senator McClean on his speech here in the Senate today. I do this, Sir, because I had the privilege of hearing his political leader in the Other Chamber, and I am more than satisfied that his presentation here today far outshadowed that of his political leader. However, Sir, as I understand it, his political leader is a student of his in economics, so I can quite well understand his performance today.

However, Sir, I must admit though, Sir, that I was concerned still about Senator McClean's speech as far as it related to the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister. For whatever reason it seems to me that Senator McClean seems to have some personal vendetta as far as the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister is concerned.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, on a point of order, I don't think that is a reasonable deduction from anything I said and it certainly is not a statement of fact.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, I say this because it is without doubt that on no less than thirty occasions during the course of his speech he made reference in not too kind a way to the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, and Sir, with your permission, I will make it a document of this Senate, that there was an article written by Senator McClean in yesterday's *Sun* and I would not go through the whole preamble of the article, but I make reference to the final paragraph, and the final paragraph reads as follows:
5.00 p.m.

"The pity of it all is that the Minister of Finance is blissfully ignorant of the consequences of his policy and the Prime Minister is no wiser." In other words, today's dissertation was merely a continuation of that which appeared in yesterday's "SUN".

Now, Sir, in spite of the Government having problems with unemployment, the economy of our country remains relatively sound, stable and showed a growth rate of 2.8% which, I think, when taking all the other countries in the Caribbean it was a satisfactory performance for this island of Barbados.

The Ministries of Government have continued to be effective and efficient. However, the work and achievements of Government have been hoodwinked and overshadowed in recent times by a political manoeuvre, carefully engineered, to divert the attention of the masses from what was actually taking place but the evidence is clear. The tangible evidence of the Government's performance is there for all to see.

The formation of a new political party now represented here in this Chamber, was brought on stream in order to meet certain events but has left the way clear for the people of this country to judge and to get a clear vision as to the Government's effort and performance. People will not be misguided by the sort of extravagant language that is being used by the political leader of that party and will not be misled into confusion anymore.

It was a timely exercise and very much to the benefit of the Government of this country when that political party took the position that they did because the Government party was in disarray for some while because of a high level of uncertainty, because members were not sure as to where certain people stood but the way has been now made clear and the works of Government will be seen and ventilated in all corners of this country.

I would like to deal, Sir, first with the question of, I think, it is Head 43, Ministry of Tourism. Without any doubt, tourism is by far the fastest developing industry in the Caribbean and easily in our island of Barbados.

Tourism, however, in order for it to impact as significantly as it should and to continue on its stream of development, must require the assistance of other ministries in this country for the kind of support to develop the sort of success and to maximize the efforts of those persons involved in the development of tourism.

They need the support of the Ministry of Health and the Environment, particularly in relation to the arm of the NCC that beautifies this country. They need the assistance of Communications and Works and I think while making reference to Communications and Works I am tempted to say that for the first time in the history of this country Barbados has developed a clear policy in relation to its roads. In other words, for the first time one is seeing a clear road programme.

The Government started out on a programme in the City of Bridgetown and is developing its roads like tentacles. In other words, they are going through every nook and cranny and it is useless any Parliamentarian or Senator asking about a road in Park Road, or what is happening in Delamere Land, or what is going to happen in St. John, because the Government has a programme which will cover the whole of this country in the very near future.

There are plans, also, too, Sir, as far as the electrification of this country is concerned, which will eventually create a situation where there should be little or no complaints as to our road system and to our electrification of Barbados.

I believe, Sir, in the Other Place the new Opposition Party made it clear that there was no political divide on this question but I would think it abysmally silly for a party in Opposition to say that they would have a political divide on the development of a road system that we are now having.

Sir, let us get back to tourism. Tourist people also need the assistance of the Ministry of Agriculture and to a lesser extent, the Ministry of Trade. In the development of tourism, a number of facts have to be taken into consideration and a significant effort still has to be put in our marketing strategies for the development of Barbados' tourism.

I believe, Sir, that it is very important that the Government take a critical look at the quality of persons we employ in our Embassies overseas. It is important and fundamental that persons who have the interest of their country at heart be placed in these Embassies and not persons who are there merely to work for salaries. We need committed persons in those Embassies in order to sell Barbados to persons in various countries.

I believe we have some still very good untapped markets and I refer to the Japanese. For a long time in this country we have been concerned about the imbalance of trade with Japan and it strikes me that although we do not have anything tangible to sell to the Japanese, we have facilities which we can offer which can attract Japanese. However, it must be borne in mind that Japanese are persons who like to travel together. In other words, they do not expose themselves in a one by one basis in strange countries and, actually, what they do is to have large cruises and I am hoping that the Ministry of Tourism, through its Board of Tourism, will seek to attract Japanese visitors.

Where Japanese visitors too have the advantage on a number of persons that may now visit Barbados is that Japanese are people by and large with money. In other words, the development of that country has been substantial and workingclass people in that country are able to pay for a trip overseas to visit countries to spend money.

However, in looking at that too, we would have to look at areas such as restaurants. We would, obviously, have to provide Japanese restaurants. Although they may eat some of the indigenous foods, one must understand that some of those people, with some of their religious beliefs and so on, are very peculiar when it comes to their eating habits so if we looked at that as an avenue to develop this country we would have to, obviously, look at the total package of developing that.

As we approach the year 2000, Sir, I believe, it is fair to say that people are going to become less interested in just the question of the sea, the sun and the sand. I believe that the culture of our country and the other natural resources are going to play a more prominent role in encouraging persons to come to Barbados. In other words, we have to look at developing our museums, improving our theatres, encouraging more musical activity, particularly if Barbadians could develop a music mood that is consistent to Barbados. What I have found, as far as music is concerned, by and large we have been copying either from the Trinidadians or the Jamaicans. We are not really able to identify anything musical yet that can be considered to be strictly Barbadian.
5.10 p.m.

As far as our natural resources are concerned, what are now wasted gullies and caves and windows to the sea and so on, some effort must be made to make these places semi-parks as such where, for people who visit here and drive around the country – we could provide facilities such as benches, probably small canteens, probably shops selling various small commodities, it could be like information bureaus. That sort of development is needed rather than continue to try to sell the sand and the sea and the sun all the time.

I believe too, Sir, that it is important that in the tourist plants we develop our human resources more. In other words, we need to have training in the area of human resources. Very often, Sir, the main complaint that I hear people who visit here make about Barbados, is the complaint largely about the quality of the service in the restaurants.

People are prepared to spend the top dollar, particularly, Sir, those persons who go to the 5 Star hotels. But people who spend the top dollar are also looking, Sir, for top service. And I am afraid, Sir, judging from reports that we are not as well off in that area as we should be.

Another problem which I see, Sir, in the tourist sector is that of the question of management. By and large we have a lot of expatriate managers. But again, too, Sir, I think you have to relate that to the ownership of the tourist plant. However, I still feel that more or our local persons should be sent on management training courses with the idea that they should be able to take over these operations, if and when the expatriates leave, whether they leave on their own or if they could be persuaded to leave, because we have persons that can be trained to take over the jobs and carry them out efficiently.

As far as the tourism plants are concerned and when I say tourist plants now, Sir, I make my main reference to the hotels concerned. I have a serious reservation, Sir, about Government's continued interest in the retention of the hotels. I refer now to the Hilton and Heywoods. I believe, Sir, that even if the Government retains Heywoods for a bit longer, I feel that we should dispose of the Hilton. I feel strongly on the privatization as far as hotels are concerned. I think, Sir, that when Government is thinking of privatization you cannot just look for enterprises that are losing, but we have to look for some of them that are making money to encourage people to invest in that kind of situation.

I believe, Sir, that the intent of having the hotels by the Government was good. But I feel that they have served their purpose. When these hotels were constructed, it was meant to give confidence to people who wanted to invest. Now the confidence has been established. I think it is time that Government say bye to them and make some money, and probably it would ease the question of taxation, if we got rid of these hotels.

In Barbados, I do not know which Administration did it, fortunately, there is a very strong inter-linkage between tourism and sport. And this has worked to the benefit of tourism and has worked to the benefit of our country. I believe, Sir, that we need to look at sport in a rather more philosophical manner, in a broader sense. I know that we are improving our sports facilities. I think there is the gymnasium on stream now. And we have the Stadium there which has been recently refurbished.

But I think that we need to encourage a more international flavour as far as sport is concerned. We have seen the success of the young people and I believe that games like tennis and so on, that is, lawn tennis and a whole lot of other games have an international content in them. We should try to encourage them to do their competitions in Barbados. The greatest example of them all, Sir, I declare a small interest here Sir, is the Gold Cup. I am not going to put any commercial name before it. The Gold Cup Race has brought international recognition of our country.

In 1988 the Gold Cup Race was filmed, as a matter of fact, an entire documentary of activities in relation to Barbados was filmed and was shown no less than eight times in Canada. It is very, very difficult, Sir, for the Government to determine in any direct terms, as to the sort of saving the Government would have got by that race being televised on the Canadian station. I believe, Sir, it would run into millions of dollars. In other words, it was one of the greatest things to happen in this country when tourism and sport was linked, because it has definitely worked to the benefit of Barbados.

By and large, Sir, that covers what I have to say on Tourism.

I should like, Sir, to say a word on agriculture, I think that is Head 25. I think under that Head there is the question of livestock development.

The ADC is making every effort to carry out the role for which ADC was formed. And from my assessment of persons showing interest in agriculture, I personally hold out a great deal of hope for agriculture. But unfortunately, Sir, the Government is confronted by a negative attitude spearheaded by some persons with large holdings. Indeed some of them seem intent on embarrassing the present Administration by not co-operating with Government in an effort to diversify.

The potential for the export of cotton, yams, eddoes, potatoes is tremendous. Almost our entire need in our locally grown food and meat, including chicken, can be satisfied. However, every effort is made, Sir, to frustrate the effort.

Agriculture can substantially improve its contribution in the area of foreign exchange. It appears to me and it has come home to me that Government has to seriously come to grips with the question of putting idle land back into production. Unpopular measures may need to be taken. But in the cause of the national interest, an effective land lease policy has to be pursued.
5.20 p.m.

It is to my knowledge, Sir, that there are progressive farmers out there with the will who are yearning to have land made available in order that they can grow more crops geared particularly for the export market. But, alas, there are so many others in the planter class who seem to feel and who openly express the view that sugar cane is our only hope. This sort of 19th century thinking has to be dismissed if the new order is to succeed.

I have had the pleasure of seeing an imaginative programme of a very comprehensive nature on livestock production produced by a gentleman well known to many persons here in this Chamber. It is the sort of programme, though possibly over-ambitious, which could solve all our problems relating to the production of meat. But, however, it would require substantial acreage of land for this project. But I believe the project has a lot of content in it. I believe it is something that the Government should look closely at. As I said before, we may have to contract or, when I say that I mean shrink – I prefer that word – the proposed programme. But I believe this programme has a lot of merit and I implore Government to have a look at that programme a little deeper. I know that some submissions have been made to the Ministry and some presentations have been made to the various Ministries from this individual and I do not think that we should just turn our backs on it because it is of significant importance and can only work out to the well being of this country even if we have to reduce the size of the project.

A cotton industry, Sir, as I understand it can be a significant foreign exchange earner. Every effort was made during 1988 to encourage land owners to plant cotton. The lead was taken by the ADC who again as I mentioned, was carrying out the role for which it was made. I believe I am right in saying that some 1100 acres of cotton were planted in Barbados and 1000 acres of the 1100 acres were on the property of ADC. There is no justifiable reason that if the Government is carrying out a diversified programme which when one examines it has a lot of merit, – I believe even if there was some caution used by the owners of land – that more land could not have been planted in cotton to assist the Government and at least to make a proper assessment of the crop. I believe that I am right in saying that the projection of what is a reasonable acreage to be planted in cotton for it to be a viable crop is something in the vicinity of 5000 acres. Now 1000 as you appreciate, Sir, is only 20% of the needs of the Government or of the company who is carrying out the project. I feel, Sir, very strongly that the least the planters could have done is to show some

confidence in what the Government was doing because the Government had set the example.

I know, Sir, that cotton has its drawbacks. I know that cotton when planted on land does not have the ability to retain the top soil. In other words, it is not like sugar cane but yet I feel if one can see the benefits of a foreign exchange gain and foreign exchange being made available to the Government that as citizens of this country planters have some responsibility to rally behind the Government in their efforts.

The cotton business, Sir, could develop into a very large industry in Barbados. As far as I know, Sir, there is a plan to have a spinning mill here and there is already a ginnery as they call it, and the investment is anticipated to be somewhere in the vicinity of Bds$40 million. But obviously for those investors to bring such a plant to Barbados they will have to be satisfied that the planters are going to cooperate because it would be like having an abattoir and no animals to slaughter. So people cannot be expected to come and put up a big plant in here and then not have the support of the planters. It is useless going over this thing about sugar cane over and over again. Everybody knows that sugar cane is the easiest to grow, that it retains the soil and things like that. But I feel, Sir, that we live in a modern world. We have seen technologies change. Those of us who run businesses were accustomed when we had the little hand calculators that you were clunking numbers. Nowadays the electronic adding machines and so on are available in the schools furthermore in business houses.

So I feel it is time that planters be more forward looking. I know that I am going to have a response from Senator Ward which I look forward to hearing because I believe he knows it better than I. Mine, Sir, is a lot of theory as you appreciate. But I am sure if I am wrong you will correct me. If I am right in that opinion, I know Your Honour will have to say you are right.

So much, Sir, for agriculture. Before I sit, I would like to make mention of one other matter, Sir, by way of an observation that concerns me because it really relates to the use of an indigenous product, and I refer to the closure of the pottery plant at Greenland St. Andrew. I feel, Sir, that that is an unfortunate thing to say the least to have happened. I mean here is a plant, Sir, where 100% of the raw material is indigenous. It is just a question of setting up ovens and maybe putting in place – I do not know the kind of equipment – but I believe it is probably a kiln and maybe you have to have something to form the blocks and so on. But here is a beautiful opportunity rather more in my opinion to our benefit than the Arawak Cement Plant.

I feel, Sir, and I do not have any figures available, but I feel that a thorough investigation should be made into the possible reopening of that plant at St. Andrew.

Asides.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: No, it is not open. That plant has been closed for a long time. Sir, I really would like Government to have a serious look at what caused it to be close because rumour has it – you know, Sir, Barbados society is one with a lot of rumours. I do not know if it is right, but rumour has it that a certain amount of the funding was moved illicitly. So if that was the reason, Sir, it did not mean that the plant had failed. What it meant is, Sir, that the money moved before it was used in the right direction. So I implore, Sir, Senator the Hon. Dr. Clarke from the Ministry of Finance and the Minister of Finance and so on to have a look, Sir, at that plant again with a view to reopening that plant. Because I think, Sir, as a country we can only gain by the reopening of such a plant.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Applause.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Goddard.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy President, I was really hoping to speak tomorrow as we have had some excellent presentations today. Senator Clarke and Senator McClean have given us a mass of statistics which were necessary to develop their arguments and I was hoping that Senators would have a rest because I too will have to use statistics although not in the same detail to develop my arguments.
5.30 p.m.

I notice a certain hesitation across the table for Senators to get up and speak. Only Senator Phillips has spoken in addition to Senator Clarke so far. I do not know if it is a lack of support for the Estimates or a shyness or whatever reason but we will have to wait until tomorrow to hear the comments from that side.

Anyhow, Sir, I note that Senator Clarke said at the very beginning how the Estimates – and we are dealing with the Appropriation Bill, I must remember, Sir – form a very important part of Government's fiscal policy and planning exercise, and I am very pleased that he made that point, because rather than try and discern trends over many years, which I attempted to do last year, I will do that but on a more limited scale and I prefer to relate the Estimates as I see them to the Government's Development Plant as has been presented.

However, Sir, before doing that I think it is important to look at the Estimates for the year about to be completed, 1988-89, and compare what the original estimates were with what the projected results are expected to be.

In Current Revenue the original estimates approved last year was $753 million, and I will deal in round figures

of a million rather than get into the thousands and hundreds, the Government is now projecting $866 million, an under estimation of $113 million or 15% of the original estimate. On Current Expenditure the original estimate was $801 million. Government is now projecting $870 million, $69 million higher than the original estimate. The Minister of Finance made it clear that he did not make any provision for the Civil Service adjustments in the original estimate, so I suspect a large part of that $69 million was to cover the recent increases granted to Civil Servants. The net effect of this on the Current Account was rather than ending up with a Current Account deficit of $48 million, we ended up with $4 million, an improvement of some $44 million.

If you go to the Capital Expenditure, the original estimate was $179 million, it is now projected that Government will spend $202 million, or $23 million more, 12.8%. So that the overall deficit originally estimated at $227 million will now be $206 million.

In looking at those figures we should look at Appendix C for 1988-89 and 1987-88. Let us go back one year. In 1987-88 there were 42 Supplementary Estimates amounting to $100 million. Twenty five of those dealt with Current Expenditure and 17 dealt with Capital Expenditure. In the year 1988-89 there is a reduction in the number of Supplementary Estimates from 42 to 18, but the amount voted was $156 million, some $56 million more than in the previous year.

I cannot comment on these, Mr. President, in detail because as you know the Supplementary Estimates are not reviewed or approved in this Senate, but it does to me highlight a very fundamental weakness in Government's budgeting process that there should be over spending on both the Current and Capital Accounts necessitating having to come back to the Other Place for such a large amount of Supplementary Estimates.

Before looking at the Estimates for 1989-90, I would like to draw your attention, Sir, to the Government's Development Plan, on page 47, which outlines its fiscal policy, and I am reading from that document:

> "Government's fiscal policy is predicated on the medium-term objective of reducing Central Government's deficit on the overall fiscal balance, from the 7.6% of GDP recorded in 1987, to approximately two per cent of GDP. Government will also be guided by the principle that current expenditures should normally be met from current revenues, and that if the current revenues are inadequate to meet current expenditures then the revenue should be stimulated. Moreover, current revenues should also make a contribution to capital expenditures. However, capital expenditure itself should substantially be met from loans."

That is the first paragraph on the fiscal policy, it follows on with another paragraph.

The point I wish to make, Sir, is that policy can only produce an expenditure driven budget. I see no alternative to that. Expenditure driven budgets have been fashionable in many developing countries, in Africa, Latin America and right here in the Caribbean basin. In the light of experience, and in view of the economic targets outlined in this Development Plan, I have to ask these questions. Is an expenditure driven budget appropriate? Is an expenditure driven budget prudent? Finally, is an expenditure driven budget responsible? I will attempt to address some of these questions, Sir.

First, let us look at a quick review of the Current Revenue. From $625 million in 1985-86 it has risen 44.8% estimated at $905 million in 1989-90. I suspect that the estimated revenue for 1989-90 has been seriously under estimated again. The projected revenue for 1988-89 of $866 million was 15% over the original estimate of $753 million, and just about every category was over what was originally estimated. Corporation tax over by $23 million, income tax over by $15 million, surcharge on incomes $5 million, surcharge on corporation tax $9 million, land tax $5 million, property transfer tax $6 million, consumption tax $34 million and all others net $6 million, aggregating the excess of $113 million.

Having said that, Mr. President, it should be noted that Current Revenue as a percentage of the GDP at current market prices during the period 1981-87, for which I have GDP figures, has remained very constant, between 23% and 24% of GDP.

5.40 p.m.

If I may next turn to current expenditure estimates, these have risen from $663 million in 1985-86 to an estimated $986 million in 1989-90, an increase of 48.7 per cent. The estimated expenditure of $986 million in 1989-90 is some 13.3 per cent over what had been projected for 1988-89. This 13.3 per cent estimated increase amounting to some $116 million is made up primarily of the following to which reference has already been made: charges of debt $85 million, for which interest will be $11 million higher than last year and amortisation $74 million higher than last year, aggregating $85 million; the Ministry of Education and Culture $22 million and all others a net of $9 million; so we are estimating $116 million more than was projected for the current fiscal year. As has already been pointed out, slightly over 50 per cent of the total expenditure goes in personal emoluments to civil servants and included in the transfer charges to Government agencies, charges of debt accounts for another 25 per cent, so everything else has to come into the remaining 25 per cent to give you the 100 per cent or $986 million on current expenditure.

The point I would like to draw to your attention is that the rate of current expenditure has been rising quite a bit faster than the retail price index which consumers are very concerned about. The current expenditure in 1980-81 was $426 million; it had risen to $817 million in 1987-88, a rise of 91.8 per cent in current expenditure. The retail price index for the same period using March 1980 as 100, rose to $159.9 million, an increase of 59.9 per cent, just reinforcing the point that current expenditure has risen by 91.8 per cent, the retail price index by 59.9 per cent.

During the decade of the Eighties capital expenditure has aggregated $1.4 billion. During those nine years we have had a surplus on current account for two years totalling $48 million; we have had a deficit for seven totalling $180 million for a net deficit on current account of $132 million. The capital expenditure and that net deficit on current account have been financed by substantially increasing the national debt which during that same period rose from $493 million in 1980 to $1 611 million at the end of 1989, 3.3 times higher than it was in 1980.

Charges on debt have now become a very significant item in our Estimates and I agree with Senator McClean that I personally would like to see the amortisation taken out and shown below the line rather than included in charges of debt. It would make the statement much more reasonable and understandable, but it may be an international standard in public accounting, I am not sure. The point though is, Sir, that charges of debt, and by this I mean interest and amortisation and principal as a percentage of current account have risen from 12.2 per cent in 1980-81 to 16.8 per cent in 1984-85 and is estimated to be 2.2 per cent in 1989-90.

It has been pointed out earlier that the interest component has been fairly constant during that period, so it does mean that as the term periods of loans become shorter, there becomes a greater bunching of repayments, and that is what we are now experiencing. I would mention however, Sir, that if we have to go to the international market, interest rates are rising. The terms under which we are likely to be able to borrow are shortening, and we have to avoid the risk of going to the local market at the expense of crowding out the private sector investment. It is a very delicate balance that Government has to maintain there, and I am sure they are fully aware of it.

Capital expenditure as a percentage of the GDP at current market prices fluctuated between 7.2 per cent and 8.2 per cent in the first two years of the 1980s. In the last five years 1982-87 capital expenditure as a percentage of GDP has been 5.3 per cent to 6 per cent. While the capital expenditure itself has risen from $72 million in 1980-81 to a projected $218 million in 1989-90, I do not consider it too high in relation to the GDP or as a component of gross capital formation. As I mentioned earlier it has been 6 per cent of GDP.

With current revenue remaining a constant percentage of GDP at 23 per cent to 24 per cent, and with capital expenditure also remaining a constant percentage of GDP at 5 per cent to 6 per cent, higher levels of productivity and better control of current expenditure in the public sector become of paramount importance.

Earlier today Senator Clarke commented on a range of public companies that are listed on the local stock exchange and seemed to indicate that they have all had better results. He can correct me if I am wrong. They all had good results, but I know for sure that some did not do as well in 1988 as they had done in 1987, but the point he was making is that they have done well. I hope he and the Government are not taking credit for that. I would just like to comment that in every case that I personally am associated with or that I know of, improvements in results have come by controlling expenditure, not by expansion in the economy.

I speak, Sir, of this need for higher levels of productivity and proper control of current expenditure in the public sector. It is better to impose self-discipline voluntarily than have a discipline imposed from without in due course. In our situation and in order to meet economic targets in the Development Plan, expenditure restraint must take precedence in my view over revenue stimulation.

Mr. President, if I turn to the Development Plan of which the Appropriation Bill and the Estimates form a very key instrument in its implementation, I would like to look at a few selected targets. Target No. 1 was that the GDP in real terms is expected to grow by 2.5 per cent per annum. The second target was that gross capital formation, the gross investment in GDP, is projected to expend an average of 12.5 per cent per annum and rise from 16 per cent of GDP in 1987 to 23.2 per cent in 1992. The third one is that the overall fiscal deficit be reduced from its 1987 level of 7.6 per cent of GDP to around 2 per cent of GDP by 1992, and the fourth one I have selected is that the rate of unemployment estimated at 17.9 per cent in 1987 be reduced to 15.8 per cent by 1992.

5.50 p.m.

If I may deal with the GDP first of all, Sir, I believe that a real annual growth rate of 2.5% can be achieved and even improved upon. However, I believe that it will require a more vigorous and positive outreach by Government to all sections of the private sector. I believe that such an outreach should not be restricted by any historical, ethnic or other non economic considerations. As the plan says, a share for all. It can only be realized if all are encouraged to participate and to contribute to its achievement and I would like to give an example of that.

A couple of years ago when the corporation tax was reduced from 45% to 35% by a previous Minister of Finance, with the announced intention of stimulating the economy, the Government and representatives from the

public companies in the private sector sat down to devise ways and means of stimulating the tourist sector in particular. It seemed to be the easiest economic sector to stimulate and out of that the Tourism Development Corporation was formed whereby most of the public companies and some of the larger private companies agreed to contribute 3% out of their taxable income towards the Tourism Development Corporation in return for which the Government would allow them to claim 150% of that contribution for tax purposes.

Now, the amount of money is not terribly significant. The Tourism Development Corporation, I think, has collected in the vicinity of $2 million a year but it has flexibility. It has been able to facilitate and to expedite new tour operators coming here, new areas for promoting tourism. I know. I speak from experience.

It has had tremendous leverage. It has been able to obtain result. It has worked closely with the Board of Tourism. It is not intended to compete with the Board of Tourism. It has also worked closely with the Hotel Association. But that, to me, Sir, is a classic example of how Government and private sector can work closely in the interest of this country.

I support Government's announced policy on the role of Government and again, Sir, I would like to quote from the Development Plan on page 45:

> "The Government's policy over the plan period and beyond will be based on the premise that a vibrant and dynamic private sector is essential for the attainment of the goals of real economic growth, the expansion of job opportunities and the promotion of development with a share for all.
>
> To this end, the private sector will be given every encouragement to participate fully in development through the maintenance of favourable economic environment incentives, joint ventures of Government and through processes of consultation."

It then goes on to list areas Government will restrict for itself unless conditions justify a change of policy. Mr. President I really want to see that policy implemented. I want to see it become a reality and not remain as rhetoric.

If I may now turn to target No. 2, gross capital. In 1981 it was $525 million or 27.6% of GDP. The low then came in 1985 when it was only $371 million or 15.4% of GDP. I learned today from Senator Clarke that it is estimated to be $544 million in 1988 or 17.7% of GDP and the plan estimates that it should be $844 million in 1992 or 23.2% of GDP.

Now, Government's capital expenditure has been consistently between 5% and 6% of GDP throughout the 1980's so the shortfall in capital formation has been in the private sector and that is the area we need to address. Government is relying heavily on residential construction and even though improving our housing stock is socially very desirable, I am concerned about the heavy outflow of foreign exchange that that is likely to bring about.

I believe the stimuli should be to expand the productive sectors, agriculture, manufacturing, tourism and the offshore sector. It can also reduce the outflow of foreign exchange or earn more foreign exchange and create more permanent jobs. This would be a tremendous challenge to Government, the private sector and the trade unions. It will call for vision, innovation and an extremely high level of cooperation.

The third target, Mr. President, was the overall fiscal deficit which the plan claims should be reduced from 7.6% of GDP to 2% of GDP by 1992.

Now, let us look at the projections for 1992. GDP of $3.639 billion. If the fiscal deficit is going to be 2%, that would amount to $73.3 million and capital expenditure is projected at $191 million for that year so by simple arithmetic, the current revenue in that year is expected to exceed current expenditure by $117.7 million, a surplus on current account of $117.7 million after paying all interest and amortising debt.

I do not know what odds the bookmakers are giving on that one, Sir, but past experience does not support that that is easily achievable unless there is a greatly enhanced level of financial discipline.

The fourth and final target I am dealing with is unemployment. The plan calls for a reduction in unemployment from 17.9% in 1987 to 15.8% by 1992. I submit that is totally unacceptable and that we in this community have to bring more imagination, and more boldness to be fair to the younger generation.

We need a think tank. It is not any original idea of mine. Other people far wiser that I have suggested this. With a small, but very efficient secretariat we need to identify and to analyse and to evaluate the information revolution, the technological revolution. Cheap labour is not necessarily an advantage nowadays. There is equipment that can replace cheap labour especially in the garment industry.

There has been a change in market demand for various commodities. How do we gain access to capital markets? What is going to be the impact on reduced aid from developed countries to developing countries of which we are one? What would be the educational and training requirements for the next century? What would be the new roles for IDC, ADC, the Board of Tourism, the Export

Promotion Corporation? How can we develop better the offshore sector, etc. etc. That list could go on forever, Sir.

The point I am making is that with a think tank it would help us because we need to focus public debate on the future, our country's future rather than being pre-occupied with the past.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to certain statutory corporations. We heard about certain public companies in the private sector earlier today. I bring to your attention, Sir, that our national debt does not include guaranteed debt of Government agencies. I am quoting from the Government's Economic Report, page 86. They remain contingent liabilities to the Government until somebody defaults or some agency defaults. Any delinquency by an agency in repaying such debts becomes a charge against the Treasury, the Consolidated Fund. Therefore it is very important that we monitor economic performance of Government agencies.

Earlier today, Sir, we heard about A.S. Bryden & Co. Ltd., Banks Breweries Ltd., Barbados Light & Power Co. Ltd., Barbados Shipping and Trading Ltd., BARTEL, Bico Ltd., Cave Shepherd Ltd., Goddard Enterprises Ltd., I declare an interest there, Sir, Plantations Ltd., West India Rum Refinery Ltd., and West Indian Biscuit Company. I wish I had the corresponding Audited Financial Statements of the various statutory corporations, but I have a few. And if you would permit me, Sir, let us start off with the Port Authority. In 1986 it showed an after tax profit of $1.576 million. In 1987 it showed a profit of $16 000 only. I saw in the paper yesterday where they are talking about $2 million for 1988. I would not deal with that because I do not know how reliable it is.

However, I do share the view expressed by Senator Jones about the national disgrace of a $6 million gantry crane lying idle down there over two years. The Barbados Chamber of Commerce has had to initiate a study into the Port and has asked its members to contribute some $75 000 over and above their annual subscriptions to pay for that study. It will be done by BIMAP, Sir. And the Terms of Reference are:

> "To investigate all aspects of management and operational procedures and practices in regard to cargo handling through the Bridgetown Port and Grantley Adams International Airport. And to make recommendations with a view to increasing efficiency and reducing costs, thus making the ports more competitive in order to increase exports, restore the trans-shipment business and increase profitability."

The private sector, Sir, is doing that, in the national interest.

Let us look next, Sir, at the National Petroleum Corporation. Their consolidated accounts show a profit of $6 699 999 for 1986. The corresponding figure for 1987 is a loss of $2 649 000.

Let us look at everybody's favourite, Sir, CBC. About a month ago, this Honourable Chamber had to guarantee new loans to CBC. I think the total was $4 million. In 1986, a loss of $1 133 000. In 1987, a loss of $1 663 000. And from what I hear about 1988, Sir, but we should not get into rumour!

Barbados Development Bank. There is a Question in my name on the Order Paper, Sir, because this Bank is technically insolvent. But in 1987 they lost $9 700 000. And in 1988, they lost $7 133 000.

I am not going to deal with ADC, IDC, BMC, National Housing Corporation, Export Promotion, Tourism because they are more service organizations.

Arawak and Heywoods, I do not have the accounts, Sir, so I cannot deal with them. But maybe I could refer to a few Heads in here while we are on this topic.

Head 13, Subhead 10 has already been referred to. $1 998 688 provides a grant to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation.

Let us then move on, Sir, to Head 73, Subhead 2, $2 million provides for the augmentation of resources of the Barbados Development Bank and Capital contribution with respect to loan agreement. Provision is also included at the micro business window at Barbados Development Bank and home equity financing through Barbados Mortgage Finance.

Subhead 3. Here, Mr. President, we are talking about $14 724 480, which provides for contributions to a Cement Plant, the West Indian Shipping Corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and Caribbean Air Cargo Ltd. I am not finished yet, Sir.

Head 73, Subhead 10, $3 million. The Subhead provides for the on-lending of money borrowed from foreign agencies to assist with the Capital Programmes of the Barbados National Oil Company, and the Industrial Credit Fund and for making an advance to Caribbean Airways. I think I have two more, Sir.

Head 74, Subhead 15, this is an interesting one. This Subhead provides for a grant to the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation to its Central Office expenses, operation of the Motor Tractor Cultivation Scheme and financial support for the commercial Division. Commercial divisions in the private sector do not get financial supports like this. I am talking about agriculture, and dealing with the Agricultural Development Corporation.

The point I am making, Sir, is that I should like to see these Government agencies have to publish in the daily press, highlights of their operating results within six months of their financial year ends.

Applause.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Public companies in the private sector have to do it. In fact, it is a requirement of the Stock Exchange that we have to publish results at least twice a year, and we expect that it will be quarterly sooner rather than later. This accountability in both the private and public sector, anything that will raise the level of accountability, can only be to the benefit of this community.

I certainly would like Parliamentarians to get copies of these things much sooner than we get them. You take CBC. We debated in this Chamber guaranteeing those loans to CBC. After that debate, I received Audited Accounts for 1987. That debate took place early in March, 1989. That is not good enough, Sir.

To summarize, it seems to me that the estimated revenue of $905 million for 1989-90 is very conservative and in my view underestimated. I believe they could be increased by further strengthening the Customs and Inland Revenue Department. In this regard, I do applaud the Government for the efforts that they have made and are making to strengthen those departments. I would urge the Minister of Finance to widen and strengthen further the tax net rather than replace the surcharge on income with what would be tantamount to a surcharge on honesty.
6.10 p.m.

On expenditure, the high levels of Supplementary Estimates over the past 2 years indicate an urgent need for reviewing and improving current budgetary procedures, systems, whatever. In many cases a zero budgetary approach could be usefully applied to control current expenditure and let me explain that, Sir, for those who may not be familiar. It seems to be fashionable to say if we spent $100 on a particular item this year and that the cost of living has gone up by 5%, we say that we will spend $110 next year – 5% for cost of living and another 5% for growth. We are assuming that what we spent last year was reasonable and we are only increasing and we will do the same thing again a year ahead. Zero budgeting takes a totally different approach. It means we may have spent $100 last year, but did we need to spend it at all? You have to justify the expenditure each time and not assume that the expenditure was correct and must now be increased. That is what is meant by zero budgeting. I say that and I repeat – what this country needs is expenditure restraint and not revenue stimulation.

The very last chapter in that Development Plan deals with implementation and I quote from Page 218:

> "However, since the primary goal of the plan is enhancement of the condition of the citizen this efficiency and cost effectiveness cannot be achieved at the cost of human suffering and neglect."

I am in total agreement with that concept and I believe that I speak on behalf of every Senator in here, that they support that totally. However, that noble thought can never be an excuse for weak or irresponsible financial management. Otherwise Government will create the very condition of human suffering and neglect that this plan is designed to avoid.

Again, Sir, I repeat that I believe the targets are achievable by 1992 and 1993. It can even be improved upon but it will call for a much closer liaison with the private sector.

I would just like to put out some thoughts here for consideration within the Ministry of Finance. They may have some merit in the Budgetary Proposals this year or a year ahead. I would like to see some incentives given for small companies or small businesses to incorporate by having maybe a lower rate of Corporation tax on those companies. I think it would do a lot to encourage economic development. I would like to see steps taken to encourage more private companies to go public, to broaden their shareholding base. This is a difficult one, Sir, but it is so attractive for public companies to expand or start new projects out of borrowed money for the simple reason that the interest on that borrowed money can be claimed for tax purposes. When you expand out of an equity issue, you cannot claim the dividend for tax purposes. I have never seen what I am going to suggest done elsewhere, but we have to be imaginative. Is it possible to let dividends be paid up to a certain per cent out of pre-tax income? If not, how can the dividend tax credits be increased? These ideas will have to be thought through very carefully. The objective is to broaden the shareholding base so that more people in this society have a shareholding in the public companies. I think it may also be useful if consideration could be given to permitting public companies, and I want to see more public companies, grant stock options to their employees and especially to their managerial and supervisory staff. This, I know, is done in the United States quite extensively to create a sense of belonging to the company as an incentive and motivation for management to do better in the interest of the company, staff, and the community it attempts to serve.

I return to a plea, Sir, in the agricultural sector which I believe, unlike the manufacturing sector, still has to pay import duties and consumption taxes on certain imports. I also would like to repeat what some other Senator said earlier, in removing the tax the restriction on tax losses that might be brought forward in any one year which at present may not reduce the tax liability of a corporation by more than 50%. That measure was expected to yield $2 million as stated in the Budgetary Proposals. But it greatly hampers

companies that need to restore their capital base, companies that have incurred losses possibly for reasons outside of their control especially companies I see in the agricultural and tourism sectors that are earning foreign exchange that we need. I think that is a serious disincentive and handicap to companies that need to restore their capital base to do more.

A couple of other proposals, Mr. President. I would like to see the off-shore sector with its tremendous potential for earning foreign exchange expedited by the creation of a suitable Government agency to support its development. This sector has been developing but I am advised that it needs some central agency that could coordinate its efforts to expedite and facilitate. It would be in their interest and in Government's interest as well.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to return to this idea of a think tank. It requires a lot more input from others more knowledgeable and experienced than myself.... a think tank of men of very high calibre. It does not have to be a large body and it will need a very capable but small secretariat that would identify and analyse and evaluate the opportunities as well as the threats. I see this in the national interest and there is no room for any partisan or political party considerations. I say this, Sir, that I think it is extremely important because as I mentioned before we have to focus on the future.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I think that the time has come to suspend this sitting until tomorrow. In doing so, I would like to suggest that we would like to have an earlier lunch break so that we can wind up this debate on the Appropriation Bill tomorrow and also deal with 3 other matters on the Order Paper.

I, therefore, move that the sitting be now suspended until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 21, 1989 at 10.00 a.m.

The question that the Senate suspend until Tuesday 21st March, 1989 at 10.00 a.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to.

6.20 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, yesterday we had a full discussion on the Estimates and it is not surprising. But I think that as Members of Parliament we ought in passing to take note of the matters of substance which seem to escape the Press and we need to recognise the very trite areas that they grasp on to make headlines of. Among other things I overheard that Government was asked not to tax and I did not understand where that could come from when at no time during the presentation by the Minister of State for Finance nor indeed by any of the presentations on the other side could I have been led to believe that Government was asked not to impose taxation. My understanding was that Government was being warned and it was being pointed out to Government that to continue on a path of high taxation would obviously lead the country into serious and severe difficulties. That was my understanding.

In passing I would like to say that some of the speeches on the other side especially those of Senator Goddard and Senator McClean and to a lesser extent Senator Blackman are worthy of some consideration, except that in the case of the speech by Senator McClean it appeared to be tinged from time to time with repetitious venomous comment which was so personal one wondered what was going to happen next. Indeed, I trust that that is not what the New Path is all about, otherwise this country is in for a deluge of personality destruction.

Having made that observation, let me say that every Government has to be concerned about the fiscal deficit which it presents when it comes to Parliament and the present Government is no different from others that have gone before. In my own experience Governments over the last 25 years have sought to control the spiral of expenditure and to ensure that there is some relationship between the revenues which the Crown has extracted from the citizens of this country and the amount which from time to time is sought through the Appropriation Bill for expenditure on the provisions of goods and services by the public sector. So that this is a continuing struggle which faces Cabinets of whatever shade. In this particular instance the fiscal deficit for the year 1989 – 90 aggregates in a sum of some $299 million compared with the estimated figure of $205 million for the previous year. In some instances Governments are able to identify the financing available to reduce the deficit, to cover the deficit, and sometimes there is a remaining gap. When that remaining gap needs to be covered Government has several alternatives, one of which is the raising of revenue by way of taxes. Let me assure Honourable Members on the other side that out of my little experience I am certain that tax is always a last resort for Cabinets and for Ministers of Finance. It is an extremely difficult thing for the officials in the Ministry of Finance to be able to persuade their Minister that he must extract the amount of tax which in the opinion of those officials may be necessary in order to keep the country on an even keel, and obviously other measures apart from taxation have to be explored.

So that some of the recommendations and suggestions made on the other side yesterday are quite appropriate in

terms of reminding Government of the necessity to explore every possible alternative avenue apart from that of taxation. That is my understanding of yesterday's discourse and if the Press is minded to repeat that then I have absolutely no difficulty with that because it would be a factual repetition of what took place yesterday.

This year the gap includes a substantial amount for the redemption of the Japanese Bond Series and it was also pointed out yesterday that a substantial amount of the last Japanese loan that was raised would not have been expended. I would imagine that a prudent and wise Government would seek to apply Japanese Yen to repay a Japanese Yen Loan. I will say no more on that. I have other views in terms of the presentation of the Estimates which I will say in the appropriate place.

The fact that the Government is faced with a fiscal deficit at the moment on paper is a reality and it is necessary to examine the factors which give rise to the deficit and to seek out ways and means of financing it. This means in reality that the fiscal policy of the Government must assume a greater stabilization role instead of placing primary emphasis on economic stimulation and expansion and it also means that Government will have to examine its monetary policy where necessary to apply such measures as will ensure that the anticipated difficulties do not in fact arise.

Whereas current revenue rose from $583.4 million in the financial year 1984 – 85 to $738.3 million in the financial year 1987 – 88 which was an increase of $154.9 million or 26.5%, current expenditure increased by an amount of $226 million or 37.4% over the same period and the major items which contributed to this rise in expenditure were personal emoluments and charges of debt. Personal emoluments accounted for some 15.6% of the increase of actual expenditure and charges of debt accounted for 10.5%. It is therefore abundantly clear that the increase in current expenditure was much higher than the increases in current revenue and Government will of necessity have to take steps to control the deficit on current account and the increases in personal emoluments. It will have in future to manage its public debt repayments in such a way that we are not faced with a situation of another bullet. Government will also have to institute measures to ensure that there is productivity in the public sector. This question of increasing efficiency in the Public Service, particularly in the area of revenue collection, has already started to receive the attention of Government and during the coming fiscal year an even greater effort will have to be made by the revenue collection areas to collect all the revenues due to Government, in particular such arrears of revenue as presently exist.

The Land Tax Department, I am advised, has begun during the current year to respond to these urgings and we anticipate that the Customs and the Inland Revenue Departments will play a larger role. In these 1989 – 90 Estimates provision has been made for equipment to start anyhow even if not complete the computerization of the Customs Department in order to enable it to execute its revenue collection task in a more efficient manner. The accounting and computer systems of the Inland Revenue Department are being reviewed with the intention of improving them so that during the coming year the entire accounting and budgeting systems in the Government sector will be revised.

Comment was made yesterday and in the Other Place about several errors which crept in during compilation of the Estimates and my only comment is that it is abundantly clear that in future, as it was in the past, these errors will have to be avoided. If there is need for training of individuals that will be done. But other measures may have to be adopted to ensure that a document presented can stand the test and the scrutiny for its correctness.

When the measures which the Government proposes are introduced, it is believed that some substantial part of the fiscal deficit will be made up because there will be improved collection of taxes. In addition, certain savings on current account will have to be identified and more careful approaches to financing of the public debt will remove some of the burden that is being experienced this year.

Very little comment has been made about the Government's Capital Works Programme although there have been several questions. I believe that many of the questions asked about structures in the Ministry of Education will be answered and can easily be answered.
10.10 a.m.

I will not attempt to answer all of the questions, but in passing to say that the programme for development of schools and the construction of a new Queen's College and a Wotton secondary school are part and parcel of the provisions set out in the Development Plan, and the suggestions made about phasing them sound quite noble when it is not understood that Government also has plans for utilisation of the Queen's College site, so that by the time Queen's College moves out of its present location Government will have to move in and pursue whatever activity is going to be required at that location. The question of siting another school there cannot arise.

The Capital Expenditure in the Prime Minister's Office for the financial year 1989 – 90 is estimated at some $4.1 million. Of this, about $1.27 million will be used primarily for financing studies, including the export competitiveness for a marketing study and for a tourism study. The tourism study started this month, March 1989, and another study is expected to begin in April 1989. Both of these studies should be completed between September 1989 and March 1990.

Comment was made yesterday about the expenditure on the Defence Force and although the incorrect amount was quoted I think the point which was being made was that in spite of Government's position in relation to the role of a Defence Force, that year by year expenditure on the Defence Force appears to be on the increase. All I would suggest is that persons who make that comment should pay a visit to the Headquarters of the Defence Force and they will be shown in very great detail the manner in which the funds provided have been expended.

The buildings of the Defence Force, the Headquarters building and the iron building at St. Ann's Fort, are due for refurbishing, but those of you who go into what used to be the dance hall of the Drill Hall would be proud at the manner in which the Defence Force has refurbished it and presented it for public use. So that although expenditure is increasing one can see, and can be shown, the manner in which the funds have been properly expended.

The Capital Expenditure for the Ministry of International Transport, Telecommunications and Immigration is estimated to be $3.4 million. Most of this is going to be spent for improving and expanding the parking apron, the taxiway development and other airfield improvements, for the maintenance of service roads, for relocating and renovating existing facilities, including security fences, for updating radar and navigational aids and communications equipment, and for the modification of the existing terminals. I will only say on that that the matter of security at the airport is a continuing concern in the attempt by Government to stem the trafficking of narcotics.

For the Ministry of Agriculture the amount of $18 million has been provided in this year's Capital Estimates, and the promotion of non-sugar agriculture continues to be recognised as being quite essential if the agricultural sector is to contribute more effectively to the economic development of Barbados.

The major projects of Government this year include land development and soil conservation projects, rural development including the Springhall Land Lease Scheme, which is a continuation of existing programmes.

Some of the funding for the agricultural development project is being provided by the World Bank and it is planned to undertake a study of the Three Houses swamp to develop the Three Houses spring for irrigation. The European Investment Bank is assisting with the study on the establishment of an abattoir and a meat packing house.

Under the Ministry of Legal Affairs, again comment was made about the condition of the courts. This is a hardy annual and all I will say at this stage is that the Ministry of Legal Affairs recognises and has done a study of all the needs of the agencies, including the Police and Fire Service, and it has proposed that the Police Band accommodation project be pursued vigorously. There is an allocation of some $2 million for the construction of dormitory accommodation and the construction of offices and a music building. Seventy five per cent of the ground slabs for this project have already been cast, the foundation is partly completed and the work will proceed apace.

A sum of $1 million has been allocated to the Holetown complex project. It is anticipated that approval will be given for including the Rates and Taxes Department, the Licensing Authority, the Post Office, the Library and Health Department, along with the Police post in this Holetown complex.

I have already made brief comment about the Ministry of Education. I believe the Ministry of Education is provided with, if not the highest, the second highest amount of funding, and the overall budgeted cost for the education sector, $9.4 million of that will be spent on technical, vocational and adult education, including completing construction of the Conference and Examination Centre at Sherbourne. We have a way of crying down institutions that do not satisfy us at the outset, but at some subsequent time grasping them as if they had been originally our bed mates.
10.20 a.m.

Under the Ministry of Health overall provision is provided of some $30 million. This includes upgrading of polyclinics for expansion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which has proceeded apace, and also for some upgrading of the Psychiatric Hospital and for refurbishing of Roseville as a half-way house. Included under the Ministry of Health is an amount for the refurbishment and equipping of the St. Joseph Hospital to serve as an acute care hospital in the north. My understanding is that this Hospital will be run by a Board of Management which will have responsibility for its day to day running, and it will relieve the Consolidated Fund of providing the full cost of its operation, and note I said the full cost, because it is hoped that this hospital in the north will also cater to some patients who would be the responsibility of Government, and for the services rendered to them Government may be required to provide a contribution, not half. This is for putting it in shape to use. This has nothing to do with any half. The Government deals in whole measures, not in half measures. This is a responsibility of Government to deal wholly and fully with any matter for which it has responsibility. A Government is elected to serve everybody in the country; it cannot deal with half and leave the other half out. It has to deal with all.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Well the best way would be to get them to provide some additional rooms which they will give without any charge that would be on the same pathway; not the new path, the same path.

Capital expenditure in the housing sector includes the existing joint housing project with the Venezuelan Government and agencies to provide another 496 houses for the housing stock for lower and middle income earners in Barbados. The project has been allocated some $9.5 million in the current fiscal year.

The Industrial Development Corporation hopes to respond to a variety of demands for additional factory space for a number of manufacturing enterprises, and the planned expenditure in this sector is $5 million. With respect to this, a loan agreement is being negotiated with the Caribbean Development Bank in order to assist with the financing of the factory construction programme.

In the area of tourism and sports, Government has made provision to start construction of the gymnasium project during this fiscal year. The site has already been cleared, plans are with the Chinese authorities for their final approval, and we anticipate that the work will proceed apace in the short term.

In addition, an amount of $3.1 million has been allocated for further renovation and extension of facilities at the Dover Convention Centre and for the development of golfing facilities at one or other locations in the parish of Christ Church.

Let me in passing respond to a comment made yesterday about the absence of revenue from the Hilton Hotel, and to explain that the Hilton Hotel is the responsibility of the Tourism Investment Corporation and therefore any revenues which would accrue from rent of the Hilton just as any profits which will accrue from the operations of Heywoods will find themselves into the hands of the Tourism Investment Corporation which is the statutory authority responsible for these properties.

I believe, Mr. President, that I should respond to a question which was raised on the question of training in relation to nurses. I am advised that seven nurses are being trained at the University of the West Indies, Mona, and the Royal College of Nursing in advanced nursing education. Secondly, an affiliate programme between the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Greater South-East Community Hospital in Washington D.C, has been initiated by the Ministry of Health to train nurses to man specialised areas within the hospital. This training is done in rotation and four nurses have benefited already under the scheme, and a second additional four nurses are due to complete training shortly. These specialised areas include ophthalmic nursing, recovery room techniques, operating theatre techniques, accident and emergency techniques, oncology, and orthopaedic nursing. Another nurse has completed a burns management course at the Shriners Burns Institute and another nurse is presently in training at the University of the West Indies, Mona, in this area of burns management.

Four nurses have completed training in neo-natal intensive care nursing in hospitals in the United Kingdom and Canada, and this is provided as well by an in-service programme for eight nurses. Training is carried out on modern trends in nursing administration and two nurses are also pursuing a one year course in community nursing with emphasis on health education. Locally beginning January 1989, thirty nurses started training in midwifery in a one year programme. In addition 23 nurses who began the Registered Mental Nurse course in January 1987, are about completing it, while a further 39 nurses have started a three year programme from September of 1988, and this programme is in collaboration and under the direction of the Barbados Community College. Over and above all that, another nurse is in training in chiropody in the United Kingdom. I believe that more than responds to the enquiry about the training of nurses which had fallen somewhat into abeyance and which was resuscitated in 1987.

I believe, Mr. President, that I do not need to say anything more because there are other persons on this side who will respond quite adequately to the several queries which are being made; but I would only like to say in closing that elected Governments have a responsibility for ensuring what is best according to their understanding for the citizens of the country, and the views of other persons in Parliament are always welcome provided those views do not go beyond the bounds of reality as some of the comments which were made yesterday, and I will not repeat those comments; I believe they speak for themselves.

With those comments, Mr. President, I support the Appropriation Bill, 1989.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, in rising to speak on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, I should like at the outset to make the point that as regards the errors in the Estimates, this is an occupational hazard to which all Ministers of Finance have been susceptible in recent years. The departments who provide the bulk of information which goes towards the compilation of Estimates usually are themselves very confused sometimes about what they put up. It is an on-going exercise in the Ministry of Finance and we can look for errors as we go along in the presentation of these Estimates. I have no doubt that in the expenditure items which merely fall on the recurrent expenditure, this is inescapable when it comes to Government. I do not know how much we can do to further reduce this expenditure. I take the point by Senator McClean and Senator Goddard about expenditure constraints, but we are also constrained by the notion of recurrent expenditure in the various departments, and even though the Ministry of Finance would look at the other non-recurrent expenditure very critically and more or less reduce things that are asked for, we are still bound by this big wall of recurrent expenditure which forms the bulk of Government expenditure every year. It is just like the Great Wall of China. I do not know how we will get about

making departments become more aware of the amount of money which is spent, or might be wasted, in certain departments.
10.30 a.m.

It is true the Auditor General's Department is supposed to point out in the reports every year which are made to Parliament areas of wastage and the Public Accounts Committee is also an institution of Parliament and is supposed to study the Auditor General's Report in very great detail and bring to the notice of the House those Heads of Departments which have wasted or more or less abused Government funds as has happened in the CARIFESTA.

When Barbados hosted CARIFESTA a few years ago there was gross misuse of public funds in that exercise. Nobody has come to justice on that matter but, I believe, it was in the area of $42 million which was actually squandered in the staging of CARIFESTA in this country.

I know the Auditor General made certain strictures on those expenditures but, so far, no-one has been asked to explain the great rise in the expenditures. We had taximen and people who provided transportation working non-stop 24 hours a day. They never slept and money was paid out in that respect.

Anyhow, Sir, those are different attitudes we have to watch in the Public Service and I would like to hearken to the call by Senator Goddard about cooperation among the private sector, Government and other institutions in order to bring about some kind of realisation in this country about where we are going and how we are going to head in the 21st Century.

This is going to be a very terrible year in the history of Barbados and in the history of the world. There are going to be more calamities this year, at the end of this decade. In the history of the world all the 1980's have always been uproarious. People tend to lose control and you get a very great deal of confrontation as exhibited here in the recent salaries talks. Although people would exhort us to have constraint in expansion, yet we still hear arguments that the Minister of Finance should have paid out more money to the civil servants. The Head of the Teachers Union confronted Government saying that they would not accept what was eventually legislated and all along there is an area of confrontation building up in this country.

We, as Senators, must be very careful not to fuel those kinds of confrontations because it could be disastrous to every one of us in time to come. I for one, knowing that Barbados is faced with an unemployment problem, would not mind my salary being cut even by 10% if it would go towards helping some people to get some kind of money in order to help themselves in this day and age but we find that in society today every person is exacting their pound of flesh. They become Shylock. We have several Shylocks now in society, each person exacting their pound of flesh. In that atmosphere, Sir, we cannot make much headway.

When the DLP came into power in 1986, we reduced our salary by 5%. We took less at that time because we were conscious of the fact that we preferred to see more people being able to share the cake and we hoped that that would have gone through the society and to ask people to exercise restraint in their negotiations for salary increases, you find unions castigating one union because it had come to an agreement with Government before the others were able to. This is the kind of thing that exists in this society.

We have had people referred to the Port Department about the gantry crane not being put in operation and there was a report in the newspapers that the crane had made $2.5 million and that the cost was very high and things of that nature.

I have been looking at the unaudited figures for last year and the actual profit is around the region of $1.3 million when you take out the taxation and the increase in revenue for last year which is an amount of $4.6 million. It was caused partly by increases in profits in 1988 and this has come mainly through an increase in tariff dues, more or less.

I would hasten to add, Mr. President, that the Chairman of the Port Authority was reported to have said in the papers, I do not know if that is true, that the charges were too high but I believe that the charges at the Bridgetown Port might be high in relation to other ports in the Caribbean but the charges of the Bridgetown Port do not form a big percentage in the final product in Barbados. The final cost to the consumer is arrived at by other routes by consumption taxes and things like that so if you examine the slight increase in cost at the port in comparison to what the consumer gets in Barbados, the charges that are paid at the port is a very small amount when you look at the final product in this country.

I would concede that the charges at the port in relation to other ports in the area we are not competitive at all. As a matter of fact, I think that Guadeloupe is having its third gantry crane in a very short time. St. Lucia they pay their labour. Trinidad has now reduced its port charges by at least 1/4 of what you pay in Barbados because you will see from those kinds of operations that we are in a very bad way and anyone who thinks that we can get back the transshipment business in Barbados is a big joke. That is gone. We cannot compete with the other ports in the area when it comes to transshipment business. We have lost that.

On the other hand, when I peruse the figures I see that the port gets interest on its investments which comes to a tidy half a million dollars every year as well as rents which is over another $2 000 so it does not strike me as being any

mastermind in management at the port to arrive at any profit during these years and when we examine the wages bill at the port, what I am concerned about is that wages and salaries for the port for 1988 were $10 892 092. Of that amount overtime is $5 662 530. Now, overtime has taken up 52% of the wages bill at the port. Now this is nothing to do with the Agreement with the Union because the union has the rates worked out there that have been agreed upon. I believe that the overtime is excessive. This has to be blamed on management as far as I am concerned. Certain Heads of Department in the Port have been allowing workers – we know we have to get some overtime at the Port, we give in to that, people must work overtime – but the overtime which is being worked at the Port is far excessive to the production which we have at the Port. I am not saying there should not be overtime. But when you get an overtime bill becoming 52% of your total wage bill at the Port then you would understand that something is radically wrong with how we manage people at the Port.
10.40 a.m.

There is one shift which I believe works all the time. There are some people, personnel, who are able to get large sums of money at the Port. And it is a continuing exercise of any Minister in charge of the Port to be able to steer a line that would bring some kind of equilibrium in the workers at that Harbour.

Now Barbados Port workers have to clear 33 containers in a day which is very low in comparison with other Ports. In Jamaica it is 80 per day. The workers at the Port have been accustomed to a certain amount of money when the day comes. So any agreement involving the gantry crane has got to be worked out very carefully with the union.

All I can say now with regard the gantry crane is that the union and the Port Authority are continuing to discuss and are trying to come to a conclusion as to how we go about allowing that crane to work. They are in talks right now and rationalisation talks have been continuing between the union and the Port Authority for the past five years. And everything revolves around these rationalisation talks.

We have tried even to ask the union to train people in the meantime in the use of the crane, but that has not been granted so far.

But the present state of the matter is this, that we have submitted certain proposals from the Port Authority to the union which the union is presently studying and should get back to us with new counter proposals. So I can only hope that those talks between the union and the Port Authority which are now going on with a degree of eagerness will come to some kind of conclusion very soon and allow the crane to work.

But I do believe from what I see in the spiralling overtime that we can initiate some savings in expenditure at the Port, despite the fact that the crane is not in operation yet. Management has got to tidy up certain areas at the Port, if not we will find ourselves blaming the crane all the time. The Port has become more or less a free for all in its attitude to certain people. And the Port Manager has been there from the inception with Port Contractors.

I believe that sufficient use is not being made of the expertise in the Port Management staff when it comes to negotiating certain conditions with the union. And he appears to be the only man who actually talks in a dispute. That is from a domestic point of view and no blame on the other negotiating team.

As for the study by BIMAP which is being organised by the Chamber of Commerce and the Shipping Association, I do not know, Sir, how far that would go to ameliorate what is happening at the Port. To me it might be ill-timed when we are going through the very technical stages of rationalisation talks to have the Chamber of Commerce and the Shipping Association coming in at this time. I would hope that the union would give its co-operation to the investigation. But structured as it is with several members, and each person looking after some section of the Port there appears to me to be some kind of overlapping in that study team. And we may not get the amount of information we might need in order to come to a decision as to how to operate the Port for the benefit of the taxpayers of this country.

I would hope that the union would give the study team its co-operation and help them to arrive at some kind of solution, come up with a report probably in the next two or three months. That is as far as the Port is concerned.

As regards agriculture, I should like to assure Senator Goddard that I have checked with the Ministry and most of those items which are important to agriculture are exempt from import duties including insecticides, manures, chemical manures of every form – all those are exempted from import duties.

I should like to say that the Ministry of Agriculture is trying to put emphasis on crop development as well as livestock and feed production. As a matter of fact there is a feed lot as Greenland in St. Andrew whereby they are feeding 250 head of cattle in a certain way on certain feed lots in order to provide information for farmers so that they can carry out acreage production.

There are also incentives being given in the Ministry of Agriculture for orchard development and pasture. I believe the Ministry has been handicapped over the years in that the main research centre is located in the Pine as far as grasslands are concerned. I have always wondered why the best land in Barbados, there at the Pine, a fertile valley have

been devoted to grassland tryouts. And after all of these years we have not come up with a proper legume which can be fed to animals, because in that area there in the Pine, just south of Ilaro Court, there are three water wells. That area can grow all the vegetables to feed the hospitals and some of the School Meals Service. It is very fertile. It has been devoted to grassland production over the years and yet you do not hear about any kind of discovery coming from the Ministry of Agriculture as far as some new grass or some new legume which you can feed to your dairy animals until we can produce the kind of gains that we so badly need in production in this country.
10.50 a.m.

We have been trying down at the St. Lucy Development and we have been putting farmers on certain plots down there which have proved to be very successful in some instances. But there again we have been constrained by marketing considerations. The Ministry has been trying for years to find a formula whereby the farmer who has got to work hard farming should not have the problem to look for markets. We should be able to provide a ready market for certain farmers in this country and despite the fact that the Government has been giving Barbados Agricultural Society a grant of $200,000 to $250,000 a year to help with non-sugar agriculture we find that the actual small farmer is not able to get his goods marketed. It seems that some farmers are in the Barbados Agricultural Society because they are able to get their items marketed at the expense of the small farmer who is also a member of the same Barbados Agricultural Society. These are things that have got to be looked into and the Ministry is very conscious of the problems facing small farmers in the area of marketing.

It is true that last year there was a lot of rain at the time when we were looking forward for our vital production. There were plenty rains in Barbados and that effected the yields that resulted from last year's crop and we had to import a few vegetables from Guyana for the shortfall. But we are proficient in growing vegetables in Barbados for our own consumption. We are proficient in carrot production, the best in the Caribbean. Right. We have had trouble with the yam, although we grow a lot. But the yams have been coming back this year and we will be able to reap a little better yams than we reaped a few years back. But we are still plagued by the anthracnose disease which has curtailed the overall production of yams to any great degree. But the Ministry is continuing to work on that disease. We still have been troubled by the scabby in potato and work is continuing in those areas. The major brunt of the Ministry's attack for the past 2 years has been in the area of cotton. They have been trying to revive the cotton industry and we are at the point now where you see a million dollars being provided in the Capital Estimates which Senator McClean asked about yesterday. I think that million dollars is for cotton – the cotton as equity for the cotton that we are about to embark on as well as $250,000 for the Caribbean Food Corporation. Those are the increases in expenditure for our agriculture.

But cotton is one of those crops which – I do not know how to put it – it is one of those things that you have to be very careful about and there have been problems with the seed for the last 2 or 3 years. The seed did not germinate and when you ask plantations to plant cotton and you get bad seeds and things, you know what I mean, it means that the plantation has lost time, time and effort, in trying to respond to Government's plea to grow cotton. Unless the Ministry of Agriculture can convince farmers that they could rely on the seed, that fertilizer will be available at the very time when you need it – these are all the constraints that go into producing a cotton crop – if the seed is good and it germinates, then you have got to have the manures in place at the time because cotton needs manuring at the right time – if it is not manured at the right time – it means all the difference between having a good yield of cotton or a poor yield, you see. Agriculture is no Sunday School thing. It is not a thing we talk around the table. Agriculture is out there. You have got to be out there. You have to experience it to know it. The farmer bears the uninsurable risk of losing a crop at anytime and nobody insures a farmer for his losses. You must understand that. People feel that farmers "out there and thing". But everybody else who is salaried and who gets wages can boast and talk big because they have already done. Week after week and month after month they get paid. A farmer can grow a crop of carrots or a crop of cabbage for that matter, almost the hardest crop to grow. Take cabbage – you have an acre of cabbage. The man has got a family to raise and despite that he has been trying to care for those cabbages for the last 3 months. He can get an insect come along in the last month and wipe out the whole cabbage crop. Right. Anything like that. I hear of praedial larceny which is the worst thing which is confronting farmers in this day and age. You see. He has to pick up the pieces. He has to go again. In the meantime, his children have to go to school. He has to provide food and shelter for his family. Nobody insures him against this kind of thing.

In Canada when people get loans for agricultural purposes, for every year that you have losses the repayment is postponed by one year. If you had a loan to finance in 5 years and you have had 5 losses, you take pains to pay for that loan. The loan does not become owed until you get a successful crop where you can pay back out of your successful crop. But we have got to be more lenient with agriculture and we would hope to maintain our production of sugar cane – this is very necessary as the Government is committed to sugar cane production in this country and we would like to maintain our sugar cane levels – while at the same time diversifying our agriculture for the benefit of not only plantation owners who go into food crop cultivation but also to the small farmer who earns his living by working on the farm.

We have got to move very rapidly and this is my own view. I have been concerned very much in this country about the black belly sheep. As a matter of fact when I did at one time stop all export of black belly sheep at that time in Barbados, they called me "black belly sheep". But if that had been adhered to by both Governments through the years we would now be in a position with a peculiar animal, the black belly sheep, which is prolific in its offspring and which has now been found to contain the best mutton available in the Caribbean. We should now be exporting mutton throughout the whole Caribbean. I would like to see the time come when we do not export one black belly sheep at all. We should be keeping that sheep cultivated at this stage and we should be going about and the Ministry of Agriculture should be engaged in a programme going about the island and castrating every small ram that does not mean anything. Those inefficient rams should be castrated and have proper rams for breeding with black belly sheep and in no time we will have all the mutton available here in this country, not only for our own consumption but to be exported throughout the Caribbean. That is a fact. Get rid of all of the "unuseful" rams that are around the place that are not much for breeding and breed the black belly sheep from a lamb. You know we used to hear before that the black belly sheep was prolific in offspring and had no mutton value.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator, I do not want to stop you. But we are dealing with a positive matter here. I would like you to get back to the issue that is before us. The black belly sheep is really . . .

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Yes, but agriculture is so wide. If you start agriculture, it will last the whole day.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: No Sir, I was just trying to pin-point that agriculture at this time has got its emphasis on black belly sheep cultivation which is necessary to the upkeep of the mutton crop in this country.
11.00 a.m.

I was only responding to certain remarks made, and I believe that Senators might wish to know what we are doing in agriculture from the Government's standpoint. I was just trying to pick out a few areas whereby we can help our food production in this regard. I am obliged, Sir, for your indulgence.

The Ministry intends to get ahead with its cotton development. I think Montserrat and Antigua are co-operating with the Government of Barbados in trying to get this cotton off the ground, and we hope we can get into spinning and textiles to bring a bigger dollar to the cotton industry.

Sir, as far as the Ministry of Transport and Works is concerned, I have got to give a slight overview. The Minister of Transport and Works is embarking on an island-wide programme of road building and road surfacing. The Minister hopes, in the remaining part of the year [illegible] to resurface most of the roads in the country, and he is embarking on a multi-parish kind of attack on all our roads, as well as to bring certain tenantry roads up to standard in an effort to make people wherever they are happy with a proper road surface. He is awaiting the culmination of loan funds which should be available in the not too distant future where every parish rather than every constituency will be serviced by proper roads and be able to feel that they too are part of Barbados.

The Government is very conscious of its responsibility at this time and the Government intends to make Barbados a better place for all of us to reside. We would like that every one of us in every aspect of our endeavours should enjoy a piece of the cake, and the Government will spare no effort in the remaining months to bring certain programmes to reality which would go towards making Barbadians happy of their country.

Sir, with those few remarks I would like to endorse the Estimates and support the Appropriation Bill, 1989.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN: Mr. President, much of what I would otherwise have said has already been contributed by other Honourable Members of this Chamber, but I should like to make reference to a few areas.

I should like first to touch upon Tourism and Sports, Head 43, pages 163 to 167. I think that we are doing an excellent job in that Ministry. On page 167 we see the sum of $5.6 million being allocated for a gymnasium, a sum which I think will be very well spent, especially if it is utilised in a specific way. By that I mean I know it is under construction now and that the National Stadium is also being refurbished, and I think that we ought to promote these together internationally. This can be of tremendous value to the island, because I am thinking of our possibilities when it comes to piggy-backing on the advertisements of sporting bodies abroad. This is almost limitless.

Not only are we well known for our cricket and, as Senator Phillips was saying yesterday, for our king of sports, but there are many other sporting activities which we can draw to the attention of the rest of the world if we were to utilise this method of piggy-backing in our advertisements. Therefore, this sum of money which is inserted in here I think can be put to very, very good use indeed. I say this because our neighbouring countries all have the same sea, sun and sand, but we have to have something different, and we do in fact have something

different, and it is not only in our people, but we can become a Mecca for sports.

We can ill afford certain types of publicity, but I will say a little more about that afterwards. What we really need to do is to get to some of the international agencies. I see we have reverted to the public relations company and the advertisement company which were doing us so proud in the mid sixties and the early seventies, the years all going back when I was Chairman of the Tourist Board, and I can see that we have had a very fine year last year and if we continue along the same trend we will be able to put this to very good use.

Under this Head, concern has also been expressed about the number of wholesale tour operators overseas which are going out of operation and leaving the local tour companies, hotels and agencies with large sums of money outstanding. I think that the Board of Tourism would do well to monitor the activities of a number of these organisations and keep the local bodies informed. I know from experience that this can cause a lot of damage to the tourist plant not only in Barbados, but in other parts of the world, and if we are spending this sum of money which I see here between pages 163 and 167, it would be important for us to pay special attention to this, because there is no point in having a potential $X million and providing goods and services only to find that you cannot collect it at the end of the day.

If I may revert, Sir, to the linkage of tourism and sports, I think that our young people can be motivated to a great extent if they see the sort of gymnastics which we saw when we viewed our television screens for the Olympics.
11.10 a.m.

When the gymnasium is fully operational, we should be able to link tourism and sports. I am sure we have all seen many floor shows at the hotels and have had that feeling of *deja vu* when you have seen the limbo and the fire eating act and you see that same thing at every hotel, and I am sure that we can benefit by having a number of our young people trained in the sort of beautiful gymnastics which we have in fact seen displayed on the television screens during the time of the Olympics. That is another way we could really put our gymnasium to very good use. I am going back a very long time, Mr. President. However, there must have been something very good about it because the Board since it has reverted to the same public relations and advertising specialists has proved that it is getting excellent results once more.

Now I should like to turn to Culture, Head 34 on page 94, Mr. President. Under subheads 25 and 26 I note that there is provision for the grant to a number of organisations including the Arts Council, the Land Ship, etcetera, of certain sums of money. I think that this is money very well spent. I am quite aware that we have to be conscious of our financial resources and we cannot put out more money than we can really afford, but I should like to see more spent in this area, because I am not satisfied that we have got in the Island the sort of facilities we need, say, for promoting another CARIFESTA. We need to have a theatre. I should like to see, for example, the Empire Theatre refurbished. Can you imagine putting on "Gas Light" in the theatre at Queen's Park or something like that? Where would the orchestra be and things like that? I am looking forward, Mr. President, to the day when the Empire Theatre or some such building will be returned to its pristine glory and we will be able to have the sort of shows which we really deserve to have and a place to put them on, and it is for this reason that on this page when I look at the amount, the $2 356 000 that I think it is not at all too much and that we really ought to spend a little more when we can afford it on projects such as that, because if we did have a theatre, a lot of what took place last time could not possibly have taken place, and also there again the linkage with tourism, we would be in a position to invite some of the big international shows to our country.

We cannot over-estimate the value of the contribution made by these organisations which receive these small contributions in terms of the development of our people, Mr. President. In today's world we all see the effects of stress and we do need to have certain safety valves which can be provided by these outlets. It is for this reason that I feel very strongly that we ought to spend a bit more not only on the cultural activities but on the development of the buildings such as those which would provide the facilities for them.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to turn to page 102, Head 77 – Foreign Affairs. I observe there that we seem to be spending such a small sum of money. I think it was just over $1 million, and I do not quite understand how we can manage to represent Barbados properly with this very limited budget. I do think that if it is correct that out of every dollar spent the Foreign Ministry takes only two cents that we should really give a little bit more consideration to spending a little bit more under that Head as well, even though again I am aware of the constraints under which we operate. My understanding is too that there are only approximately 150 persons in this Ministry including the local administrative staff, and I should like to see us being in a position to afford a little bit more for foreign representation. We have got to showcase ourselves to the world, but I know that the ACP/EEC involvement makes it necessary to maintain a presence in Brussels and I support this, but the Caribbean representation I think could be upgraded. I am thinking in terms of perhaps someone being accredited to Haiti and Surinam. I do not know if the Foreign Minister would wish to tell us if this has in fact been done; but the sum of money however which I see here does not seem to be sufficiently large to do all that I should like to see done in terms of our representation internationally. I think in terms of a closer relationship with

the African States. I always think of Nigeria, for example, and I remember the $1/2 million which was donated by General Gowon in 1975 after the Commonwealth Summit in Jamaica, and I think that we ought to pursue these linkages. There again we have another possibility of another linkage in terms of tourism, but even apart from the tourism linkage, I think we ought to be better represented. I should frame that differently, not better represented, but that we should have more representation abroad.

Now the bottom line is, I am quite sure, that developing countries must so conduct their foreign affairs as to be able to sell their goods and products at prices which are remunerative. I am aware of this. What I need to know is how much is being done in those circles to effect a reduction of interest rates on our international debts. You have got to spend something to get something. Every businessman knows that, and I think of Brazil which is the largest country on the South American continent. It is important that we strengthen our ties with Brazil, for example, and we should be placing more funds at the disposal of whoever is servicing that country, whether it is being serviced from Venezuela or some other place, provided of course that the funds are available, but we now have an air linkage with that country and we need to strengthen our cultural links as well, I think. In fact, I hope to see the establishment of a consulate or an embassy there just as they had a presence in Barbados.
11.20 a.m.

Finally, in this regard, Mr. President, I think of graduation because what I am talking about here it affects our Budget. It is important that the doctrine of graduation be rejected.

We understand that the World Bank and other financial institutions have developed a formula which permits them to graduate developing countries such as ours. Now, the present system must be rejected out of hand. Are these financial institutions saying to countries such as ours that we may develop thus far and no further and is there really a penalty for good management because that is what it seems like to me?

I should like to know how it is impacting on the local financial resources of our country. Maybe the Minister could let us know if there has been a reversal of the position of these financial institutions and if we are, once again, eligible for certain types of aid for which I understand we had been debarred.

Mr. President, with these few observations, I support the Appropriation Bill.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Mr. President, I listened to most of the speeches that were delivered yesterday with great care and it seemed to me that most of them seemed to be based on a common underlying philosophy, or common underlying assumptions.

I just want to give a short outline of some of the things that were said yesterday. I think the common underlying assumption is that fiscal policy in Barbados should be geared to the accommodation of capitalist enterprise in this society. That seems to me to be the common assumption of most of the presentations that were made, particularly yesterday.

For example, listening to Senator McClean's presentation, his essential quarrel with the Government was that Government was underestimating its revenue and was also intending to spend too much and he also made the point that Government seemed prepared to close the deficits by the route of increased taxation. He believes that if the deficit is to be closed, a better way to close it would be by borrowing but, in any event, he believed that expenditure was too high.

To my mind, that is not . . .

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On a point of order, Mr. President. You cannot close a deficit by borrowing. You can finance it by borrowing. That was not my method.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: I thank Senator McClean for that clarification but the point remains the same.

To my mind, Senator McClean is tinkering but it is clear that what he said yesterday is based on that common assumption that the purpose of fiscal policy really is to accommodate capitalist enterprise in this country and a number of the speeches seemed to be based around that common theme.

We had, for example, a listing of a number of businesses that have made profits in Barbados last year. We had, for example, Senator Goddard's admonition that Government's economic policy should not be based on historical rhetoric or other non-economic factors and what he seemed to be saying to me really was that what Government should be doing . . .

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. President, on a point of clarification.

I welcome Government's working with the private sector and I said that any vigorous or positive outreach to the private sector should not be restricted by ethnic, historical or other non-economic considerations. I did not say that Government's economic policy should be based on the points mentioned. I said "the outreach."

Mr. PRESIDENT: I just want members to – we do not have in here points of clarification to rise on. You rise on a

point of order if you want to explain a point. However, I understand what you mean. We do not want to invent rules.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: I thank you, Sir.

We also heard from Senator Goddard – I think I am fairly representing the general tenure of the speech, that we need to look at the future without being too pre-occupied with the past and underlying the speech, to me, was this common assumption that the Government's role, really, is to provide the right climate and to facilitate private business enterprise in Barbados.

We also heard from a number of Senators the sentiment expressed that Government's expenditure and state enterprises should be pared down to the absolute minimum, in other words, that Government ideally should occupy the smallest social space that, in the circumstances, seems to be possible.

In fact, we heard a listing of unprofitable state enterprises and we also heard a number of calls for the divestment of privatisation of a number of our state enterprises, particularly, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and there was also a suggestion that Government should privatise the St. Joseph Hospital as soon as possible.

Underlying all of this, Sir, it seems to me is an almost total acceptance of the so-called free enterprise market economy and I say so-called because, really and truly, I do not believe that we in Barbados operate a free enterprise market economy. The level of monopoly that we have in this country precludes a genuine free enterprise market economy but the accepted wisdom seems to be that that is what we have and that Government's role is really to accommodate it and to facilitate it.

But, Mr. President, I want to disagree with if not all, certainly most of those sentiments. I have the greatest respect for Senators Goddard and Blackman as men. I enjoyed the lucidity of Senator McClean's presentation, but I intend to lock horns with them if not personally, certainly, ideologically.
11.30 a.m.

Sir, it seems to me that if we are looking at Estimates and we are looking at what Government's role should be in this society, certainly in terms of how it spends its money, that we cannot get away from looking at our history. And it always boggles my mind why so many of us seem to be so reluctant to look back at where we have come from. I think this is a truism, a trite one though it may be, that you need to look back at where you have come from in order to see where you are going to.

I think, Sir, that history has bequeathed to us in Barbados a fundamental social problem which no amount of tinkering with Estimates and with revenue and expenditure figures will solve, a fundamental social problem which no amount of accommodation or management of capitalist business enterprise in this country will solve. However, effective that accommodation or management may be, something more than that is required.

Basically, Sir, our history of exploitation under both slavery and colonialism has left us with a terribly skewed distribution of wealth. In our society we find we have a large mass of relatively underprivileged and poor people. And because of our particular historical circumstances, we find that that large mass of underprivileged happen to be Afro-Barbadians. This is our history. And this is the fundamental problem that this society has to solve. This is the fundamental problem that Government has to solve and Government expenditure, Government Estimates have to be directed to.

Put simply, Sir, we have to dismantle the class structure which history has imposed upon us and we have to set about to eradicate the gross inequalities in the ownership of wealth in this country. That is our fundamental problem and that is the fundamental problem that Government must grapple with and that Government's Estimates, Government's expenditure must be directed towards. Simply maintaining a free enterprise economy will not achieve this because we all know that the strategic business positions in this society have been dominated and will continue largely to be dominated by a small group of our people.

We know that, for most of our history, Barbadians who are descended from Africans have been disadvantaged so far as getting into strategic business positions in this community has been concerned. In fact, not only have we suffered vis-a-vis the white Barbadian community but in recent years we have suffered vis-a-vis the Indian and Syrian communities, Indian and Syrian ethic minorities.

So the point is this, where these small groups occupy strategic positions in the private enterprise or corporate structure, if Government were simply to devote itself to accommodating and fuelling that corporate structure what it would in fact be doing is accommodating and fuelling the progress of those small groups. And I am saying that that is not good enough, that any Government worth its salt in Barbados must recognize that over and above that it has a fundamental role to play in redistributing the wealth, in opening up opportunities for the underprivileged and poor, in ensuring that the real assets find their way into the hands of the majority of the people in this country. And I make no bones about that. Any political party worth its salt must see this as its fundamental goal.

And this is where the Government Party, Sir. The Democratic Labour Party has to part ways with the two Opposition Parties. I have no doubt about that.

Senator McClean, as I said, admirably represented that common assumption that Government's place is really to be narrowed down and to accommodate the private enterprise economy. This I believe will become the dogma of the Party that he represents. It is clear, Sir, that the business community in this country see in the Leader of Senator McClean's Party a person who perhaps can most ably represent their interest in Barbados. And I suspect that more and more his Party is going to assume the role as the defender and the protector of vested interests in this country, particularly the small class of big businessmen and members of the economic establishment.

We in the Government Party, Sir, the DLP, have to part ways on that score. We must be clear in our minds that we stand for something over, above and beyond that. That we are not simply here to facilitate the continued progress of big business in Barbados. That we have a responsibility over and beyond that to redistribute wealth in this country and to open up opportunities and space for the vast majority of our people. These, Sir, are good democratic socialist principles, this is good egalitarianism that I am preaching. This, Sir, is the essence of the equality which should lie at the heart of the political democracy that we claim to practise in Barbados.

Therefore, Sir, we in the DLP cannot be satisfied simply with Bryden's or BS&T or Goddard's making profits. There is nothing wrong with these firms making profits. Let me make that clear. I do not begrudge Senator Goddard his profits. But even more importantly we need to hear that small businesses, that black businesses, are on the move, that Government has been facilitating them over the past year, that Government has been opening up opportunities for them. This is what we need to hear as well. I am not begrudging them their profits. We need to hear something else as well. We need to hear that real wealth and real assets are moving in the direction of the black majority. Real assets, Sir, like land for example.
11.40 a.m.

I am glad Senator Ward is here because I just want to touch a little bit on land, agricultural policy. Many of us feel, Sir, that there is a real need for land reform in Barbados. Many of us feel that too long has the vast majority of arable lands in this country remained in the hands of a small group of people and it does not placate us to hear that the country owns these lands because these people are indebted to the Barbados National Bank. That does not satisfy us. We want to see some of these lands actually in the hands and being operated by and cultivated by more of the people of this country.

We often hear from the sugar planters that sugar cane is unprofitable, they do not make a profit, and that is supposed to frighten us off, that they are doing this country a great favour and, therefore, that we should really be thanking them rather than be seeking ways of democratizing the ownership of the lands which they now possess.

But I cannot buy the argument, Sir, because these people have never been known for their altruism. These people are businessmen and throughout history have been known as some of the greediest businessmen that the world has ever experienced. So when I hear the argument that sugar is not making money but that they still want to hold on to these lands to continue in an enterprise that is impoverishing them, it leaves me to be suspicious. I have heard the argument put forward that the attitude of a number of these planters and particularly the corporate land owning sector that they intend to hold on to these lands because by so doing it means that you maintain a large number of people who are landless and who therefore are relegated to forming part of a labour force and sometimes often forming part of the unemployed of our labour force and therefore acting as a reservoir of labour that will keep wages in Barbados at a certain level. I have also heard the argument advanced that these people intend to hold on to this land because by so doing they cut down the store of land that goes onto the market in Barbados and thereby maintain the high land values in Barbados.

So people are putting forward arguments, so this thing is not as simple as that sugar is not making money and these people like planting sugar and are doing Barbados a favour, that there are ulterior motives behind the retention of this land, that it helps to maintain a large reservoir of potential labour and keeps wages down and that it helps to maintain the land values in Barbados.

I am saying that this Government must see it as one of its fundamental objectives to democratize the ownership of land in Barbados. I think Senator Blackman wants to know how this relates to the Estimates. I am going to tell you how this relates to the Estimates.

I believe, Sir, that the whole question of land reform and land redistribution should become one of our priorities and I believe that what we need to do in Barbados is instead of simply running Government in such a way that you try to do a little bit of everything at the same time, I think that we need to move more towards an approach where we identify – Government identifies – one or two really critical problems that it intends to solve and that Government make a conscious effort to divert or to focus a large portion of its attention and its finances on solving those 1 or 2 problems. And I am saying that one of the problems that we should be solving should be the whole question of agriculture in this country, both food production, democratization of the ownership of the land, and non-food agricultural production. We need to be looking at how we can diversify out of the simple production of sugar cane for making sugar and confectionery. I understand that companies like Tate & Lyle and our own Government have done a large amount of

research in how the sugar cane can be used to create other industrial products.

The point I am making, Mr. President, is that very soon I would like to see our Estimates reflect a conscious decision on the part of Government that it is going to focus a much greater proportion of Government's attention and resources and expenditure on the solving of these three interrelated problems than we are now doing. Because really and truly the solving of this problem lies at the very foundation of the proper development of this country. Let us not fool ourselves. All this nonsense we talk about offshore industry and facilitating offshore industry. We are not going anywhere with that. Real development – real sound developments in this country – have to be based on the agricultural sector and the sooner we make that determination and decide that we are going to deal with this problem and that we are going to devote real resources for dealing with it, not just messing around with it and every year we vote the normal sum that you vote towards agriculture, etcetera, etcetera, not just messing around with it like that but making a conscious decision to deal with it once and for all and to get it solved and then to move on from there into developing this country, the sooner we do that the better for us.

Thus, Sir, I see a clear role for Government being more than just the facilitators of the capitalist economy. I see a clearer role for Government certainly in the agricultural sector. I see a clearer role for Government in the tourism sector. We keep on hearing this slogan – "Tourism is our business. Let's play our part." How many of us have really scrutinized that slogan? Is tourism really our business? Whose business is tourism? Who owns the hotels? Who manages and finances the hotels? Whose business is tourism? I agree that there is a lot of potential in tourism, but I also want to make the point that this is again another area in which Government must do all in its power to facilitate real democratic control in the industry. Let us really make tourism our business.
11.50 a.m.

We heard in here calls for the privatisation of the two state enterprises that Government holds in tourism – the Hilton Hotel and Heywoods Resort. Both Governments can take credit for having seen that their role in tourism had to be more than just facilitating foreign and local enterprise, that they had to take a leading role. I think the Democratic Labour Party led the way when they built what is now the Hilton Hotel. I understand that the original thinking behind the Heywoods Resort was that six or seven Barbadian families would run the whole enterprise as a type of joint venture, but somewhere along the line that was shunted aside and instead Government built the facility and then licensed it out to some foreign firm who actually operates it and manages it.

Clearly those two projects show that there is a role for Government to play in really making tourism our business, and both methods used are methods that we should look at very seriously. The method that the DLP Government used in its approach to the Hilton Hotel, and the original thinking behind the Heywoods concept, that Barbadian families could operate the undertaking, that the resort could be split up into different areas and Barbadian families could manage it, I think that that type of approach has a lot of merit in it and it is something that I would suggest that Government look at very, very carefully as a way forward in the tourism industry.

The basic point I should like to make in relation to this is that Government has a role to play in acquiring real assets on behalf of the people of Barbados. I cannot accept the suggestion that came across so strongly to me yesterday that Government should be limiting itself to the smallest possible social space. I cannot accept that. There is a role for state enterprises to play in a society such as Barbados. There can be no doubt about that. In fact, even during the colonial era, even the colonial Governments recognised that in small societies like these the State has a role to play in meeting the demands of the citizens. Throughout Europe that whole approach to economic development, certainly in the post World War II years, has been manifested, so it is nothing new. Yet what I heard coming out yesterday was a suggestion that Government cannot manage efficiently state enterprises, that the only people who can efficiently manage large enterprises are the private sector.

I do not know that this notion can have any credibility in Barbados, because when we look at the large number of private sector business failures that occurred in Barbados not very long ago, during the mid-eighties, where then does this almost mystical belief in the fallibility of the private sector arise? Businessmen in Barbados pat themselves on the back because they make profits, but we must recognise that for the most part the businesses in Barbados are relatively simple businesses. As members of the distributive trade they have a ready-made and captive market in Barbados. Most of them are not creative manufacturers. Those that do what they choose to call manufacturing tend simply to assemble products for a captive market in Barbados. Most of them enjoy monopoly control in Barbados, their profits are assured, so for businessmen to point at profits that business enterprises may have made and to compare Government enterprises unfavourably, it is not fair because it does not take into account the totality of the circumstances.

In any event, Mr. President, state enterprises are not necessarily there to make a profit, state enterprises are based on a whole different type of thinking. Some state enterprises consciously make an effort to deliver services to the people at reasonable rates as opposed to the highest possible rates, the rates that will bring the highest possible profit margin. Some provide services deliberately knowing

that they have to provide these services at a loss. I do not want to go into any long defence of state enterprises, because I think most of us in here should know the arguments well by now, but I cannot understand this persistent call in Barbados for privatisation. We heard calls for the privatisation of the Transport Board, the privatisation of CBC. I even read David Seale writing a column calling for Government to divest itself of its shares in Barbados External Telecommunications. Good Lord, one of the Government's shares in Barbados External Telecommunications brings dividends, profits, money into Government's coffers year after year. Why should Government unilaterally decide to sell these shares? And if Government decides to sell these shares, who will buy them? Who will benefit from Government's generosity? I strongly suspect that perhaps the same author of that idea would be one of the chief beneficiaries. Why should we privatise CBC now, after Government has just last year and I believe the year before spent untold hundreds of thousands of the capital of the people of this country to build up that Capital installation, to properly equip it, to repair, refurbish and to build new buildings up there?
12.00 noon

After Government has now built it up we are hearing this call for its privatisation. After Government has built up the Transport Board, has spent millions of dollars and is in the course of spending millions of dollars in rolling stock for the Transport Board, we are hearing that this state enterprise should be privatised. I cannot understand the rationale. These are major pieces of the social capital of this country, and it is vitally important that certain services like Transport be maintained in the hands of Government. I know that if we were so reckless as to privatise the Transport Board that the travelling public in Barbados would suffer immense hardships, because there are no private bus operators who transport the people from St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. John; there are no private bus operators that will transport people at 11 o'clock and twelve o'clock at night.

In addition to that, Sir, there are two other aspects of the state enterprises that we have to look at very carefully. Government ownership of state enterprises gives Government an opportunity to put into effect the theories and practices of worker participation that we as a democratic socialist party must be committed to. In state enterprises we have an admirable opportunity to experiment with and to put into operation true worker participation democracy in this country, and if we privatise our state enterprises, we are giving away that opportunity to experiment with and to put in place, bearing in mind the history of our people in being excluded from participating in any fundamental decision making process, we are giving away that opportunity to experiment and to put in place true worker participation. This is certainly an area in which all Governments in Barbados since the 1940's who claim to be democratic socialists have fallen down, because we have not taken to heart the opportunities that we have in our state enterprises to put into practice what we say we believe in, worker participation. We can set the lead for the private sector so far as worker participation is concerned if you are serious about it.

The other aspect I would like to mention in relation to state enterprises is that there must be a role for local joint ventures between Government and private enterprise in Barbados. We seem to have accepted that there is a role in the Caribbean at least and most developing third world countries seem to have accepted that there is a role for Government joint ventures with foreign businessmen. We need to look seriously at the concept of joint ventures between Government and local businessmen, and this is an area that is pregnant with possibilities. To my mind, Sir, this view that Government must limit itself to the smallest social space is simply backward 19th century liberalism, and if this view were taken seriously by Government, and if any Government in Barbados were so irresponsible and reckless to go down that road, then we would be risking the very future existence of this society and I want to demonstrate that clearly. If any Government in Barbados were to take to heart any belief that Government should occupy the smallest social space, that Government should be cutting expenditure and confining itself and divesting itself of state enterprises, it would be jeopardising the very future of this country.

For example, Sir, if Government does not take on a lead role in the society, pray tell how we are going to solve the whole problem of unemployment. Mind you, Mr. President, it is my belief that a large part of solving of the problem of unemployment hinges on providing our working population with marketable skills. We continue to talk about the unemployed, but we do not seem to really research the true condition of the unemployed. I suspect that a lot of people who are unemployed in Barbados today are lacking in marketable skills, and it is my believe that we will go a long way to solving the unemployment problem in Barbados when we do proper research on the distribution of marketable skills within the society and when we come to grips with providing our people with marketable skills, and Government has, I believe, a big role in this.

Sir, when I hear Honourable Senators querying the amount of money that Government is spending on the Girls' Industrial Union or the Barbados Workers' Union Labour College, I can't go down that road with them. This is money well spent or money that has the potential for doing real good for this country provided it is put to proper use. I would not go down the road of saying that these organisations should not be supported by Government or that Government has given too much support. The Labour College in particular has a crucial role to play in providing for Barbados a disciplined and intelligent labour force that will form the base upon which manufacturing enterprises can be based. It has a critical role to play in the society.

In addition, Sir, since I am on Education and we spend quite a bit on Education every year, I want to digress slightly for a while and to go back to one of my pet peeves, and I am thankful to see that in the last year it is something that has been picked up by the Minister of Education, Mr. Walker, and it is that we will be teaching in our secondary schools Black and African Studies. We need to teach our secondary school children West African history; I am clear in my mind about that. We need to teach them black studies, and when I say black studies I am really speaking about not just confining the studies to the continent of Africa, but we need to give our young people an understanding of the role that African people have played in the creation of western civilisation, of this powerful industrial civilisation that we boast so much about, because that essentially is the history of Black people in the modern world. When you talk about Black Studies you are not talking about anything segregated from the major currents of world history; you are talking about an integral part of world history, and our young people need to know its history, that the continent of Africa has provided the labour and the brains that built the basis of industrial civilisation.
12.10 p.m.

The cotton kingdoms in the United States, the southern United States and the sugar kingdoms in the Caribbean, Central America and South America were the basis of the industrial civilisation that we enjoy today and those sugar estates were run on the labour and the brains, not just the labour. People seem to forget this.

The artisans, the people who operate the factory, the factory technicians, the wheelwrights and the carpenters were slaves so it is the brains as well, not just the brawn, the brawn and the brains, and I am saying that we need to look at our curriculum in our secondary schools and if we are spending all this money on education, you are putting up new schools, you are putting up a new Queen's College, you are putting up a new school in St. Thomas, we need to be aware that we have to be conscious not just about the school buildings but about the contents of the education and, to my mind, this is a glaring deficiency and I am glad that Mr. Walker has picked up upon it and I hope that he will truly act upon it and put it into place and that it goes beyond a mere talk.

Sir, it is clear that, if we are to have any acceptable future in this country, Government must take its role and be prepared to devote substantial resources for the whole area of social welfare in this country and I make no bones about saying that.

We are a people who have gone through a history in which the majority of us suffered severe physical degradation, lived in abject poverty and suffered physical deprivation and we, as a Government, cannot allow our people to suffer anything approaching that type of fate in this last quarter of the 20th Century.

I look around Bridgetown, Sir, and I see more and more signs of vagrancy on the streets. I see more and more signs of young people who have severe drug and mental problems and I think that one of the things we should be doing is scrutinizing these Estimates just looking to see how much money we are spending on the Psychiatric Hospital, how much money we are spending on drug rehabilitation programmes or a drug rehabilitation centre.

We are faced, Sir, with an endemic problem in our young people. Many of them are unemployed and many of them, because of the state of unemployment, are turning to drugs to relieve the boredom. Many of them are turning to petty crime, to stealing and things of that nature. We need to be devoting substantial resources towards a youth programme in our country.

I visited Trinidad about a month ago and all the middle-class people I went among in Trinidad were telling me, you have to shut up your house carefully, lock your door. I was even driving through town and you drive through certain parts of town and they tell you to roll up your glass window because they are afraid of criminals and violence being perpetrated against them and the point I am making is that Barbados is not too far distant from such a situation.

You have middle-class people in Trinidad who are putting four and five locks on their doors and their houses are shut up morning, noon and night and they are even afraid to drive through certain parts of town so I want to send out that warning to the comfortable and the wealthy in Barbados.

Mind you, what is happening in Trinidad is that the society is becoming more and more polarized and you are getting large pockets of underprivileged people being confined in areas and all the problems of unemployment, drugs and crime are festering and I see similar signs on the horizon for Barbados. The point I am making is that this relates to Government's expenditure because I am saying let us not fall into this mistaken way of thinking that money spent on social welfare and policies is money badly spent. This is far from the truth.

In fact, I believe we need to be spending even more to deal with some of these social problems that I see developing so that, Sir, in essence that is my defence of what I can term the democratic socialist path of development and I know people look at this word "socialist" askance and all sorts of negative connotations have been attached to it but it is an honourable path, and it is a path that has been embraced by the more progressive of our Caribbean politicians and it is a path that the Democratic Labour Party has, for a long time now, claimed to represent and, in this upcoming political tug-of-war, it will become even more critical that the Democratic Labour Party dedicate itself to these goals and make a clear

distinction between the Democratic Labour Party and the two Opposition Parties.

There are just two or three other points I want to touch briefly on before winding up and I want to support Senator Blackman on his suggestions in relation to how we can make Parliament more effective and more democratic. These are ideas that I have had myself but we spoke about them only about a week or two ago, the whole concept of using joint committees and establishing joint committees with the power to investigate and to scrutinize various areas of Government activity and to call before, subpoena before the committee, summon before the committee, not just Ministers of Government, but Public Servants as well.

I believe that this is a progressive thing. It obtains in the United States Congress and Senate. It obtains in the British House of Commons. Judging from what Mr. Manley was saying recently, it seems that he is moving in that direction in Jamaica as well and it can only redound to the benefit of true democracy in this country because we have to be very careful.

We claim to be practicing political democracy but many of the things that we do smack very much of authoritarianism and it is really sad that people who have been elected to Parliament, people who have been voted for, and enjoyed the support of thousands of Barbadians, exercise less power and influence in this country than a lot of people who even deliberately divorce themselves from the vast majority of the people in this country.

For example, Mr. President, I believe as a Senator, or the backbenchers in the House of Assembly probably have less influence in Barbados, and less power in Barbados, than Gordon Matthews, who can find himself on the front page of our newspapers saying that Barbados has more apartheid than South Africa.

Mr. President, I could not get on the front page of any one of our newspapers even if I wanted to say something sensible. Gordon Matthews can get on the front page of our newspaper to make the most reprehensible, erroneous, misleading and a statement derogatory to all of our people, and especially to the people of Barbados, that he can say that we have more apartheid in Barbados than there is in South Africa. It is a slap in the face of all of us.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I hope that you are not suggesting that that is an element of power.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Sir, I am saying that the mere fact that he is on the front page is that he is in a position to influence and persuade people with his nonsense. I am hoping that the statements and Mr. Matthews will be denounced by all Barbadians, black as well as white, as well as Indian and Syrian, that he will be suitably denounced because, really, it is the most unpatriotic and a most reprehensible statement.

Secondly, Sir, the whole question of the Defence Force. It was stated in here yesterday as to the expenditure on the Defence Force. I want to lend my support to that query. For a long time now I have had my reservations about the Defence Force. I am not afraid to say certain things that we had a drastic build-up in expenditure on the Defence Force since 1978 and that build-up was part and parcel of the Reaganite policy that emanated from the United States with the election of President Reagan. In fact, it preceded him because in the last year of the Carter Regime he had taken on that particular policy as well to militarize this region as to encourage elected Governments in this region to divert the social capital of their people to building up non-productive armies. And this Democratic Labour Party spoke out against it but since coming to power we have done very little about it. This is a deficiency that we must remedy. This was an election issue. It formed part of our campaign and we cannot be content to sit back year after year and allow the kind of expenditure which was built up under the Tom Adams Regime to continue in Barbados. I am saying that it is not a question of the revenue itself but that build up was instigated by Washington and was designed for a certain purpose. And we as an Independent sovereign nation have to have the courage to look again carefully and scrutinize that whole development in our society. We must have a Defence Force. I have no problem with that. But let us put it in its proper perspective. We should not be spending more on the Defence Force than we are spending on sport and community development etcetera. Let us get our priorities right.

12.20 p.m.

Just two other points quickly, Sir. Senator Blackman wanted to know whether the $2 million in the Estimates under Education for the Transport Board is a subsidy. No, Sir, it is not a subsidy. The Transport Board provides a service to school children. This gets back to the whole question of state enterprises. People would want to say that that is a subsidy. But the point is that the Transport Board provides a service to school children. And like any business enterprise, it should be paid for that service. They have worked for that money. They have provided for pensioners as well and the Police Force. It is money the Transport Board has worked for. So it cannot be a subsidy.

Aside.

SENATOR D. A. COMISSIONG: Okay, what you are subsidising is the bus fare. But the point is that the Transport Board is actually providing a service. It has done the work for that money. That is the point. It is not that it is charity coming to the Transport Board. They have worked for it.

The only other point I should like to mention, Sir, I think it was the question about Government's contribution to the West Indian Shipping Corporation. I do not know all the details behind that. But I want to say as a young politician that it is clear to me that West Indian integration has to be on the political agenda for us as a region. It has to be. As a young man I cannot see any acceptable future for the countries of this region, except within a strong nation state. I cannot see any acceptable future for us, if we remain divided and weak as we are we will continue to be simply the prey and the pawns of the large metropolitan countries who will use us, use us for cheap labour, use us for the location of selected manufacturing enterprises, use us as their holiday resorts. But if we are to have a future that is different from that, a future that is built on self respect, on self reliance, on sovereignty and our own identity then I believe we have to be moving in that direction. And, therefore, the West Indies Shipping Corporation, no matter how weak an enterprise it might be, at least seems to offer some hope. As I said, I do not have all the details, but I want to say that enterprises like that, initiatives like that, should be supported by the Government of Barbados because that represents our only future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Applause.

SENATOR Miss V. P. BRATHWAITE: Mr. President, in rising to add my comments.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you do not mind, they are going to make a suspension now. After we come back you may continue.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, yesterday I indicated that we would like to stop at 12.30 p.m. today.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move the suspension of this sitting until 1.30 p.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly at 12.30 p.m.
12.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, at the beginning of this session, in June 1986, even longer than last year, a Committee of Selection was appointed to serve this Honourable Chamber. Recent events have robbed us of the membership of former Senator Billie Miller and it is necessary that somebody be appointed, some Senator be appointed to serve on the Committee of Selection and thereafter that Committee will meet to regularize the other Committees.

I beg to move that Senator Wendell McClean be appointed to be a Member of the Committee of Selection.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Is the nomination of Senator McClean agreed? Any objection? No objection. Senator McClean is agreed.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Brathwaite.

SENATOR Miss V. P. BRATHWAITE: Mr. President, in rising to add my comments to the debate on the Appropriation Bill 1989 with its Schedule of the Estimates for 1989-90 which form a necessary part thereto, I wish first of all to compliment Senator Goddard for the very lucid and informative discourse which he gave in his contribution to the debate. It seems to me that Senator Goddard's comments were based on a well thought-out and informative premise. I wish also to associate myself with those comments made earlier by my colleague, Senator McClean. I am sure it will come as a surprise to no one that I do so sitting as I do from this vantage point in this Honourable Chamber.

I am sure that Senator Comissiong would also be very surprised to learn that I too support in great measure some of the comments that he has made today, earlier this morning. But I caution him I support him in so far as his comments regarding the ideology and the history of my people are concerned. There are some areas which I am sure will be very clear to him, if not now, during the course of the next few minutes during my speech, where I shall take issue with some of the premises and the comments issuing from them which he has made.

I wish first of all to state categorically that as far as I am concerned the interest and the welfare of Barbados and Barbadians should be the first and the paramount consideration and that this premise should inform and guide debates such as these.

I turn now, Sir, to a note of caution as far as the Government is concerned. I am dealing specifically now with these Estimates. Let me say first of all though that Senator Comissiong's call for fiscal sanity is a call which is shared by my colleague and me and, I am sure, by other Members on this side of this Honourable Chamber and that this is precisely the reason why we have attempted to point out to Government those areas of possible indiscretion or misinformation or mismanagement. You see, Sir, I think persons, Senator Comissiong included, must recognise that though we go from a base of certain ideological perceptions the question which confronts us at this time and the burning issue is what is the Government going to do about the direction in which we should be going? Hence, the call earlier of Senator McClean for Government to be careful

and to think again, a call which I fully endorse at this time and I shall go on to show you why.

The reason why we perceive the need for careful and prudent scrutiny of Government's expenditure at this time is because it is precisely the same person that Senator Comissiong is attempting to protect that we think is going to get hurt if Government were to proceed along the path where it is headed. I agree with Senator Comissiong that it is all well and good to list names of those companies that are presently listed on the Stock Exchange as having done remarkably well or reasonably well. I also share his view that while we are happy for those companies because they contribute either in great or small measure to the growth of the economy, we also want to hear about the others, the myriad others, about their performance – and here Senator Clarke was silent. Of course, though Senator Clarke should take small comfort even given the basis that the good performance of those companies, as he has termed it, is an indication of the way in which the economy has performed under the management of the present Administration, he should be forever mindful and on sober reflection I am sure he will agree with me that he must take heed of Senator Goddard's warning. Senator Goddard stated that whilst not disputing that those companies performed well, rather those companies performed well in spite of the fact that there were certain fiscal and budgetary measures in place during the last year and he also stated that those companies performed well as a result of curbing their own expenditure. I think, Sir, that the Government is well advised to take heed.

I also caution Senator Comissiong that whilst pursuing, sometimes frantically I think, his ideological perceptions to the bitter end, that he does so from one of three positions. Either he is ignorant of his own Government's statement of the role of Government as outlined in the Government's Development Plan 1989-93. He is either ignorant of it. He either misunderstands it or he disagrees with it. But whatever he does, Sir, his comments were not in keeping with the side of the Honourable Chamber that he represents. Here the Government is well cautioned also, Sir, to seek to inform or to make sure that their representatives understand the very point that they were placed here to endorse.

Sir, at Page 45 of that Development Plan the Government expressly stated in no uncertain terms that as far as it is concerned the role of Government and Government's policy over the period 1988–93 and beyond will be based on the premise that a vibrant and dynamic private sector is essential for the attainment of the goals of real economic growth, the expansion of job opportunities, and the promotion of development with a share for all. So I remind Senator Comissiong that ideologically I have no fight with him. I am proud of my Afro-Barbadian past. Indeed, I would have it no other way were I offered a choice. But in doing so we must also be mindful, and here I agree with him again, that coming out of the historical past there is a certain heritage in which we found ourselves and the role of Government is to do its best in bridging the gap between the haves and have nots. It is precisely the way the Government is attempting to do that we take issue with.

Sir, Senator Comissiong's comments in dealing with the state enterprises, I support to some extent.
1.40 p.m.

I wish to inform him that the Government must be very clear as to those agencies of the State which are welfare agencies. Such activities as water services, transport services, health services, because of public finance considerations would not be well advised to be left up to the private sector. On the other hand, Sir, it is an unwise Government which would proceed to take over or to keep those enterprises which are not welfare enterprises, but which also are non-profit making.

I hope that I am not misunderstood. I am saying that the Government should get rid of those welfare agencies. I am saying those which are not welfare agencies and those which are not profit making, profit generating, or even breaking even in the accounting sense, Government must get rid of, and I speak specifically about the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Hilton Hotel, among others.

I caution Government also, Sir, because of its history of estimation errors – and here I am glad Senator Phillips is in his seat – let me say I have no personal affinity with the Government or with any one of its representatives here or elsewhere. I hope that the members of this Honourable Chamber will bear in mind that I speak from the premise of the best interest and welfare for all Barbadians at all times and therefore I think it unfair to accuse anyone who dares speak against any opinion expressed by the Government of having a personal axe to grind, as having a personal affinity against the Honourable Prime Minister, Minister of Finance or any other person.

Here again this is an area in which I caution Government to be respective to the views of others. My role in this Honourable Chamber, and I am sure that of others who are not members on the Government side, is to seek to point the Government in the right direction and I wish not to be accused of being anything other than or doing anything other than that.

Sir, I mentioned the estimation errors as contained in the Schedule to the Appropriation Bill, Estimates 1989–90. I look specifically at page 104 of the Estimates where I note – and these are taxes that were unaffected by the 1988 Budget – Corporation Tax, original estimate $65 million, in fact Government has collected $78.5 million, an error of some $13.5 million and when expressed as a percentage of the original estimate, 20.8%.

I look again on the same page at income tax which was originally estimated at $80 million, in fact this particular area of Government activity brought in $95.2 million, a difference of $15.2 million and a 19% error. Land tax, Sir, on the same page, originally estimated at $25 million. It is now sure, or pretty sure that revenue from that tax will bring in the area of $30 million, an estimation error of $5 million and a percentage error of 20%. On that same page, property transfer tax, original estimate of $8.5 million, now expected to yield $14.9 million, another estimation error of $6.4 million and a 75.3% error.

Again I turn to page XIX and I see there the training levy with an original estimate of $8.7 million to the nearest dollar, a revised estimate of $11.7 million, a $3 million error and a 34.5% error.

This is why I want to sound a note of caution to the Government, because Government's Estimates for the year 1989–90 are based on these premises and you cannot have a sound fiscal policy if the basis is flawed and defective.

I look again at those taxes which were adjusted by the 1988 Budget, and here I turn back to page IV, consumption tax revenue originally estimated at $155 million. During the budgetary proposals the Government was of the view that this amount should be increased to some $238 million. In fact, Sir, revenue from this Head yielded only $189.4 million. In other words, the Government received in an area where Government deliberately changed the original estimate with a view to bringing in more revenue, $83 million to be exact, Government in fact received $48.6 million less than it expected.

Also, Sir, page VI, stamp duty from Customs, Government had originally estimated, in its estimates for the last financial year, revenue here of $100 million. It then introduced measures which would in effect have removed the stamp duty from certain CARICOM goods in like areas for those businesses that were registered with Customs and which sought to reduce the revenue here to $45 million. In fact Government received $80 million.

I am sure my friends on the other side may say that is all well and good, we got more than we expected. I am happy when that happens also, but the fact is it is an estimation error for which the Government must always be on its guard, and I wish to sound a note of caution here also. The net result of those provisions, Sir, is that instead of a projected net revenue gain of $28 million the Government in fact suffered a net revenue loss of $13.6 million.
1.50 p.m.

That is a result, Sir, of gross estimation errors on the part of Government, and my only quarrel, Sir, the only issue which I wish to take is that Government must not wallow in self-complacency; it must heed the advice and criticism of other persons, because such errors as they are, when they form the basis for Government's future action will lead to Government being ill-informed and misinformed and mismanaged. Sir, I caution Government also because of the Prime Minister's misguided and off-sighted premise – he has said this so often I am tempted to believe that he believes it. Sir, it is an economic concept, an economic statement that current expenditure must be met from current revenue as a general guideline to things, but, Sir, that statement does not take account of the amortisation payments that are included in the current account and at page 4 of the Memorandum to the Estimates, Sir, we note that same $143 million has been taken into account. This has been taken into account as an item of current expenditure. It therefore gives a false and misleading signal to those who manage our fiscal policy that that is an area which must be taken into account when Government is determining again on a false premise that current expenditure must be met from current revenue. That is another area, Sir, which I caution the Government about.

My view is further strengthened, Mr. President, that Senator Clarke has sounded what in my view is a warning that he does not like to use the word "gap" – I was not in this Chamber, Sir, when there were certain connotations or explanations placed upon that word, but I think I am intelligent enough to catch his drift when he was speaking, and I would prefer to say that the deficit resulting from Government's current expenditure and current revenue would be met by the budget. Those are not my words; those are Senator Clarke's words, that the Government will attempt to fill that, I must say, gap by the budget. It is precisely for that reason that I wish to caution Government further.

Senator Clarke himself stated that a deficit budget of itself is neither good nor bad. It must be looked at in the context of the prevailing economic circumstances, the direction in which Government wishes to take the country, and if after careful consideration also the level of taxes which the country can endure, if at the end of all that there needs be a deficit budget, then so be it, and if at the end of that there needs be a surplus budget, so also be it. But to state and to go on the premise that a budget must be balanced at all times and that further current expenditure must be met from current revenue and that further that gap must be bridged by the budget is to be misguided and will lead down a path of economic ruin. I caution the Government also in that regard also, Sir.

Sir, at page 2 of the Memorandum of the Estimates, I notice there under the heading "sources of funds" a total of $206.5 million and as a item of the items listed there a 1988 Japanese Bond Special deposit of $79.8 million. This is precisely why I need to sound a note of caution to the Government. That is money the Government did not need. It is money the Government had no right going after. That, Sir, is why it is placed where it is in parenthesis in that list. My colleague Senator McClean has already asked Senator

Clarke for certain explanations in this regard. I wish also to reiterate and endorse the comments made by Senator McClean. I wish also to query whether or not the acquisition of this money from Japan was as a result of systematic planning and good economic foresight on the part of the Government, or whether the Government found itself with this money and then realised it did not need it. But we can find a way out of this, Sir, if the net result is a financial gain to this country. I rather suspect it will not be, and I say so, Sir, because if the difference in interest rates which we receive wherever we have placed that money and what we have to pay is a net gain to Barbados, that's all well and good; but normally we know that is not the case in international economic circles, and I would wish, Sir, some clarification on that. I direct my question to Senator Clarke. What is the interest rate that we paid on this money? What is the interest rate that we received on it?

Senator Lewis stated earlier that it is an unwise person – I am not deliberately misquoting him, but he spoke words to this effect – that it is an unwise person who would borrow Japanese money and hold it in a currency other than Japanese yen. Sir, the performance of the Government so far leaves me still to ask that question, in what currency is it held. I got no enlightenment whatsoever from Senator Lewis' remark. Perhaps he might term me an unwise person, but I prefer to err on the side of caution, and I would wish to know in what currency is it being held, what are the net gains realised so far or expected, and also what is the effect on our foreign exchange reserves. I ask that question specifically, Sir, and I refer to the Central Bank Economic and Financial Statistics report of January 1989, where at Table H-1 on page 65 there is an amount in excess of $80 million in our foreign reserves as a Government deposit. I wish to ask whether that amount relates to this Japanese bond that is being held elsewhere, and if it is not, then where is it.

I turn now, Sir, to another note of caution as far as the Government is concerned, and it deals specifically with the projected data, that is the 1989 – 90 Estimates as contained in this Schedule. I am not, and I wish Senator Comissiong to note very carefully, I am not stating that Government does not need to increase expenditure when it deems it necessary. My question is if it is in fact necessary.
2.00 p.m.

I look, Sir, specifically at page 16 of the Estimates, Head 14, Subhead 7, Item 12. I see an increase there in Operating Expenses from $67 000 to $266 600. My only question to Government is, what is the merit for such a large increase in operating expenses? This is not by way of criticism, Mr. President. This is by way of seeking further clarification because I see no explanation here as to why there must be an increase of some $200 000 in operating expenses in one financial year.

Sir, at page 18, we see again a further increase in Operating Expenses from $25 000 to $505 000. At page 22, Mr. President, we see an increase in Other Personal Emoluments from $193 000 to $425 000. At page 30, Sir, I see an increase in Other Personal Emoluments from $403 000 to $605 000 and under that same Head 19, Item 12, an increase in Operating Expenses from $4 000 to $396 000.

At page 53, Sir, again under Other Personal Emoluments there is an increase from $843 000 to $1.8 million. At page 139 I note there is a grant to Public Institutions an increase of $2 million and I note at page 147, Head 40, Subhead 10, Item 2, provision there for $345 500 to the Cooperatives. I understand that it is Government's intention to expand the staff of the Cooperatives Division. It is a view which I fully endorse.

Sir, I want it to be abundantly clear that my only question is, is this expenditure that the Government deems – I know the Government deems it necessary – is it expenditure that is, in fact, necessary and on that same page, 147, Item 6, Travel, I see a 100% increase over last year's Estimates from $20.8 to $44.2.

I do not for one moment wish to be accused of stating that these amounts for Other Personal Emoluments are not merited. I recognize that they are the salaries and wages of Barbadians like myself. My question is, Sir, and especially in the light of Senator Clarke's earlier comments that Government is doing all it can to keep down expenditure, my question simply is, has Government done all it can in those areas where there is a glaring discrepancy between last year's figures and this year's figures and there are more. I would not bore members with the others. There are others that have been mentioned yesterday and this morning early in this debate. I sound a note of caution also there.

Sir, I wish now to sound a note of caution also as far as an article which appeared in today's newspaper to the effect that Government's credit-rating in economic circles has increased. This is as a result of a survey by some body which publishes a treaty called the "Institutional Investor" and therein the Prime Minister of Barbados is quoted as saying that the fact that Government's credit-rating has improved is indicative of the steady performance of the economy.

Sir, I would be the first one to admit that an improved credit-rating is, in fact, indicative of good management in the economy. However, Sir, and this is where I do not think I can stress enough that Government should proceed cautiously. What was reported in that newspaper and what the Prime Minister was speaking to was not credit-rating but, in fact, credit-ranking. It is the credit-ranking of the economy of Barbados that is improved.

My question, therefore, is did the credit-ranking improve as a result of an improved credit-rating or did the

credit-ranking improve because some other country's credit-rating became worst. Let me explain a bit further, Sir.

The credit-rating is a figure that is afforded countries after this body who publishes the Institutional Investor has done certain investigations about a country's economies and it is given an absolute figure, a percentage, 30.8 or 40.2 or 25.6. It is given an absolute figure. That is its credit-rating. Those figures are then looked at in the light of other people's credit-rating, a credit-ranking of countries. It is on that scale, the credit-ranking, that Barbados has improved and it is that that the Prime Minister is using to indicate that Barbados has had a steady performance of the economy and this is why I feel I need to sound a note of caution again to the Prime Minister, a false premise.

The only reason why the Prime Minister could properly take an improvement in the credit-ranking as being indicative of a good performance of the economy is where that credit-ranking came about as a result of the improved credit-rating. My question to Senator Clarke is if that was, indeed, so. In other words, it only moved up the ladder because somebody else dropped down, some other country fell?

Another word of caution, Sir, because it is precisely these errors of judgment and understanding, flawed reasoning, estimation errors, that the future of Barbados is predicated upon. Government uses these as indications of what the country has performed so far and indications of where the country should go and, as I have stated before, the premise is false, the decisions which flowed therefrom would be ill-informed and mis-informed and will result in mismanagement.

Sir, I would like to turn now to some specific Heads, specifically on page 82, Head 34, the Ministry of Education. I wish just to state here that I wish to sound another note of caution to Government. I wish that Government, along with the allocation of funds to this particular Ministry, also take a serious look, not at the brains that you are producing, but as to the morality and standards of those individuals who pass through our schools in Barbados.

Sir, it is not long ago since I left school myself and I do not recall instances of drugs, prostitution, bad decorum, disrespect for teachers, disrespect for the school uniform and so on. Those things were unheard of.
2.10 p.m.

I had never ever encountered or heard of it. And I left school not so long ago. There must therefore be something fundamentally wrong in our society, Sir, and I do not place the blame solely on the teachers. I do not place the blame solely on the headteachers. I do not place the blame solely on the Government, whichever Government it might have been, because this is something that has been going on now for a little while. So I think that all of us as responsible adults in this society must recognize our role in shaping the character of these young ones. It is all well and good to produce good brains, to allocate funds to computers and science. But at the end of the day we must first of all produce good individuals. They are persons first and students afterwards. I wish to sound a note of caution there to Government, Sir, to devise some programme of getting morality back in the schools.

I turn also, Sir, to page 105, Head 36, the Ministry of Health. And my comments in this regard are these, Sir. In recent weeks we have witnessed and heard of certain comments in relation to the Ministry of Health. It is not my duty to apportion blame neither would I attempt to. Indeed I really do not know where the blame lies. But the senior executive responsible for the Ministry of Health in this country must take all steps to ensure that this issue of dead chickens or diseased chickens or cold slaughter or whatever is put to rest and quickly.

My only quarrel, Sir, with the Minister in this regard is that he got into the Debate at a time when he properly should not have. And therein lies his error. He did not, by his own admission, carry out a thorough investigation of the matter and therefore he spoke out of time. And the problem with it is that the more he spoke, the worst the issue became. I sound a word of caution, Sir, to the Government and in particular the Minister of Health to ensure that the confidence of consumers in this country is restored. And also to ensure that those delinquent persons who either negligently or wilfully flout the Public Health Regulations in this country be quickly brought in line and that the Minister does whatever is necessary to ensure that the health and the welfare of Barbadians is safeguarded.

Sir, I am not going to go much further. I am sure that the hour is fast approaching when other Members would wish to speak. I wish only to reiterate my position, the common thread, the basis upon which I place my comments and it is simply this, that I stand in this Honourable Chamber because of the fact and cognizant of the fact and ever mindful of the fact that it is my duty at all times to ensure the interest and welfare of Barbadians. And I would wish to caution the Government, especially those persons who would wish at the first opportunity to accuse others of having some hidden agenda, some reason why, ulterior motive why they should say what they are saying, I caution those to be reflective. And I am sure that on sober reflection and on revaluation of the matters that they will come to the same conclusion that we are all acting in the interest of Barbados and Barbadians.

Thank you.

Applause.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Forde.

SENATOR Mrs. P. Y. FORDE: Thank you, Mr. President. In all matters before this Honourable Chamber, Independent Senators are in a special position. Senators on the Government side seek to interpret the policies and programmes of the Administration in a most positive way. The Opposition is invariably constructive and they aim to demonstrate that our affairs can be conducted in a better and more efficient way, that there is need for change, change of direction in policies and indeed in personnel. It is in the centre of these two divergent positions that we, as Independent Senators, find ourselves. We are not necessarily the arbiters but I hope that we succeed in taking some of the politics and some of the partisanship out of the matters which come before this Honourable Chamber for consideration.

Barbados, Mr. President, has in the past two years experienced some modest growth, some modest economic growth. The growth has not been spectacular, but it does underline the fact that under successive Administrations the ship of state has continued to be the envy of almost all our neighbours. None of us should try to run Barbados down.

There are, of course, some serious problems. The chief among these is unemployment which is certainly, I think, our largest social problem. There is evidence to support the fact that more than 20 000 Barbadians are unemployed. The other problem which deeply concerns me is that of illegal drugs which becomes worse with every passing year. And it must be fairly clear that some of the unemployment is linked up with drugs.

Other Honourable Senators have already adverted to other unhappy indications. But as I looked at the burgeoning cost of Government, I am concerned that Barbados is carrying an infrastructure of a developed country. On the face of this, it seems fair enough. But unless we are paying our way in the world, something must have to give. Must we not find ways of cutting our expenditure without too much pain? Alternatively, should we not seek to earn more? We seem in the last few years to have taken the easy road of borrowing to the point where donors are beginning to have a second look. Yesterday and today Senators who have already spoken have talked about curtailing our expenditure and I, too, must add my piece on that.
2.20 p.m.

I am, therefore, recommending, Mr. President, that we should adopt a twin approach to those problems if we are to build a more prosperous country. We must strengthen the manufacturing sector and we must also give greater encouragement to private sector developments.

We need to examine our competitiveness and we need to increase productivity. It is critical that we pay greater attention to manufacturing which represents a significant part of our gross domestic product and also employs a significant part of our labour force. In addition to being one of our main exchange earners, it supports the provision of a high level of services in Education, Health, Communications, and in the physical infrastructure among others which of themselves are the basis for self-sustaining growth and development.

The creation of jobs and improvement of output in manufacturing is the responsibility of the Government and should be shared with the private sector. Businessmen, Mr. President, must take their role in this shared responsibility and not always look to Government for the solution of every problem.

It is the role of Government to create the right environment and it is to the private sector to manage the business activities.

I now turn, Mr. President, to one of two particular areas of concern in the Estimates now before us. I refer to the Ministry of Health and, in particular, Head 36. The proposals to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital provide for the continued upgrading and refurbishing of the hospital. I know, too, that it also includes for a revote of $675,000 to carry out certain works deferred from the previous financial year.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has had its problems, but for all that it is one of the finest institutions of its kind in the Eastern Caribbean. I would like in mentioning the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to pay tribute to the much maligned nurses for their commitment and dedication in the face of many difficulties, not least inadequate pay and unsatisfactory conditions. I hope that, before long, Government will examine a better deal for our nurses and they would not have to attend interviews to get jobs overseas.

On this point I note a provision under Subhead 6 of the Capital Head 78 – for $3.6 million to commission and to refurbish the St. Joseph Hospital. The intention to have an acute care hospital in the North is a noble one and I am pleased to hear from Senator Lewis that Government will be involved in a sort of half-way house situation. I originally mentioned the private sector and Government, so I have added the half-way house for private sector and Government.

Asides.

SENATOR Mrs. P. Y. FORDE: ... Shared – we do not saw the house in half. Presently, private hospitals are being developed in Barbados. But Government in the present state of its finances cannot afford to re-equip and run St. Joseph Hospital. This is certainly a case for shared responsibilities between Government and the private sector. I warmly support the sums allocated to raise the security wards at the Children's Development Centre and I recognise that

Government is doing all they can to support that noble institution where our very young handicapped citizens can be evaluated and treated and stimulated to become good citizens with good social standards in our community. We wont have to be ashamed of them when they come around those of us who think we are more fortunate than they are. So I welcome that contribution to the Children's Development Centre and to enclosing the grounds of the St. Andrews Children's Home where we have some young adult handicapped in training.

I have expressed my concern in this Honourable Chamber about the vexed problem of child abuse. It may have been thought in some quarters that I was exaggerating my own concern when I tabled a number of questions on this matter in this Chamber. I accepted Government's assurance communicated by the Honourable Leader of the Senate on December 16, 1987 that the Ministry was discussing the inadequacies in the present legislation on Child Abuse with the Attorney General and the deficiencies would be corrected in the near future. Not so long ago we had a case of incest before our Courts. That more than anything else has heightened local awareness of the degree and nature of sexual and other abuse of our children. I very much hope, Mr. President, that we quickly move to develop some guidelines in dealing with these serious cases. We need to preserve some element of confidentiality. We need, too, to train media staff about the dynamics of child abuse and the sensitivity of the subject. More than that, Mr. President, we need to provide social support for victims and their families in a small society where everybody knows everybody else.
2.30 p.m.

Recent events suggests, Mr. President, that young people, and particularly our young women, are at some risk. The drug culture has brought with it pornography and other ugly features. I am not at all satisfied that Government, and particularly the Police, are doing enough to tackle these problems. We have passed the time when we speak about big fish and little fish. Unlike the calypsonian, my question will have to be, who will guard the guards?

Some of my other concerns relate to inefficiency in some of our very costly Statutory Boards, in particular the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the Barbados Development Bank. In the case of the CBC there is the clearest case for some private sector involvement. I am sorry, but I have to reiterate that.

Tourism is very important to Barbados, but we need to preserve a clean, healthy and aesthetically pleasing environment for visitors and Barbadians alike. I very much hope that there will in the future be speedier action to deal with the jet ski problem and other nuisances, such as the horses on the beaches competing with humans. There is need for greater regulation.

Earlier in my speech I referred to the high cost of Government and I wish to end on that note. I remain very concerned about the escalation of Government expenditure and I wonder where the Government will get the nearly $250 million to close the gap or deficiency between the taxes which it will take in and what it intends to spend as set out in the Estimates now before us. Unless Government looks at its expenditure, much of what we have achieved in recent years may be in jeopardy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, I rise to support the Appropriation Bill before us, but first of all I find it imperative to support and compliment Senator Comissiong for the presentation, which is a very lucid one, that he has given us today. Most of the areas that he touched on I had the intention of doing so. It indicates that there is some common ground between Senator Comissiong and myself.

His lucid presentation has given clear philosophical directions to the Democratic Labour Party. It is a record that must remain for posterity. I believe many young men would be well advised to look to see what a clear mind we have on this side in articulating a direction for the Democratic Labour Party. It was not just a mere ideological position, it did not make the assessment in a mere vacuum. He examined all the conditions that at present surround the economy of Barbados, he examined the means of distribution in Barbados, he looked to see how the utilities in Barbados were controlled and as a result of a number of factors he came to certain conclusions.

He also touched on our historical background and indicated that this background had great relevance to the decisions which we are taking today. I believe the point he wanted to make then was not to impress upon anyone that he was a firm believer in state control, but he was thinking in terms of a wider distribution of the resources of Barbados. Obviously he recognised the importance of this factor when it comes to the management of Government's affairs, and since this country is moving vertically out of a plantation economy where a small group of imperialists were in full control of these lands, it is only axiomatic, if we are going to talk about social justice, that these aspects of land distribution must be examined and the persons who control the economy of this country must be also taken to task.

I am sure that he was not taking any position which is based on any ethnic preferences, but it is just that in an environment such as Barbados, a community like Barbados, the term "black people" invariably falls synonymous with working class people in this society. It might not apply empirically, but it certainly applies to Barbados, so it is not as some distortionist is likely to impress, a racist position, it is a position where anyone who is committed to the tenets

of social justice will follow, and on this occasion I want to pay a special thanks to him for clarifying a clear course and making that clear philosophical divide between this administration and all other parties in Barbados.

I do not want to ruffle the hair of the females. I believe that they should be initiated into this Chamber with a great welcome. I have not had the privilege of welcoming Senator Brathwaite before on my feet, but I supported the Government when they welcomed her here. I have not had the privilege of welcoming for the first time in my presence Senator McClean. I appreciate the lucid presentations by them both, but somehow I have missed the rough and tumble that we formerly got from the two Senators who by some misfortune, or good fortune, were rejected in constitutional terms from this Chamber. While they were here they took a completely different position on Government's policy as it relates to social services and welfare.
2.40 p.m.

As a matter of fact, on more than one occasion this Government was described in what I interpret to be a pejorative and unjustifiable term, a term which most suits those who voice the opinion of this party, a term called neo-conservatism. A former Senator of this Chamber, Mr. Louis Tull, had a common position on any reduction in welfare of social policy. When he looked at the Estimates and he saw any reduction in that area, he would always describe the Government as anti-worker. I am seeing a new position now. The Government has increased the allocation for welfare services and we are hearing that there must be caution. I am a little bewildered at what is right and what is wrong.

Sociologists sometimes confuse me, economists sometimes confuse me. They claim that in a small economy like this, there is a small corner outside of the equilibrium point and in the metropolitan countries while that corner is wider, we have to be very cautious. I do not know if they support that theory and as a result they have accepted the title of the party of caution. I do not know if it is a positive position or not, but I believe as time goes on with the presentations that are likely to be made by the two Senators who I believe today spoke very well in terms of a smooth presentation, but I cannot agree with the substance which was enunciated by them.

Senator Comissiong intimated that it is a conservative organisation and his assessment of this, not mine, is that as a result of the positions that are taken in relation to expenditure, they are conservative in outlook. If that is true, I need that clarification from them, but I would not at this time classify them. I will wait a little longer until I hear their position. Anyone coming to this Chamber and taking a firm position on the lines where they would not be any attempt to see a clear redistribution of the resources of Barbados will come under the wrath of my tongue.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But I am sure within the Standing Orders.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Within the Standing Orders. I have great respect for the President and for the Chamber in general, though some persons would not like to believe that.

However, Senator Forde in her short presentation indicated that the Opposition is invariably constructive. It is strange. I would not like to believe that that is an obsession; I would not like to say I am ignorant of what the actual description means, but I hope it is not an obsession, because in my view it should never become a law or an order within the Opposition benches. Sometimes we can have some very strange positions being taken over on that side, and I hope that at least he will refrain from holding that as a law.

Previously I spoke in this Chamber on the position of a deficit and I said that after the Second World War to my understanding, which I must confess is limited in this specific sphere of social science, the concept of deficit financing was an accepted phenomenon. It was said from my interpretation that if there is a deficit, what is important about it is that it reflects economic development and not economic growth, because you can have economic growth without economic development. I guess that is if the receipts or the money is not well spent. So we accept this as a given. Senator Clarke earlier in his presentation indicated that the Estimates were not an end in themselves. He added that expenditure must be related to the impact it has on the economy. There is no fundamental difference with what Senator McClean was saying. He indicated partially that he concurred with Senator Clarke on this matter, and said that his main concern was the excessive spending by Government for the year 1989-90. He pointed out that expenditure is likely to grow at approximately 15 per cent and combining inflation and so on the actual growth should be around 6 per cent, and if this occurs then this is a justification for being cautious. I am a little different in respect of that. I am concerned with whether the social services remain intact. I am concerned with the historic performance of this Government. So far there have been many predictions, but the indications are that we could be recording an average of 2 per cent growth, and whether you add capital expenditure to current expenditure and give an alarming figure of over $1 billion, then I believe that you have a responsibility, if you are going to say that it is a figure that we should view with some fear, to impress upon the Government and explain to the Government what the alternative position is. He was a little reluctant; he said it is not his responsibility to do this.

Mr. President, I believe that, if he is as nationalistic as he has indicated, he has that responsibility. The party also lays claims to being influenced by the philosophy indicating that the late Prime Minister Errol Walton Barrow gives it

guidance, this NDP party. If this is so, Mr. Barrow in the latter stages of his life just prior to his death in his Georgetown Speech quoted these words from Jose Marti on 3rd July, 1986. He said: "A true man does not seek the path where advantage lies, but one of the paths where duty lies, and this is the only practical man whose dreams of today will be the law of tomorrow, because he knows that without a single exception the future lies on the side of duty."

I am hoping that these words will serve as a form of guidance because as an Opposition you should give us your alternative; tell us exactly. If you are going to say that something is wrong, that is not a position that a scientist would take. He says it is wrong and then he justifies the wrong, and in doing so in some way he indicates what the alternative ought to be. I do not understand why you would deliberately in the national interest just criticise the Government for the position they are taking and you would not go a little deeper and give some clarity or substantiate the point that you were making. If you are going to tell us that we are wrong, substantiate the point that you are making.
2.50 p.m.

I believe that if you were in a different place, in an academic institution, and you made that point, you would be questioned by your subordinates, your students, on what is the alternative. If you perceive us as neophytes in the area of economics, and in the area of Government administration, then give us the authority. Tell us how to take it down in a particular direction and you will be rewarded by the judge and jury in the public domain, but if you continue to come before this Chamber and condemn us and denounce every position taken as someone indicated before, then you are not doing justice to this country and you have a very special responsibility to establish the direction of this new NDP Party.

You have to acquire that space in this society if you claim there is a space to be fulfilled. You have to acquire that space in this society which you claim is awaiting you and you can only do that by making yourself relevant by giving the public an idea of the planks and the direction that you are hoping to take your party.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, very much like Senator Comissiong, who as I said before, is philosophically clear, a very clear vision in terms of ideology and, certainly, cannot be condemned as totalitarian, neither Marxist, Leninist or neither a Trotskite.

I believe, as I have said before.....

Aside.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: He is not a Machiavellian type either.

I believe that he is looking at certain objectives and he is looking at how we will direct our resources, how we utilise them. He is looking at the ownership of the resources of the country and without even comparing notes in advance, and this is being very honest with you, we fall on common ground on many principles.

I am happy to know that Senator Brathwaite also has identified herself in some way. I am waiting also on her pronouncements in this area of Afro-centric views on many issues and I am not sure if to her right she would enjoy the type of comfort with the other Senator because, for quite a while, almost everything appeared to be progressive in terms of the progress of the dispossessed and, as I said before, that term is synonymous with black people. He has always advanced an argument, if it is not on free tertiary education, he is always concerned about some element.

The only progressive area that, I believe, that he has been voicing quite recently in this Chamber...

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Prescod, I still have to draw your attention to what you are dealing with. You are on a specific item in the Estimates and I gave you a long leeway now. I think you must find your berth back home.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I am coming home, Sir. It is just that I felt that he is a strong advocator, he is an educator and he has some influence just like Senator Comissiong raised the point about the persuasive power of persons in the Press before.

However, let me deal with the point or complement the point as it relates to the artificial person, the corporate sector in this country.

Senator Comissiong made the point in ideological terms that they were in firm control of the economy. Let me bring it with a little more clarity to this Chamber.

Now, these private enterprise bodies, B S & T who made over $332 534 000 in 1987 and $399 309 000, some kind of gross figures like that in 1988 – they spoke about a profit of over $81 million.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are not making a statement as a financier.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, there seem to be so many people wanting to give me guidance.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No. Do not mind that. The only person that can give you guidance is the Chair.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: There are a number of precedents in here apparently.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not mind that. There is only one President.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I am quite confident that my ears did not deceive me on that occasion that it was $87 million in profit.

The point that I am trying to establish is this. Why this group, as has been intimated by, I think, Senator Ward, by citing one of them....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Ward has not spoken yet so you could not have heard him.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I get confused over pigmentation sometimes.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You do not mean you are colour blind?

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Probably I should look at the hair. The hair would give me a clear idea with whom I am dealing.

This sector said that it was not as a result of Government's management. It is indicated that one of the firms did not succeed as a result of the management of Government and that what they did was to control expenditure.

I do not buy the argument. This group of speculators are not only in manufacturing, wholesaling and retailing, but in real estate areas. They now occupy approximately 60% of the lands of Barbados in plantations. I believe between.....

Aside.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: It is an approximation. It might be wide but I believe that about 50% of the land around here is utilised for space in town, business places, roads etc. It appears to me that about 25% of the land available in Barbados is there for people like me who are landless to bargain for.

I believe that by design it will be all of the plantations despite the fact that they argue day in and day out that they are not making any money and, therefore, they get into the real estate business and we are faced with the high escalation of the prices of land in this country.

They monopolise everything. They actually control employment in this country. In my view, they are a bunch of quasi Government institutions that fight sometimes as a force against Government and sometimes they ask their agents to articulate positions in all different chambers. Sometimes you hear them arguing about corporation tax reduction, all types of areas that are affiliated to these cooperative bodies.

I believe that we have a duty, not to the corporate group, but to transform this economy in the hands of people, in my view, who are more nationalistic.
3.00 p.m.

I believe that if indigenous Barbadians, not Barbadians who came here and walked up the steps of the Immigration Department at quarter past two as an Indian or Asian, walked back out with a document at half past two and automatically the status is transformed from an Indian to a Barbadian. I am not talking about that, because the psychology remains. The commitments to their families overseas remain.

If Barbadians, genuine Barbadians, born Barbadians, not that there are not other persons who come into this country with good intentions, but there is also Mrs. Ram and other persons who come to this country and invest money and inflict hardship on people. And we must be cognisant of that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Prescod, you are straying now. You have to get back to the subject that you want to deal with, if you are dealing with something in the Estimates. You are going outside of the Estimates now. These do not come within the purview of that – Senator Comissiong made a statement in dealing with the Estimates that what he wanted to see within the context of the Estimates is the control of land and other things. And he made that. But you cannot now stray over the same things he made, but not doing it the same way. You cannot deal with it. You see, you cannot follow him down the same road he is taking. You have lost sight of where he is.

Laughter.

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot pick him up.

Laughter.

Asides.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, I can probably speak about the threat to the health of the nation by dealing with the topic chickens which relates to that.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Deal with things within the Estimates.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: The point I am trying to make is that, rather than tinker with the economy, increasing taxation and reducing taxation, that in this proposed transformation which embraces the business

sector, I was hoping to indicate that in order to restructure the whole economic spectrum, that there is need to have committed people. And if you had committed people then a commitment to the country would fall on parity with that interest which the Government seeks to achieve, the interest of all people in Barbados. But since we are finding difficulty with urging some people in this area to recognise the importance of the fiscal policy of the Government – I believe I am pertinent now, Mr. President – despite all the adjustments, the juggling in the area of figures, there are other components of life that influence decision-making.

There are people in this country – and this one relates to business and it also relates to para-statal bodies, so I believe I am there again. The business sector as it stands continues to preserve the administrative sector within their small groups for their families. There are some managers in this area who could not qualify to be a cash boy, who are qualified on the basis of their family relationships.

But this same sector, and I am talking about commitment, would like us to believe that there is nepotism in Government, as sometimes a person is put into a position because of political affiliation. So the matter goes further than just shifting figures up and shifting figures down. It is a wide problem. It is a social problem. It is a problem that can be classified as a protection of a certain group who is certainly not black. And on most occasions, the group that fail in this country to penetrate the economy, they find it difficult because of these people who I consider as encumbrances in this system as it stands. They deliberately monopolise many areas, especially in the wholesale area, the distributive area. There is a glorified shopkeeper in this country who is masquerading as an economist, as a top businessman and sometimes in his control over the goods of this country, retail outlets where shopkeepers find it difficult to get some goods, and sometimes even to meet the competitive prices that he offers in his retail outlet. His concern is more for animals, race horses than for human beings.

Laughter.

Aside.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I said a glorified shopkeeper.

Asides.

Laughter.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Mr. President, so much for that. As time goes on, I will probably be able to expand on the need for some of the view as a – I do not want to describe it as the gospel – form, a forward, the type of philosophy that is needed now for this Party to make that clear divide and make its way into victory in the ensuing general election.

In the area of education, I want to make some points. This discourse is not going to be too long. It is going to be sharp and good. We have to examine education carefully. I know that the Minister of Education is trying his best, but he has taken up a Ministry which is not that easy at this time to control. And therefore I believe it is right at this time to assist in giving some progressive opinions in the way we probably can help to advance and correct whatever disparities there are in education.

Senator Brathwaite indicated that she had great interest is seeing morality restored to education in this country and she highlighted her experience at school as a flawless one, flawless in the sense that she did not see the kind of escalation of these areas when she was there.

I just want to make the point that these problems were existing even before the Democratic Labour Party took over office. We were seeing problems with headmasters, everything prior to that time. And the whole morale in the area of education declined substantially. But I want to express my support for Government in the area of pre-primary education. As I have indicated before, in this area we were in the forefront of bringing children of age 3 into the educational system or we have intensified that effort. As a result, many children from dispossessed homes who did not have that time in school before they reached the 11 plus were given the opportunity by this Government to spend the same amount of time in pre-primary education as many of the other affluent and fortunate children in this community. Therefore, in a move towards equality and education which falls within the framework and the attendance of social justice, the Government must be complimented for its efforts. What we have to do now is to cultivate that environment so that those children can reach their maximum potential at that level to go on to primary and secondary level.

3.10 p.m.

I would just like to say that there is need in some of the primary schools who at present are accommodating pre-primary children for the regrading of some of the facilities, namely Belmont School and I would like to see the Minister of Education pay some special attention to seeing these facilities improved. There are some protruding walks in the playing field and there is need for regrading the pasture at that school.

Another area which is of great concern is vocational and technological education. The problem, as has been clearly expressed before, is that we do not have the skilled people to meet the demands at present in the area of employment. I suppose this can be attributed to a portion of the present unemployment problem. I do not know the

magnitude but it can be attributed to it. Technical education and vocational education are not just academic pursuits. It prepares young people for the world of work and, as a result, I believe that the Government in close communication with the business sector would try to get this programme off the ground.

But we are still having problems in the area of finding masons. Sometime a year ago while the Government's Social Welfare Department in Bay Street had a sign on it asking for a mason – I do not know if one of the employees put it there or if it was somebody just passed and put the sign there – it appeared to me then that there was a shortage. In talking to a number of contractors in Barbados, they indicate that as a result of the construction boom there was a shortage of masons. It also makes it difficult for ordinary people to get the service of that type of artisan and if you get the service it makes it even more difficult when you have to pay for the work. So I believe that we have to look and see how we can fill that gap. Another problem about that is this. Academics, unfortunate people in this society, sometimes impress upon the young people that have a job that most of the people that venture into that field are people who are unable to acquire any level of scholarship. Regardless to how we put it, we are actually creating a form of psychological damage to young people who would like to go into certain areas, because there is a status symbol existing in this society.

In any race, it is class and within class we get status. There are men in this country, regardless of how much money they get – I am trying to make a point in relation to psychological damage – regardless of how much money they achieve, I have seen that they have not acquired the status that they dream of. So these aspects in that area serve as a negation to the entry of young men who are conscious of the behaviour of other persons towards them from going into that sphere of life.

The National Training Board – any funds in my view which will increase the National Training Board Schemes at this time are justifiable. It needs to play a more meaningful role in the entire development of this country and it is on that note that I want to say that in its programme there should be no restrictions on what age a person should become a student of that institution or as an apprentice, whatever classification is used. Because there are persons over age 30 and sometimes 40 who are made redundant in the world of work and are forced to find a new area to go into in order to survive. If the Training Board can open up their institution to persons of any age without putting any ceiling on it, I believe that this will be a progressive step. Thirty to forty – let them go into the Training Board and acquire the type of technical skills that the country at present requires.

Probably one of the problems that we face here is that the former Government of this country, the Barbados Labour Party, had no vision and did not understand despite setting up the National Training Board. They did not move as quickly as they ought to in meeting the demands of this technological age. As a result, we have people in Barbados who want to be computer operators and there are very few computer technicians. There are very few engineers. There is a shortage of engineers in the area of printing to repair printing equipment.

So that institution has its relevance and I believe that some of these responsibilities can be extended in the sense that I believe that the institution should at least give some kind of certificate of merit, so that when you accumulate these credits from the National Training Board a person can move from that Training Board because that is a kind of crash programme. You can move from that institution into the polytechnic and there will be some incentive for that person to go further and further. I believe that the Minister of Education has to look inwardly and see where he can make these adjustments.

Senator Shorey has criticised, and this is the area of education. There is a substantial sum of money being spent in that area both in capital, in building and also in services, and in salaries and so we have heard of expenditure. Apart from the Capital Expenditure that relates to buildings, we have to look at that system as well and see where we can change certain mechanisms and see how we can use the institutes in the area of education, namely institutes like the University of the West Indies, to its optimum position. I do not understand the call for remedial education by Senator Shorey at one level and then he is asking for us to remove the use of English Programme from the University of the West Indies. He has no quarrel with the same programme under a different classification at the Community College, but he is arguing against it at the University of the West Indies. I am wondering if there is some latent reason for these strange positions being taken. I cannot in any way state overtly how I feel about it, but yesterday a prominent sociologist was attacked by him for a position which he took supported by information that was in her possession on the reason why the imperialist powers – Stanley and all those powers of 1833 – directed that our education should be for social control. He is an authority and she is an authority. The person he cited yesterday is an authority. You cannot argue that she is wrong. You can deny it, but you cannot refute it, and you know that.

3.20 p.m.

I do not understand why there are so many attacks on the positions taken at the University of the West Indies by Senator Shorey. There are young men who acquired honours at the University of the West Indies in sociology and all the other social sciences who are finding it difficult in the initial stages of their entry to master the English language, but at the end of the day that subject, Use of English, has proven to be beneficial to the end result, the individual.

If there is a problem at the primary level in reading and writing and you pass the primary level by chronological order, and you get to the tertiary level, you have to correct it at some point. Are you going to deny a person who might not be as fortunate as you are the opportunity to go into university, sometimes not adding any additional years to what is standard, from acquiring a degree with First or Second Class, whether lower or not, honours, from gaining that success by removing the Use of English course? This is an anti-intellectual position being voiced by an intellectual, or a pseudo-intellectual, a distinction which I cannot make, Sir. I am not an academic, so I do not know which one it is, but it is a strange position being taken.

We have some areas we have to look at. Another aspect of education. Reactionary. It must be classified so. At this time when blood relations have succeeded through the University of the West Indies, we are called upon in this Chamber to say that these persons should be made to pay for their education at that institution. Once again the remark points to the same exponent, a reactionary philosophy. We have to question his motive.

I am looking forward to the day when the committee will be set up, and I support Senator Blackman on this too, I hope the committee will also include the powers that we can bring Senators before the Chamber and question them to see if we can go beyond the facade.

Aside.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: Senator Shorey made the remark before you. Are you not conscious of it? You had better keep your ears open because he might persuade somebody to follow that direction. Fortunately the Barbados Labour Party is not in power and the Democratic Labour Party probably will be in power for the next 20 years and the socialist position of this party will not allow that persuasive voice to give us direction.

In the area of co-education I believe the Principal of the Extra Mural Department at present is voicing some concern about what is happening. He is concerned about the amalgamation between male and female. I do not know if he is attributing the failures of the male sex to the presence – the Rastafarian Movement describes the relationship and the spiritual connection between male and female as the vibes – I do not know if he is referring to the vibes that exist between males and females and saying that this is serving as a negation of the success of the males in the schools which are amalgamated, but I believe that his call, and since a teacher at Lodge School is also voicing the same opinion, Mr. Fingall, we have also had comments from one of the journalists in this country about this same affair, I believe that it demands that some form of commission, some form of inquiry should be set up to determine if there is any merit in the suggestions that relate to this particular issue.

I believe that the Extra Mural Department Tutor in his performance, a very dispassionate type of person, very composed, I do not believe he has any partisan axe to grind, he is a very genuine and spiritual man, and I take his words seriously. I believe they are non-partisan.

That Department has also been doing a great job and I heard Senator Blackman yesterday querying the grant that is given to the Extra Mural Department, the grant that is given to the Barbados Workers' Union and the Labour College, into the area of education again, and the NUPW. He is another very strange Senator. His voice can be heard reverberating through these corridors day in and day out as the Senate meets about a reduction in corporation tax. The interest of the business sector is clearly manifested, but he does not see the need when a small group from this ethnic background is given the opportunity through a trade union movement like the Barbados Workers' Union, the National Union of Public Workers, but in particular the Barbados Workers' Union who fought so hard from in the 1930's to move this country towards progressive lines, a movement by the black masses of this country, and that was responsible with its strength combined with the political organ that stands at its side at the particular time to move Barbados into the 1980's, and subsequently those persons who recognised backward movement in the Trade Union with the party which was affiliated to it, broke ties and moved along even more progressive lines, the only thing that can come out of an organisation like the Barbados Workers' Union which has representatives in the Other Place and you, too, Mr. President, but we cannot make that distinction when we look at the actual person but in terms of status and position I know you are a different person.
3.30 p.m.

But you too must be complimented as President and as a human being in general for the contribution that you have made to this country. If you check the courses that were offered by any of those organisations that I just mentioned, taxi drivers were given an opportunity to go to the Extra-Mural Department and receive training in order that they could be more effective in the area of tourism. Is that not progressive? The Extra-Mural Department last year trained over 50 persons, in fact taught over 50 persons....

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have three more minutes, Senator Prescod.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: That department taught over 50 persons who were finding it difficult to read and write. This is going to be a short cut off.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is why I served you notice. I could have waited until I had reached the end and cut you off, but I thought I would serve notice on you.

SENATOR T. A. PRESCOD: I thank you for that. I wish you could have given me a little more time.

In the area of housing, I believe there are over 12 000 applicants at the National Housing Corporation. The Government is moving expeditiously to solve the problem of housing. The Government in conjunction with private enterprise should be building over 2 100 housing units annually, an average of 1 200 service residential units. Money will be more available to the Mortgage Finance Corporation to assist persons with loans in order to purchase houses. Low income houses will be provided for approximately 50 families per year, and as time goes on we will be reducing the cost, hopefully, of maintenance because it is Government's intention to move expeditiously to sell its housing units to their tenants.

What I would like to suggest to the Minister of Housing at this point is if he could set up a method to allow some of those persons who on the basis of merit have been paying rent for a given period of time, which is left to his discretion, he could use this method to defray the total cost of the purchase of the house, because these houses were built at a historic cost at a very low rate, and I believe that it would be a fair demonstration and manifestation of the social conscience of a progressive organisation such as the Democratic Labour Party, and without any reservations whatsoever, I give my full support to the party which would take this country into the 21st century. Thank you very much.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. President, I would like first to support the Appropriation Bill which is before us, but before I add my contribution to this debate, I would just like to say that in view of the remarks which were made in here relating to black and to power and that some should be taken away from those who have etcetera, I would like some of the youth of this country to understand that there are persons in this society who by the sweat of their brow have achieved what they have, and only by working hard can our country move forward. I am sure that nearly all Barbadians would like to see this country go from strength to strength. I admire the Goddards and I admire all those persons in my community who have worked and sweated, and I can tell anyone – and I suppose the whole of Barbados must know this – I have come a long way from $200 to where I am, and I certainly am not going to give away what I have without a fight, and it is going to be a very serious fight at that. I do not envy people, neither will I.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Eastmond, I certainly do not wish to stop you, but I do not want you to make an emotional speech, because in the context of saying you do not want to have a fight, we are not dealing with fights in here. Deal with the things we are dealing with. I understand how you feel about other matters, but you should deal with the matter that is before us. We are dealing with the Appropriation Bill which is before the Chamber, not with matters outside the Chamber, and I want you to get back to the matter before the Chamber, and not become too emotional.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: If I seem that way I am really not emotional. It is just that I would like certain persons who have not very long spoken to understand that in Barbados we who appear to be black still have some white relatives.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You do not want to deal with genealogy; that is not a subject of debate, whom we are and where we come from. We want to deal with the things before us.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: In adding my contribution to this debate on the 1989–90 Appropriation Bill, I would like to deal with certain aspects of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education and Culture. These two Ministries are vitally important to the whole physical, mental and spiritual development of the human being, and for this reason I view that they are within their rights to have the largest amount of money voted in the Estimates for them. I certainly agree that they deserve the large amounts that have been placed there for them.

Sir, Health and Education and Culture have always received as far as I can remember, and this is going back into the 1970s, the largest amounts in the Estimates. What we must ask ourselves is whether the country is getting the most out of what the taxpayers are putting into the coffers of Government. My answer is in the affirmative. I have lived to see more and more and larger schools being built. We have more children today than in my time. Therefore the Ministry of Education has to make provision to accommodate them. I am seeing free education at all levels which is very commendable, but often one has to wonder, after giving all this free education, where eventually will be the jobs. You know, Sir, children coming out of school and realising that they have been educated to the highest and given quality education expect to find jobs in the area that they would like. We in private enterprise have been trying and will continue to try. Government cannot fill all the positions, but there are jobs out there that often these children are not trained for. I grant you the Polytechnic is there and there are young people who are getting their various trades and are doing credit to this community but here again, in our schools there are children, although the education is free, there are quite a few children who are not making the most of it and teachers are having serious problems with them.
3.40 p.m.

I would think that these problems often – I am not saying always – can come from the homes. Perhaps we need to take some of the community centres and have adult education. In my day children were taught to respect their elders. Today, teachers complain they cannot even lash the children because their parents would come for them. Some

are telling you that they do appear to take a bus to school but when the reports do come in some of them are really not attending classes.

There are some serious problems in this community which you cannot blame the Government for. I think that most adults over the years have seen a kind of life that is commensurate with the type of salary that they are getting now and in this society as it stands, it appears as though the physical things – when I say physical I mean the car, the house and those things – more emphasis appears to be placed on these things than in the training of the children in the home.

I am not saying that this is the case with every parent. I have noticed it. I have talked to parents. I have talked to teachers and I know that some teachers are very concerned. What can we do about this? I do not know but I feel and I think that when the parents feel that they are holding on to tangible, physical things and not giving children the spiritual things, that they should make them understand that when they grow up they have to be responsible to a country. They have to be responsible to themselves and, if they have families, to their families as well.

Today you may have wealth and tomorrow you may not have wealth but we must learn to survive and we must learn to accept what we have. This is life. It can go up and it can go down. From the bottom you can reach the top but I hold and I will continue to uphold that discipline in our country is absolutely necessary if we want to move forward.

I would like to say to my men folk, because there are more of them here than women, that I wish more men would support the women in their endeavours.

Aside.

No, not always! I am afraid you do not always support us because often men seem to be jealous when women have reached a pinnacle. They have attained something by their own rights of attaining it but then they seem to feel that the woman has gone ahead of them and made them look small but this is not the case. We are human beings and each human being must develop himself or herself.

Now, looking at the Ministry of Health – I may come back to Education – that, previously, used to be a very large Ministry because it had other areas with it but I would say that the Ministry of Health so far has been doing an excellent job.

The repairs to the hospital I am very pleased about but what I want to see is that the nurses who are working there get good pay. Their lives are at risk when they have night duty and without the nurses the hospital could not be the quality that it is and the doctors as well. The doctors are there, yes, but they cannot work unless they have the ancillary services and they cannot work unless the nurses are there to work with them and, again, those nurses, when you look at them, are women and they are dedicated and dedicated to their service.

There are male nurses at the Psychiatric Hospital, more at the Psychiatric Hospital because the men are needed there. The strength of the man is important and I am not trying to cry down any man because I would not be here were it not for a man. Yes, the woman carried me for nine months and that is important. That is my mother and I would never put down a woman. When you see women do things that they do not want to do, you know that life has to be hard and tough for them and often it is a man that is making that life miserable.

Now, I am a heavy taxpayer. There are others in here who are taxpayers. We all are taxpayers. We contribute to the coffers of this country and when we contribute to the coffers of this country, we would like to know that the education of this country can move forward, the health services can continue to move forward and other services. But I am very, very strong on the health and education because it deals with human beings from the cradle to the grave, and in every aspect of our lives, from when we are first born. Most children now are born in the hospital. I do not think there are any more midwives around like in my day, a doctor and a midwife would have to see about the delivery of the child. But today...
3.50 p.m.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I am told they are reverting back to midwives.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: In the big countries. I suppose some time we will go back to that, but they will have to be qualified people.

Now there are some delicate sections in the Ministry of Health. That is the Geriatric section and the Mental Hospital. I am looking forward to the day when I can see, I know it is on the books somewhere, a new mental hospital. And I would like also to see somewhere within that hospital a drug rehabilitation centre.

We have, as Senators, a great responsibility, although we do not hold Ministries, to our country in the way we speak and the way we conduct ourselves. Therefore, as far as the rehabilitation centre is concerned, there are problems with our youth in drugs. Not only with the youth, but I first must deal with them. We want to save them. We must save them from damnation. They think it is a glorious thing. It is an end. That is what they say. The crowd is with it. So they must be with it too. But they are destroying their brain. And

if the majority should turn to drugs, this country will be in a very sad state. Wherever possible and whatever it takes, we as Government Senators and Senators on the other side – and talking about Senators on the other side, before I forget, let me congratulate the Senators who have so far spoken. I am one of these people who believe that one should give credit where credit is due. And some wonderful speeches were made in this Honourable Chamber yesterday, as well as today. From that side and this side. Not one without the other. I think we are here to disagree, to agree and we are here to speak our minds. And I am very pleased.

Speaking again about the Psychiatric Hospital, I know that the one we have now is overcrowded. We are doing renovations on the Queen Elizabeth. It takes money to do these things. But I hope that before 1991 or so perhaps we will see some ground-breaking for a new Psychiatric Hospital. The cost is going to be escalating all the time, because nothing gets cheaper. Everything gets more expensive. But we as taxpayers – there are very few of us and often we would like to broaden and have more taxpayers – but we have to look at the restraints of various things.

I am sure that there are many more people who would like to go into business and they want to do it on their own. And in this I know that my sister Senator Fraser on my right has been instrumental in her own way in encouraging persons to get involved in small businesses. This she must be commended highly for.

But there are other areas that some of us can look at, because this is our country. We, as Barbadians, must look at the whole aspect of things, not just in a small area, and feel that that is it.

I would hate to see nurses leave to go to the United States for more money. Therefore, when unions are negotiating, I hope they will negotiate as they do I would think, in the interest of the nurses so that they can remain here, because we need them. The hospital which we have is one of the best in the West Indies. And in the staff, ancillary staff and the persons who work cleaning and so forth nowadays, I have been there recently and I have seen an improvement. Last Estimates I spoke about something there. There is a vast improvement. But apart from that, the dedication that goes with it, that is important.

Teachers. I could never be one. I could never be a teacher. It is a tough job. And it is getting worse all the time. I sympathise with teachers. I hope and pray that no matter what type of salary you may receive, it could be ever so high, please do not give up. Try with the youth of this nation. This is our nation. I suppose that most of you are Barbadians, if not all. Give your all and when you see some of those youngsters going the wrong way, talk to the parents. I hope you will be able to reach them and get through to them. Because, let us face it, there are some that say, Mr. So and So, my neighbour has a car. He has this. He has that. I have to get that. They lay stress on the physical. They do not lay stress on the human, the human part and the physical part of the human, the being they do not lay stress on. And the child or children who belong to them they must look at because those children are the men and women of tomorrow. They are the ones that are going to run this country. We only have a limited time here. And we have to give the teachers and the nurses our fullest support.

The Police as well need support. When I heard a few months ago what their salaries were, it surprised me. I know they are getting increases and I hope that they will continue. Because they deserve credit. All are not bad. In any place, if you have a bunch of limes you are going to find a bad one. There will be one in the flock and sometimes that one will spoil another two, three or four. So this happens.

Agriculture which is vital to the economy of this country is assisting to feed the nation. I would not like to see persons who have a great interest in buying the land and working it for agricultural purposes and feeding us – because the best food is the food that is grown here in this country – I would not like to see anyone talk about taking away that land or giving it to persons. I feel that it is your land, work it, sell the produce and make yourself feel big, whoever you are in agriculture.

I feel that more of our young people should get back into this. Senator Fraser has been saying this for a long time. We need agriculture. If we have a war tomorrow and we cannot get ships to come here or planes to fly here, what are we going to feed the people of this country with?

We must salute those people who have gone forward into agriculture. I do not mind what agricultural food there is, give it to me any day, forget the rice. We have come a long way.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I love ground food. The next thing.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator....Yes, come back.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: .....I believe in free .....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Come home.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: What did I say, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, I just mean, you know, get down to what you are.....

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I did not say anything. I was talking about Agriculture.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no, I understand but let us get to the meat of the thing. Agriculture is very wide you know. Some people think that when they are dealing with agriculture....

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The children are not in agriculture. No, I want you to get back to the Head you are on.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: No, but I have not done anything wrong, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am only telling you about the debate. You cannot tell the President that you have not done anything wrong because I have not accused you. I want you to get on to the debate.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I am on the debate, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, because I noticed that you were rambling into the.....

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I am not rambling.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, go ahead.

SENATOR Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I am a woman in this place!

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no, none of that. None of that. Keep that there for outside. You cannot get on with that behaviour in the Chamber.

SUSPENSION

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, it seems that whenever I intervene it is about refreshment. But I think that it would probably be the convenient time to take a twenty minutes tea break if Senators do not mind.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Why twenty minutes?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: You want more, Sir?

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, 4.30 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Come back at 4.30 – is that convenient?

Yes Sir, I beg to move the suspension of this sitting until 4.30 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is suspended until 4.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, like most of the other Senators on this side who have already spoken, I am concerned about the rapid rise in Government's expenditure. There is a saying, Sir, what goes up must come down. But Government expenditure is not controlled by the laws of gravity. So it may not come back down. Every prudent businessman, Sir, in his field of endeavour monitors closely his expenditure and I wonder if Government is. Other Senators have pointed out areas of large increases which I also would like the Minister to explain.

The servicing of foreign debt is up approximately $98 million over the 1988–89 Estimates and I would like to deal with the 2 major sectors of the economy which earn foreign exchange. Firstly, agriculture – everyone is aware of the financial difficulties of the sugar industry, no more so than Senator Phillips in his capacity as Chairman of the Barbados National Bank. Yet Mr. President, this country cannot afford to lose the $70 million approximately earned by this industry yearly. The sugar dollar is estimated, Sir, to be worth about 4 to 5 times the retail value of the tourist dollar because it takes so little of the earnings of sugar to service it and it takes so much of the earnings of tourism to service tourism.

Sir, I would like to look at an area or two that I feel that the Government could give some relief to the sugar industry in and, as an example, Andrews land tax in 1982 was $3,700 and in 1988 it was reduced to $3,150. Bulkeley was $7,350 and that also reduced to $6,800 in 1988. Carrington in 1982 was $4,425 and in 1988 it was $68,640 and that is an increase of about 15 times as much because some improvement was done on Carrington. Four Square was $2,800 in 1982 and $33,200 in 1988 which was about 12 times as much. But Sir, the one that really concerns me is the one that the industry spent a lot of money to build, a new factory at Portvale, and the land tax on that Portvale Factory which wisely or unwisely the sugar industry built to improve the efficiency of the industry, that land tax is $732,000.

Now Sir, at this point I would like to say that I am not criticising the Commissioner of Land Tax because he has an Act under which he operates and he has a responsibility to operate under that Act. But I feel, Sir, that Government could do something about either making the sugar industry and the hotel plant that is non-profitable, because both of these things are two earners of foreign currency, if they could waive land tax until any one of them came into

profitable position. Because it is extremely difficult to pay this class of land tax out of losses. It is impossible to do it.

Sir, if we were to compare Portvale with Heywoods Hotel, Portvale cost under $30 million to build. Heywoods Hotel cost over $60 million to build and if they are both taxed on the same basis Heywoods Hotel will be paying $1½ million in land tax and I am sure the Minister by a telephone call could verify how much that Heywoods Hotel was paying in land tax. Both of these projects, Sir, employ people and both of them are valuable earners of foreign currency for this country. Perhaps the wages that the people at Portvale earn may be even higher than the wages of the people at Heywoods Hotel. Well Sir, that is one area I feel that Government could look at to give some relief to the industry.

Diversification, Sir – vegetables. The Island I think, Sir, is fairly well supplied now with vegetables. The onions – this crop is a good crop but it is a seasonal crop and only so much onions can be planted and used within a given time or otherwise they will spoil. Other vegetables, Sir, I am told – I am not now a practising planter myself for the last number of years – but I am told that vegetables are receiving stiff competition from imports from Guyana with the result that some of our local production is spoiling and going to waste. It was reported in the Press, Sir, that Guyana is likely to devalue its dollar to $38 Guyanese to $1 U.S. or $19 Guyanese to Bds. $1.00. This Sir, when you import produce, a pound and something for $19 from Guyana will only cost the Barbadian a dollar but he has shipping and that sort of thing to pay.

Sir, Cotton – Senator Phillips has already mentioned this as a possible earner of foreign exchange and I agree with Senator Phillips. But Sir, agriculturalists like anyone else would expect that they could earn some profit from their endeavours. They are cautious to enter into another undertaking that would earn foreign currency for Barbados but would be another loss to themselves. In other words, Sir, the cotton industry could earn considerable foreign currency perhaps for Barbados but it may not be profitable to the grower in Barbados and if they are doing one thing that is highly unprofitable at the moment which is sugar it will be difficult for them to carry cotton.

But Sir, that is not the only problem. There is a problem of picking cotton. I think this year with the limited acreage that they had in the Island that there was some difficulty to get cotton picked and if it is Government's intention to increase the acreage under cotton considerably this question would have to be carefully examined, because it would be pointless growing it and then you could not get it picked. Our long staple cotton that is grown in the West Indies is very valuable for Sea Island cotton material. But Sir, it cannot be picked mechanically because you destroy the long staples which people are prepared to pay for.

So, Sir, I think cotton is a possible crop but I think before we commit ourselves to go into the heavy expenditure with cotton that it should be carefully looked at and do not let us have another crop which would be a burden on the agriculturalists in this country.

In passing, Sir, fishing comes under agriculture and I wonder, Sir, if the people who take out fishing vessels in Barbados should not be licensed.
4.40 p.m.

If you fly a light aeroplane you have to have a licence. If you drive a motor car you have to have a licence. Yet, Sir, any of us, even me, could go and get a boat and go out and lose myself off Barbados and then it means that the Coast Guard and light aircraft and everybody else cost the country money to look for me. So I think that Government should look at licensing the captains, the persons responsible for the boats. Fishing boats are not cheap. There are ice boats which I understand run into $175 000 each.

I will touch lightly on the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation. That seems to be winding down its agricultural activities and I see that they are planting quite a few houses now on some of this land. I am beginning to wonder whether the subsidy that is being given to the Agricultural Development Corporation should not be reduced. I see this year it has been increased.

Senator Comissiong referred to me as a land owner and the possible handing over of agricultural holdings to small people. If Senator Comissiong will use his considerable influence with the authorities, I am very willing to subdivide some of our estates and sell them over to the people. I could not believe that Senator Comissiong would expect that they would confiscate them and divide them, because that would be terrible publicity for Barbados.

Mr. President, that is my small contribution on agriculture.

The other area that earns foreign currency is tourism and I am fairly well concerned about tourism, although it has made a vast improvement. It was reported in the last *Sunday Sun* that the Minister of Tourism and Sports said that tourism earned $914 million in 1988. This has been a considerable improvement over previous years and I am hoping that this will bring hotels out of a loss position into at least a break even or more maybe make a profit.

Sir, at this point I would like to refer to the Official Report of the Senate Debates on March 21, 1988. That is a year ago. This is what I said:

> "There is another serious thing that tourism is facing at the moment, and that is harassment and drugs on the beaches. This has been going on, and being talked about, for, I am sure, more than five years. And this is

as far as we get, Sir, talk. The hotels know the problems, the Hotel Association knows the problems, the Tourist Board knows the problems, the police know the problems, and the only body that seems as if it is not sure that they know the problem is Government. Government is now setting up a commission after all these years to find out what is happening on the beaches."

Sir, I understand now it is not a commission, it is a committee. I went on to say:

"Another enquiry means commissioners to be appointed, time for them to sit, time for them to be told what I believe most Barbadians know, if not all, time to report, then time to consider. And all that time we will be bringing tourists to Barbados to prove to them that there is harassment and drugs on the beaches of Barbados, and we cannot do anything about it."

Sir, that was a year ago. I also saw reported that the Minister said he expected to get a report within two or three weeks.

This is a serious thing that is happening to tourism in this country. When you get visitors to this country that take time out – perhaps they were only in the Island for two weeks, maybe three – of their holiday to write letters to the Press practically on a daily basis complaining about the problems on the beaches, the horses on the beaches, jet skis on the beaches, harassment from these people on the beaches, I do not think that there is one of us in this Honourable Chamber, even in the Visitors' Gallery, that has been abroad on holiday and has taken time out to write complaints to the Press of the country in which we were guests, and I feel that these people must be really browned off with what is taking place on the beaches here, and I really feel it is urgent that Government does something about it. Because every one of those dissatisfied people that go back home, they are not ambassadors for Barbados, they are going back and telling their friends of the problems that they had in Barbados, and that friend may say well, I would rather go to one of the others.

Now, Sir, these jet skis, they are the biggest complaint on the west coast, because the waters suit that type of operation. On the east coast of the Island it is a little bit rough for that and the visitors on this side of the Island are not as affluent as the ones on the west coast. But I also saw where it was suggested that the jet skis or the drivers, I am not sure which, will be licensed. I am wondering if this is to make it legal for these jet skis and their operators to continue their practices within the law. They are now operating outside of a law and if you license them, unless you are going to licence them to control them, the jet ski people will tell you what I saw, a fellow with horses on television leading the horses between the tourists on the west coast beaches saying, that nobody could stop him because he was operating within the law. There was no law to stop him.

Mr. President, I come now to those who years ago were known as beach boys. Today they are referred to by most visitors and locals as beach bums. I have heard some people say that these are unemployed persons trying to earn some money. No such thing, Mr. President. These people are professionals. The same way you get teaching, medicine, law, these people are professionals. These people are not going to accept a job somewhere else. They are making too much money pushing drugs and manipulating tourists. So don't let anybody say that they are unemployed. They are employed people in the same way that legal people are employed. Some of these female tourists will not refer to them as beach bums, but they are gentleman friends, that is why these same people and the beach bums say that they are providing a service to the industry.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. President, legislation was brought within a matter of weeks to get McDonald's out of Barbados, and McDonald's was nothing as dangerous as the beach problems in Barbados are; yet nothing has been done up to now, but I am hoping, Sir, that next year this time I will be congratulating Government on the measures that they have introduced to save the industry from these problems.

As has been said, Sir, in watching costs and trying to control them, the hotels are faced with some charges that are contributory to the high cost of running in Barbados. Hoteliers always get the blame for high costs, but this is a publication "Beverage Business" of October 1988, Caribbean Beverage Trade Magazine, and I am quoting, Sir. The duty paid landed cost of a case of whiskey, which is standard whiskey, not premium whiskey, in Barbados is $171.81. I will make this a document of the House, Sir. In St. Lucia it is $102.33, in Bermuda it is $96.47, in Grenada it is $88.45, in St. Vincent it is $73.71, in St. Kitts it is $64.17, in Antigua it is $58.47, and St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands it is $47.49.

Sir, Antigua is a tourist destination from which we are going to get serious competition shortly. They are building hotels, they have beautiful beaches, as good as anything we have in Barbados, and only in today's paper I saw where in the Throne Speech the Governor-General was saying that they were improving their economy. Well, Sir, when you compare the cost of a case of whiskey in Barbados at $171.81 against the cost in Antigua of $58.47, visitors who have been through Antigua and have drunk whiskey will say when they get to Barbados that these hoteliers are ripping us off, because it is more than three times the cost. Sir, these things are small, but all these things add up to give Barbados that name of being a high cost destination.

Sir, the last point is that I think it was last year's Estimates that had a token sum of $1.00 for Durants Golf Course. That has disappeared this year. I only hope that Government has not dropped the idea.

Asides.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: I am glad to hear that the Government has not dropped the idea of the Durants Golf Course. Last year was the first time I saw it they did mention Durants Golf Course last year, and I was hoping that it would be Durants Golf Course that they would be spending the money on. I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, I am happy today to associate myself with this Appropriation Bill and to support it. I refer to a point which has come from Education in that some time ago for an Independence celebration I recall some children singing a song, I think they were from the Westbury School, "Barbados I tip my hat to you", and I should like to speak in that vein under the various headings. I think it is a very easy thing for anybody to do something called criticism and to pull down and tear down. It is not very easy to build up, however. If we say that we are nationalistic Barbadians and this Appropriation Bill is placed before us, I think it should be placed before us as a time for reflection, putting our commonsense into full action, of how we are going to approach the future of this nation, the small developing nation called Barbados, a time for constructive criticism, yes, a time also for us to look at some of the answers that may be blowing in the wind right now, but look at some of the answers that we could probably marshal, look at some of the resources that we have going that we could marshal.

We always think of Barbados as a place without any mineral resources; we do not have any gold, any iron ore, anything of this sort like some of our rich neighbours in the other Caribbean territories, but we have always used our commonsense, and we have been able to keep this country through our various establishments and peoples on a steady and even keel over the many years. I think for the future for our young people we have got to get right back down to basics. We have got to realise that a Government has been placed there by the people. We are living within a democratic society. A Government is also placed there to manage, and in management you will make mistakes, you will also have to take some harsh decisions that may not be very popular at some times. However you would have to look at it analytically under various headings as we are looking at it today and see where we as a people can marshal these resources and make them work to benefit all Barbados.
5.00 p.m.

I think in doing the Estimates in the Bill under the various headings, I think we are looking seriously too at how we can curb this in every area and I feel that the Government has to be congratulated because this is not an easy time in any part of the world for a Government to run a country, a small, developing country like Barbados.

I should like, Sir, to turn my attention at this point and the attention of the Senate to Head 13, Subhead 10, CBC which has been very much talked about here. I should like to take a different look at CBC. I know that calls were made by some individuals who, perhaps, have their own reasons for so doing to get rid of it, let it not be a Government institution anymore but let it be owned by a private sector company or group.

I would like to say that we should look, if we are managers, and as I said, a Government is there to manage, and problem solving is all part of management. If you can not solve problems, then you cannot manage and it means that you have to look at the problems that we have.

We are not going to have it easy in every area and we have to get down to them and make some decisions. As I said, they might not be popular, but we make decisions. We do not just throw away a thing and say, I will give it over to somebody and say, "Okay, I am a manager but I give it over." That does not prove you are a good manager so, therefore, I would say that I think some effort is being made, as far as I know, to try to correct many of the problems that have been associated with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. It might take a bit of time.

I also would like to say as far as that is concerned that we should look at giving more assistance and I am talking now here about the private sector. We have a lot of soap operas on the CBC television and most of these are sponsored by many of our business houses. I know they cost a fantastic sum of money but if we are really strict guardians of our heritage and firm craftsmen of our fate, why do we not encourage those young people who have been so outstanding whom we focus attention on during our Independence celebrations and during Christmas time whom we do not ever see again until another Independence.

Why cannot we have some of those plays which have been excellent productions sponsored on CBC by some of the business houses who, I believe, are very nationalistic, rather some of the soap operas coming that are not related at all to our society and people get all sorts of change in attitudes and change from these kinds of soap operas and some of these prime shows? There is a popular phrase that has been used. I know some people are begging to, want to live the life of the rich and the famous. They want to have champagne with a mauby pocket all because of the attitude that has been portrayed to them by a very strong media which is television.

It can also be used very effectively to educate many of our Barbadians in many areas of activity. For instance, somebody was talking today about our cultural heritage,

black history, things of this sort. You have seen spasmodic areas sometimes on a Sunday, a lecture here and there but I am talking about a very consistent basis where people can look out for education in a particular area of activity, say Barbados in the early Thirties, the development of the Trade Union Movement, the development of the Cooperative Movement, what it was before and how it is today, the development of small businesses in this country, all of these can be areas that business houses can sponsor and put on our television for our young people to see instead of seeing some of the scrap that you see.

Also, I would like to see women portrayed in a more positive light on television. There are some advertisements that are really very degrading to womanhood and I feel that these should be looked at with great seriousness by the Censorship Board or whoever did them before they are shown and decide that that is not going on television.

We have to be strong if, as I said, we have to able to make decision that may not be popular, even if you are a statutory board or what have you. You may not be popular but it will redound to the good of your country in the future and this is what is vitally important.

The negative advertising. I know that there are a lot of people in Barbados who talk about it and when it comes to writing a letter or to doing something, they do not really do anything about it.

I talked to one editor one day about a particular advertisement and he told me: "So what? Only eleven people complained about it!" and for the amount of people you heard talking about it you would have thought that there were thousands of people who had, in fact, complained. They were just talking about it but they were not seriously laying a complaint and what I am saying that we need to do, if we are not satisfied with an advertisement on T.V., we need to write to the Corporation.

We have to do things the proper way. Write and say that we are not satisfied and if we have a large number of persons who do something like this and who, also, write and ask for various educational programmes, I feel that any board would pass on that information to some business people and ask them now, "Look, you have a large number of people asking for this. Would you be able to assist us in sponsoring this" and I think that people in Barbados have been nationalistic over the years and they need to get back to this. Some people are a little bit too selfish. They feel that as long as it is not going to profit them, they are not going to do it. They do not think 10, 20 years down the road – some of the people in this country – that that programme would have benefitted or would have assisted in any way.

I should like to turn to Head 14 and touch briefly on the Ministry of International Transport and just in passing to say that we need to look at the organisation at the airport of the red cap persons. I think that must be looked at, not with a view to taking away anybody's job but I am talking about questions of getting the thing organized in a very proper way.

I also think that, with that area, we need more persons policing the Customs area. I think if there is an area that we have to spend additional money on we will benefit in the long term because if we have people who are specially trained in detection of drugs, narcotics, and crime prevention, this will assist our country and it will rid us of some of the types of, perhaps, international drug people who come through there.

People who are trained would be able to recognize them and then we would be able to have a more clear understanding about the problems that we have there because we would have had people who could pinpoint these problems. I think there is a need there for more people and there is also the need for more trained personnel to police that particular part of our entrance.

As you know, Barbados is the Clapham Junction and we have all sorts of people coming here. Also, some come in the name of Tourism as well, not necessarily that they are these worthwhile citizens or people whom we might like to have.

I should also like to touch before I go on to Agriculture, on the area of Education and Culture. Page 86, Subhead 13, this is between page 85 and page 86, was touched on today, but I could not allow this to pass, Mr. President, Sir, in view of the fact that I remember one of our Senators saying yesterday that they were wondering if the money was well spent on these institutions, one of which I have passed through and had the honour to pass through, the Girls' Industrial Union which was started in 1912 in this country and has educated many young underprivileged girls. There are people even working within this area of operation, in Parliament who have done their typing or their shorthand or their bookkeeping at the Girls' Industrial Union. The Girls' Industrial Union did not receive a subvention until, as far as I know, when the Democratic Labour Party came into power. I recall the time when we used to get one shilling for bus fare. And I was one of those teachers. As a schoolgirl, you learnt something and Miss Symmonds would ask you to teach it, after you learnt it. And you would receive the princely sum of one shilling for bus fare.

5.10 p.m.

What I want to say is that these institutions were before many of our Government institutions today. They were run by the union fete and the dances and the fairs and so on. But the purpose was positive and has always been positive. And that institution is still alive and well today and still turning out some of the loyal daughters of our Barbadian soil.

Also, when we think of the question of labour education, the trade union, the Barbados Workers' Union has paved the way in many a field of endeavour. Many skills have been taught here, in the area of business development, in the area of how to treat people, people management, workers' participation, and people come from the other Islands and also benefit from these facilities. I know that the union over the years has assisted in the stability of this country. And all of those subjects have been taught at the Barbados Workers' Union Labour College.

Any Government has to realize that there are a number of private institutions that fill the gap for Government. In other words, if the union were not doing it, Government would have to do it. And therefore these institutions, I think, are worthy of what they are going to receive or what they have received because they are fulfilling a need in this community.

If you look also at the way in which the union has taught their members the co-operative spirit, how the members have been able to learn how to be thrifty and how to save money, and to look at what they used to be able to save before and what they can save now and how far they have advanced, I think we have to say that we tip our hats to these institutions. They deserve every penny and more of the subventions which they are getting.

And remember, we talk about these subventions but they have a responsibility as well. They do not just get their subventions like a gift. They have to produce the various Financial Statements, Reports and so on. Sometimes they have to go through a whole lot of things in order to get a few thousand dollars. Not that they do not welcome them. I know that all the institutions would welcome any kind of funding or any kind of money to carry out their various programmes. Primarily, institutions are given these subventions for the carrying out of educational programmes. So I was very upset about anybody questioning this whole idea.

As far as the whole question of adult education is concerned, I recall, I think it was last year I said here, that a great number of adult education programmes were closed down with the last regime. I would have welcomed the re-opening of those schools and so on in the evening for persons who wanted to continue their education, either academically or in the business field or in the area of special skills.

I am very happy to hear that the Ministry of Education has entered on this course and is continuing to give us what we call continuing education for all. Because, as I said last year, a whole number of small institutions, and large ones too has sprung up as a result of these persons not being able to continue to get their two certificates or one certificate at these evening classes. They are paying large sums of money to these institutions which some of these young men and young women can ill afford to pay. They really cannot afford to pay it. But all these various colleges whether they be town, city or urban or whatever have sprung up and they are able to have heavy pockets all because of the shortsightedness of the last Government in realizing that we need to continue the education process of people from the cradle to the grave.

In welcoming this, I hope that the fifth formers of schools who – I know a lot of them want to get into these courses to continue their education will be given the opportunity, along with the older persons in the community – who want to learn a special skill or who want to continue their education would be able to have the opportunity to do so without much difficulty.

Why I am saying this is because I hope we do not have a class at a school like in the country area which is miles away from the person's home and they cannot get a bus, a minibus or anything to get there and back home at a particular hour of night when minibuses or so may not be running. So I hope that they are placed in suitable areas, near to the people where they can walk or have easy transportation to these various centres for adult education.

I was a bit surprised myself to hear about the call for the removal of the Use of English at the University. I know that I have had a relative who was to be a doctor. He could do all sorts of things. He even had Advanced Level Certificate in English, but when it came to writing an article or composition or anything like that, his English was so poor I wondered whether he was a Second Year student in the University.

I deem that course a necessity because we have so many people who will tell you: "I have a degree," but then when they write you a letter, they are writing to you, they put your name on the bottom. I had an example of that recently. And they put, "Dear Sir," and at the bottom, it is "Mrs. Fraser." So I do not understand that kind of education.

Aside.

Laughter.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Also, you get when they are writing to a women's group, they write Dear, Sir/Madam. Punctuation is something unheard of. Grammar, when you are talking about singular verbs and singular subjects, that is a thing of the past. You know these are things that we need to look at very carefully.

I am calling for Grammar to be treated as a special subject, not only in the secondary schools, but I think right back down to the basics. We must have a good, primary level of grammar. I think we are losing that. If we lose that

we will lose every level of the English Grammar and the use of English.
5.20 p.m.

So I do not understand how anybody who wants to communicate effectively could call for the removal of the Use of English course at the university. What I would like to see as well is that more university students would make themselves available – since in this country Barbados with its slender resources, we have worked hard, those persons in the cane fields and those people who are artisans, to educate these people with the taxpayers money – and we would like them to come down from their ivory tower and get involved with the people in the community and help to teach the people in the community some things. You know, I think that some people believe that all you go up there to do is to get the university degree.

But as C. L. R. James has said: You know you have a degree now but come out and distinguish yourself. This is what many people have to do. They seem to feel that after they go to the university they are not to mix with anybody after that. They are not to mix with the common people. They are not to mix with the agricultural workers. They are not to mix with the artisans. We must get rid of this snobbishness. We must organize classes and invite them and see what they are worth. Put them on the spot. Let them understand that you are a part of this community, because if these people are going to come to offer themselves for political office just because they have been to a university and this is the only criterion, then we are going to have a whole snob club in this country and we do not want a snob club.

Free secondary education was hot given or was not given to us for us to create an elitist club. When Errol Barrow did this, he did this for us to create the opportunity for the child of the master and the child of the servant to have the same opportunity to enter Harrison College, Queens College or any other institution of learning in this country. Also, he did it that they may enter the Polytechnic, they may enter the Community College, and they would be able to enter the world of work because they have had a proper opportunity.

But one of the things we have to look at in the whole exercise of education is the question of attitude. I think that this is one of the big problems – the attitude, the attitude to work, the attitude to other people. Are good manners the correct thing anymore? I was told quite recently that a lady went to an office and said good morning 3 times and she was so upset she said to this person after awhile: Is good morning French or Spanish? Because the person never answered her. If we want to create proper attitudes in our country we have to set proper examples. We have to be courteous on the telephone. That is one of the things that we need to teach people in schools, organizations, churches, and wherever we are. All of these programmes should be teaching people how to communicate effectively, how to make people happy by speaking to them, and communication is a very effective means of getting over a message to a person and also a very effective means of relating to people generally and getting people to understand your ideas. It is not everybody who has a degree that can teach because they cannot communicate. They cannot interact. They are not able to get over their message to people. So therefore those people make very poor teachers and should not teach at all. These are some of the problems that we are having because some people are attracted to a particular job because of the salary and not because of dedication or because of the suitability to the particular area of endeavour.

I should like to say that I am happy that at this time we have got a draft Education Bill, I understand, in the Ministry of Legal Affairs now and all the various Secondary School Boards have given their various changes and so on. I do think that parts of that existing Education Act were wicked things and I am very glad to see that that Act has been revised. I believe shortly we will hear more on that, and I think that this is a good thing for the future of this country. People must not just take things and change them up because they are taking over from somebody else. They must look at the merits, and demerits of the situation. They must look at whether it is going to assist the country or whether it is going to set the country years back.

The whole question of teacher training – I am happy to see that teachers can go to the university now and feel comfortably again and get their money and so on. That is what I have to say on that area of Education.

Now in the area of Legal Affairs, for sometime now we have been calling for rape cases and other delicate cases of this type to be tried in camera. I understand that something is being worked out and I hope that this will be worked out to the advantage of all concerned. I believe that a lot of rape cases are not reported because of the way people behave to the person who has been raped. The victim becomes the villain. I have been on the jury and I have seen it where people have been pointed out by their names and so on and people have scoffed at them and all sorts of things as though that person was a wicked person.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Why do you not charge me for rape?

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Laughter.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Anyhow, rape is a very serious thing and I think they deserve the cat.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: That is why I was asking you the question.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Well, I did not hear you, Sir. But I hope that they will bring back the cat-o'-nine tails for these people. I have called for this already, to bring back the cat for them. I am glad that they are not living in certain countries like Saudi Arabia.

Asides.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What do they do?

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: I do not have to tell you that, Sir. But the other question of Senator Forde gives me great concern about this whole question of incest. That is another serious thing and I was very happy that we got at least one person to come to the Courts because for a long time a number of people would never come to the Courts and they would call us in our organizations and so on and report these matters, that this is happening and that is happening – some pathetic cases. We try to send them to lawyers. The lawyers see them. They talk with them and they cannot get them to go to the Court to report the situation. This is one of the problems that we have. Perhaps if these cases were tried in camera I think this would help a lot and a number of people would bring these cases before the Court. There are women who have been shattered and told us stories but they do not want to go to the Court. They just want to see a doctor and that is all, and that is the end, and they want to keep it quiet. We cannot keep these things quiet when they are of such terrible proportions in our society and reaching such alarming proportions in the society. Every now and again you can hear about another case through the Child Care Board or some other agency.

The other area under Legal Affairs which I am concerned about is child support. I believe the time has come when we should have, just like we have the old age pensioners, the money put there to come in the post. I am tired seeing these women lined up and I know many Magistrates and lawyers are tired seeing them lined up there to hear there is no money. Why do we not understand that it is the responsibility of 2 people not only of the mother, but that the father has a very important interest in not only the getting of the child but the total development and the rearing of that child and he is abrogating his responsibility when he does not give support to that child?
5.30 p.m.

Aside.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: That is not important. There are two people involved and in our society most of the women are left to bring up the children, and we all know this. It is my mother who fathered me in most cases in this society and we must give fact where fact is and give people their necessary due.

I should now like to turn, Mr. President, to the area of agriculture, which is an area I know that everyone in this room has great interest in, because without food we are nothing and, as the slogan goes, food comes first. Food has been treated as a weapon of war from Bible times. People have been denied certain crops and because they have been denied these crops they had no sustenance. Indeed Napoleon commissioned a special study for his men not to eat putrid meat and Nicolas Appert took ten years to perfect that skill of putting meat in a sealed container. However, that was one of the great inventions in order that food could last for a long time.

In agriculture we have several areas that we need to look at, and the first area I would like to look at is the attitude of people to agriculture. Historically, agriculture has been looked at, although people in agriculture feed the lawyers, the doctors, the economists, throughout the world they have been looked down at as people on the lowest rung of our society. We have to try to change this attitude towards agriculture. Agriculture is our business, because food is our business and therefore in order to change this we need to put a number of systems in place.

I should like to say that it seems to me that the Ministry of Agriculture is making an effort to put some of these systems in place, although I am not satisfied with the amount of money that is being spent here, but I hope that you can get an improvement. For instance, I know there is an agriculture hot line where farmers can call in now and talk about their problems. Some people do not know that an Extension Department exists. It is also true that we need more Extension Officers, and I understand that is coming on stream. For some far-sighted reason, or some blinded reason, the last administration did not see it fit to have people trained for something like nearly ten years in Trinidad & Tobago and at the University. That was deplorable and that brought about a terrible shortage in the Extension Department. The Extension Department is here to teach and train and help farmers, and to work closely in liaison with them. If you do not have them the farmer will suffer a lot of setbacks, so I am glad that that is again coming on stream.

I am also happy to see that the agricultural stations, live Groves, which fill a great need in the community, rather than calling the extension officer you can call the station and get certain assistance. You can also have certaintrials done and things of that sort at the agricultural stations.

One of the new areas of agriculture with which we are all concerned is the effort being made in the marketing of agricultural produce. I think sometimes we hear a lot of people saying that we have a great influx of vegetables, but if we examine it carefully, sometimes we really do not. We might have a great influx in one area, and in the other area, because of the lack of proper marketing, somebody is

suffering from a shortage. It is not that there is not sufficient to go around, but the way how it is marketed, and I am glad that there will be a greater thrust on the whole question of marketing in the Ministry of Agriculture, and that this thrust on marketing will give incentives to farmers, subsidies, grants to individuals, grants to non-profit agencies, duty concessions, all these things this marketing will do.

We have not heard of a census for a long time since 1971 and this year we are to have an agricultural census. I think we all welcome that, because we will know what is the true position of agriculture.

Laboratory facilities are also to be constructed during the next year.

Export marketing. There is an Export Marketing Unit and since we have identified a number of areas of agricultural produce that can be marketed successfully extra-regionally to bring in foreign exchange to this country, great emphasis is now being placed on this area of export marketing. New facilities are being set up. Indeed, one of the areas that is very comforting – and this is how we can integrate other areas of agriculture – is the area of cut flowers and foliage. We have seen in Europe, Canada and America the interest displayed and how many people are now getting into this area. What is even more, we are going to be having a factory more or less, technical assistance will be provided through UNDP and FAO to enable the Ministry to establish a tissue laboratory so that a ready range of planting materials of a higher quality can be provided at low cost. Expertise will be provided to strengthen the Ministry's research and extension capability and they will also be providing a marketing expert.

Despite the fact that agriculture has been the whipping horse, those farmers who have done very well need to be complimented, because out of all the problems that we have had they have still been able to produce for export 859 587 kilos of sweet potatoes. I see here they have been able to export also onions, sweet peppers, sausages not canned, livestock, live chickens whether you believe it or not. These things have happened and we are looking more to what is going to happen in the future. As I said, we are looking carefully because there is much foliage that we have in Barbados, especially the ordinary evergreen. Now we talk about tourism, and this is one of the ways that we can integrate agriculture with tourism, because the flower exportation is an area which the hotels overseas and people who come here as tourists want, if we are looking at things like evergreen foliage.

5.40 p.m.

We are looking at some of the exotic crops that we are growing here now and encouraging our farmers to grow and giving them the necessary incentives; things like melons, canteloupes, various types of squash, these are areas that many of our farmers are getting into, both small farmers and large farmers. Because of this, we are seeing a change in attitude in some young people.

There is one young man that I know of who has a large acreage of guavas and this young fellow has been doing very well with his guavas. He has developed different types of guavas in the parish of St. Thomas and he is also geared for the export market. He has done some trials and he has been very successful. He has shipped some on a trial basis and has been paid for them. The farmers like his crop.

There are some people in St. Philip who are growing the English cucumber on the basis of hydroponics. The technology is beginning to develop, but I still do not want people to forget that our attitudes are going to be very important in that whole area, because when we look at the whole question of the food import bill in this country, we have ourselves to blame as a people as to what we want to eat. It seems to me as though we want to keep supporting the farmers in other countries. I am not talking about basic food items that we import like flour and things like that. Why do we have to have 57 different varieties of marmalade? Thank God, we have been able to get this stopped, and most of the jams, jellies and marmalades are all coming from the CARICOM region, but we would like to see them come from Barbados, because we have a lot of people skilled here in producing jellies and jams at a very high standard, world standards, and if you are spending $7 million or so to import a product which you do not necessarily need to have in your country, this could be avoided by getting involved in the production of these things ourselves.

Mr. President, one of the things we have got to realise with agriculture is that we have got to spend money on promotion and advertising, and we seem always to forget that that is important. The farmers in England and America spend sums of money on their promotion programmes. For almost every food you get there is a little recipe leaflet with it, something that encourages you to buy; they spend money on that and it is in beautiful colour. I think any amount of money we spend on agriculture is necessary. I would like to see more money spent on agriculture because agriculture is our very sustenance and our very living.

Mr. President, there are a few minor areas that I would like to touch on, and one is the area of cooperatives. I heard someone ask here today whether the money to be spent on the staff of the Cooperative Department was that important. For years the Cooperative Department had a very small staff, I think probably an Acting Director, a typist and somebody else. To service cooperatives of the size of the Barbados Workers' Union with all that money and the various institutions that have saved their little pennies, you want people to help you with your books and with the field work. I don't necessarily mean the Union, but other cooperatives. We have community cooperatives who do not

have paid staff and it is the job of the department to help those people with their books and things like that. Now if you have a department that just has three people as staff, what sort of joke that is to service a big cooperative community that is enlarging daily. People are understanding what cooperatives mean to them, so I would like to say that money spent on the Cooperative Department is more than justifiable, it is timely, and I think it is overdue because I know the officer there is working herself to a frazzle, and we must not expect that people can look after big agencies with a small staff. This creates frustration. If you are talking about productivity, how can you get productivity from people who are frustrated? They need staff, they need people to help them to carry on the work.

Under the area of trade, I should like to touch on the cottage industry which used to help a lot of youngsters. They knew what they wanted to do and they were able to stay at home and do the work, and it helped a lot of women who had small children. The work would be collected from the home, whether it was basket making, weaving or coconut craft or what-have-you. These women were able to get their money in cash while they stayed at home and looked after their household. I would strongly like to see that restarted and I think that would help with the unemployment situation.

While I am on this area of the IDC estates, we need to see proper lunch room facilities for the workers. Here again, if we are talking about productivity, we have to give people suitable conditions to work in, other than that you are not asking robots to produce. You are asking human beings. Remember that they have problems of transportation, problems of getting rent paid, problems of looking after the children. How do you expect them to cope with another problem of a little dirty room where they have to eat their lunch or under a tree? Industrialists need to address themselves to this particular area of activity. They also need to address themselves to day-care facilities for their workers. That is very essential. I think about two or three of them have done this, but we need to see more of this. Everybody calls on Government, but some people do not realise that the workers bring the money to them because of their production, and if the workers produce and bring money to them to get rich, they should therefore treat the workers well. In Barbados we have so many women working in the industrial estates, and where there is a lot of absenteeism or the question of staying at home, it is because the workers did not get the child to the day care facility on time and preferred to go back home rather than go to work at 10 o'clock.

I think they also need to have a system for transporting workers even if the workers have to pay a small sum out of their earnings for this. I see nothing wrong with that, but in the main I would like to see them provide transportation, and when I say transportation, this is one thing I would like to make clear. There was a van that used to transport workers, but it would drop somebody at the end of Wildey to go down to the housing area. This was a joke, because by the time the person get down there she could have been raped, and indeed there was a case of rape. There was a case of a young woman who was dragged from Country Road into a gap and raped. So it happens in the day and it happens at night.

Also, I would like, before sitting down, to air my views, Mr. President, on this whole question of drug abuse in this community. I think it behoves all of us as Barbadians not to say "my light does not burn at you and it would not happen to my Johnny or it would not happen to my Mary". You have to be very watchful and we have to be our own vigilantes. We have to assist the Police. If we have information, pass it on to the Police. Do not keep it and say it would not happen to my child. It is happening in schools and, therefore, parents have a special responsibility and they have more pressures now being put on them because of the things that are happening in this society.
5.50 p.m.

If you want to agree with the Anthem that we are strict guardians of our heritage and firm craftsmen of our fate, we would, in these Honourable Chambers, put before the Chamber all the things that we know will affect us in Barbados but, at the same time, we would try to offer suggestions and try even to gain assistance to help wherever possible, to give assistance, not necessarily from in here, but maybe, in your church group, or wherever you can sound your voice for it to be heard.

It is my view that we as Barbadians have always been proud of this little country Barbados and if we are proud of Barbados then we will not run it down. We cannot be proud of a country and pull it down. How are you going to face somebody outside when they come up to you and say that they read it in this newspaper or the other paper. They get the papers in London.

I was surprised when I was at TUF University how early on a Sunday morning they got a particular paper from Barbados. That surprised me always but, nevertheless, they got the Friday paper in time for Sunday morning church and it was taken to church where there is a Barbadian reverend and it was widely distributed so all the Barbadians were *au fait*, and other people in the church, with what was going on. If you go to New York people can tell you things that happen here that you do not know and in the same way. If you start to pull down our society and we say things in this Honourable Chamber that are not uplifting to Barbados, then other people are going to read about it, they are going to wonder what is happening in this country though really nothing is happening. Somebody is just trying to be sensational. Let us keep away from this sensationalism and let us really be true Barbadians, strong, working for our country, putting our country before self and truly we can

say like the children at Westbury School, "Barbados I tip my hat to you."

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, in deference to the fact that Senators have been here for two days, assisting with the passage of the Appropriation Bill of 1989, they will forgive me if I do not press my own views upon them but content myself with showing courtesy where Senators who have, in the course of the debate, asked questions, or raised points of substance for which I have some replies.

I hope that there will be an opportunity given to me sometime, not on this occasion, perhaps, to say one or two things which I feel strongly and when that occasion comes I shall make use of it but I think, perhaps, it is better to be courteous to those Senators who have asked questions.

Now, Senator Boxill did, in response to a written invitation from me, put down a topic but since the substance of the question which he asked did not go into the records, I will write him personally and let him have his reply.

Senator Jordan in respect of my own responsibilities asked about representation in Haiti, Suriname and Nigeria. In respect of Haiti, let me say that the Government of Barbados has no accredited representative to Haiti at this time and this flows from the position which we have taken in response to the absence of a democratic system of Government there.

It does not reflect any dislike of the Haitian people, or any want of sympathy with them but our position was made quite clear that we cannot have bilateral relations with Haiti until such time as that country returns to democratic Government or, at least, moves in that direction. Now, this is not a censure. It is a reality which arises from the recent history of Haiti and the stance which we have taken on some of the events there.

I may, also, briefly tell the Senate this that we have been in some informal contact with the present regime there and it does appear as if they want to put the country on to the democratic path and we have said to them what we have said to the previous military regime that to any extent that they think possible that we can help them we are willing to do this to assist them, for instance, in the management and conduct of elections if we can be brought to understand what system they want, and if they want any specific technical assistance from us in this respect.

In respect to Suriname, we do maintain non-resident diplomatic relations with that country. Interestingly enough, the Barbados Ambassador to Suriname, is located in Bridgetown and he is Mr. Brazane Babb who is, of course, the Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister and whose appointment we have not revoked although it is an appointment which we inherited but it is convenient, on some occasions, to have a non-resident ambassador to a country located in one's own capital. For instance, when they had their important celebration last year and the election of their President and the return to the democratic system we were able to send Ambassador Babb as our plenipotentiary to this celebration.

The Suriname Ambassador, Ambassador Kolada he visits Barbados from his own country and he keeps us informed of developments in his own country following the return of that country to the new democratic status.

Of course, I may say that, certainly, in respect of Suriname and, hopefully, in respect of Haiti when things are more clarified there will be a stronger relationship multilaterally between them and the CARICOM community as there is, of course, with Suriname at the moment.

In respect to Nigeria, the point is well taken and under active consideration by the Government to see how we can strengthen the bilateral relationship with Nigeria but representation of Barbados in Africa suffers, quite frankly, from the constraints of limited financial resources so that with African countries, we, therefore, use the multilateral fora such as the United Nations, the Commonwealth, the ACP/EEC connection, to pursue and promote close relations with African countries but we have under very active consideration the possibility of diplomatic representative, certainly, with Nigeria. We do not know the form in which it would take but here, again the present Barbados High Commissioner to Nigeria is Minister Don Blackman who was appointed by our predecessor and whose appointment we have not yet revoked but, certainly, when we take a more indepth study of our relations with Nigeria we, obviously, will have to appoint a High Commissioner and it will most likely have to be a non-resident one or do it in some way in which somebody nearer to Nigeria can go there when there is business to be discussed.

Senator Forde expressed again, for the second time, it may even be for the third, I cannot remember, a concern about child abuse particularly.
6.00 p.m.

I should just like to say that my understanding is that the Child Care Board has got a legislative committee going. The point of this is to make recommendations in respect of offences relating to child abuse and offences against persons particularly to bring the Offences Against the Person Act into more relevant substance to deal with these and other matters.

I know that while this committee is meeting a lot of wrong things are going on, particularly with children. But I

have the assurance that they are expediting their ideas and their work for the early submission of proposals for making the legislation more up-to-date and more effective in punishment.

They have explained that one of the difficulties which they have in framing the legislation is the reluctance, in most cases, of mothers to give the police any assistance with evidence against fathers or step-fathers, as the case may be, and they are looking for a way to get around that. I myself do not know how they will do it. It is exercising them very greatly, and they are treating this as a priority.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg your pardon. I am very grateful to Senator Blackman who says he has some material which he would make available to them. They can be treated as hostile witnesses, is that it? The quicker the better. Thank you very much, Sir.

There were a series of questions from Dr. Shorey. I have not had time to look through and see which Ministries they have been addressed to. But I believe most of them have been in respect of Education.

But before I do this, I am sorry Senator Wickham is not in his place. He had asked something in respect of the increased training for nurses. The reply is that discussions are presently taking place between the Ministry of Health and the Barbados Community College on the question of increased training and opportunities for nurses. But I believe something has been said about that earlier.

Senator Shorey I believe had asked something in respect of the Marshall Report. Is that it? Again I am informed that discussions are going on between the Ministry of Education and the University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus and the Barbados Community College on the recommendations of the Marshall Report with special reference to the NIS and the Use of English Programme.

In respect of the reading survey, I am advised, firstly, that readers and other materials have been distributed to schools. Secondly, that language masters, listening centres, tapes and tape recorders are now being purchased for each primary school.

Next that the series of training programmes in remedial reading was conducted at Erdiston College and from this programme, a trained Remedial Reading Teacher has been assigned to each Government Primary School. Next that a Specialist Reading Teacher visits schools on a peripatetic basis, it is amazing how they put through the language, peripatetic basis, to work with teachers in the reading programme. Also, that the introduction to each school of a Reading Assessment Kit to facilitate early diagnosis of reading problems, that apparently has been introduced. Workshops and seminars for Headteachers and classroom teachers have been held. To date all primary schools, with at least one teacher from each private primary school, have been exposed to the use of this particular Reading Assessment Kit.

I think Senator McClean asked some questions in respect of Subhead 9, Item 23. The reply is as follows: The provision for $7 450 000 under this item is intended to meet the cost of continuing construction work at Queen's College and to commence construction work at Wotton, Kingsland Secondary School and the new St. Thomas Secondary School. And that the breakdown of this provision is as follows: Queen's College $4 150 000, the Wotton Kingsland School $2.8 million and the St. Thomas Secondary $1/2 million.

Then in respect of Subhead 9, Item 25, this provision will cover expenses for the procurement of equipment and furniture. Although no civil works will be carried out at Harrison College under the Second Education and Training Project, that institution will receive equipment valued at $198 300 and furniture valued at $142 000. An amount of $50 000 is being provided to commence procurement of furniture and equipment at Queen's College.

In respect of Subhead No. 9, Item 26, the provision is intended to make payments for professional services, that is, for civil and structural engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering and quantity surveying for the following secondary schools: Queen's College $125 000, Wotton Kingsland $175 000, extensions for Springer Memorial $150 000 and St. Thomas Secondary $165 000. That gives a total of $615 000.

Construction work on Queen's College is in progress. Work on Wotton Kingsland is scheduled to start in July, 1989, and at St. Thomas Secondary during the first quarter of 1990, and Springer Memorial by June, 1990.

Senator Blackman asked certain questions. I believe they are of a general nature. I have not had time to look at the replies. This is what they are. The reasons for the increase in Subhead 13, Subscriptions, the reply is as follows: Increases of $10 000 each were given to the BWU Labour College and to the NUPW to assist in the educational programmes for workers. Allocations under this Head are as follows: BWU in respect of 1988–89 $30 000, in respect of 1989–90 $40 000. NUPW $30 000 in this Financial Year and $40 000 in the next one. Extra Mural Department $6 000. No change. Barbados Astronomical Society $2 500. No change. Girls' Industrial Union $8 500. No change.

In addition, funds which were formerly granted to institutions directly from the training levy have now been included under this Head and will be disbursed as follows: 6.10 p.m.

National Training Board	–	$455,000
Community College	–	$500,000
Samuel Jackman Prescod	–	$120,000
BIMAP	–	$601,000
NUPW	–	$83,800
Employers Confederation	–	$53,000
BWU	–	$220,000
Other approved institutions	–	$1.5 million

Senator McClean, I believe, had raised some issues on National Insurance. I have some information here. I do not know how relevant it is because I did not hear the questions myself. But it would appear that the National Insurance and Social Security legislation was amended with effect from January 1989 to provide, among other things, a system whereby claims for sickness, maternity, and unemployment benefits could be processed more quickly. An actuary carried out the sixth review of the scheme and has submitted his report. An ILO expert with a very curious name, a Mr. Demetrius Belacanos, is an expert on unemployment insurance and he reviewed the Severance Payments and Unemployment Benefit Schemes. He has submitted his report and that has now been discussed or is under consideration by the National Insurance Board. It has been, I believe, sent or is on its way to Cabinet.

Also, that the Severance Fund continued to be under stress during the year. A loan of $10 million dollars was drawn down during 1987 and 1988. Repayment of principal is to commence in June 1989.

The Unemployment Benefit Fund has also been experiencing difficulties. At times monthly benefit payments exceed contributions and generally no surplus is being generated. The balance held with the Unemployment Benefit Fund may therefore be gradually depleted. Employers continue to pay contributions on behalf of their employees reasonably well but there are, however, a number of recalcitrants. Legislation now provides for interest at the rate of 1% on the unpaid contributions to be payable by employers. During the year the Department embarked on strategies to get all self-employed persons to register and pay contributions in accordance with the legislation. I do not know whether any of the matters the Senator raised are covered here but this is what we have.

I just want to make one quick comment. Oh, yes there is something else. Oh yes, a very important question was raised , I cannot remember by which Senator – yes, Senator Ward among others about jet skis. An area for great concern for the Ministry at this time is the illegal activity which has been attributed to the jet skis. These craft it appears are registered with Barbados Port Authority on the Speedbird Register and, in addition, on the record of boats in the Ministry. The accusations levelled against them include entry of these craft into swimming areas and beach landings, operating too close to bathers and divers, excessive noise, and the continuing soliciting and harassment of users on the beach by owners and operators, and also, the proliferation of unregistered craft.

I am advised that the following measures are in train. One is that, along with the Harbour Master, the Barbados Port Authority is compiling draft Water Sports Regulations to replace the current legislation, whatever that is and which has proved inadequate. Secondly, today I believe a meeting has been held between representatives of the Police and the Barbados Coast Guard to determine what measures can be taken under existing legislation to control the illegal operation of these jet skis.

The Ministry is also putting out information saying that its position is that the legislation in place is adequate if it is enforced to moderate the problem which exists. But it is felt that the gravity of the existing situation would make it inappropriate to await the passing of new regulations before taking action. So I suppose this must mean that they are using the present authority which they have, pending the preparation of new legislation.

So that the answer is that it is engaging urgent attention. I just want to make one single comment on this. I do not think that Senator Ward meant to be offensive in any way. But sometimes when we say things you know the consequence is to people who hear them are not as pleasant as we ourselves might intend. The reference to beach bums as professionals and equating them with teachers and other professionals may have been made to illustrate a point. But it is, I think, a bit offensive and I do not think the Senator meant to be. But I think that perhaps we all have to be careful when we are saying things. I am no racialist, but when you reflect the sort of people we are making these pejorative comments on are themselves of one complexion, well then it is very difficult for other people to believe that it is not meant to be a worse attack on that sort of person than in fact is intended.

Lastly, I should just like to assure Senators Prescod and Comissiong that they have not been as radical as 2 young people called Cameron Tudor and Errol Barrow were ever so many years ago, before they were born. In fact, only last week I got some documents which I was very surprised and delighted to get. I do not know who sent them. But they are old colonial office reports sent by Colonial Governors all 1945, 1946 down to 1951, 1952, and probably to 1954 or so on 2 characters called Errol Barrow and Cameron Tudor and they said we were raving communists and that in respect of me they said that I was the more dangerous because I was witty. They cited an example in which a colonial official whom I met at Government House had asked me – I do not know for what

reason – whether in the event of war breaking out between the United States and the Soviet Union whom I would support, and I said that I would fight for the Russians because I wanted to be an American prisoner.

Laughs.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: He just could not see that there was any humour in that and reported me. There was a stern warning to the Colonial Governor to keep an even greater watch on me and Mr. Barrow and all of us. So that 40 years from now when my bones are resting quietly in a forgotten grave perhaps the new generation of Cameron Tudors and Errol Barrows will be calling you old fogies and that is how it goes.

Thank you, Sir.

Applause.

SENATOR Dr. THE HON. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. President, in rising to wind up the debate on second reading of the Bill, there are a few comments I should like to make in connection with questions and queries raised by Senators. I would like to deal first with Senators McClean and Brathwaite since they represented a team and in the interest of time I would like to deal with them. In the presentation by both of them there has been concerted effort to discredit the authenticity and accuracy of the Estimates both Senators relied on what I would call nit-picking.

They have selected relatively small items in terms of the overall revenue budget and noticed marked changes in them to state that because there were large changes in small items, therefore the Estimates of revenue are way off target. I put it to the two Senators that the margin of error is less than 10%, 5 or 10%, on the gross estimate, and for a good theory to hold it needs only hold in about 80 to 85% of the cases. I think the universities and other institutions award A's for 80 and up, 90, and I am saying the margin of error in the Estimates, looking at the totality, has been insignificant. There have been changes, yes but large changes in small items.
6.20 p.m.

Let me give you an instance. I think I should make this point rather clearly, because if we discredit the premise, then of course we will have to throw everything else out, and I am saying it is insignificant in the whole undertaking. I thought the question was put to rest in the other Chamber, but it has surfaced here again and I will give an illustration. If we had a company operating and we had a payroll cost of, say, $2 000 and there was a 5% increase, we are talking about $100 increase as opposed to postage stamps which cost $1 and we had 100% increase which would go to $2, but in terms of your total operating cost it is insignificant, and I think this is the effort that has been done here to discredit the whole business of the presentation of the Estimates.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not think it is the intention of the Honourable Senator to mislead the House, but one of the items we drew attention to was consumption tax, $238 million with an estimation error of $48 million, and there are others ranging upwards well above $50 million, so I think he should be careful when he talks about small items.

SENATOR Dr. THE HON. C. D. CLARKE: My question is in the bottom line for total revenue. I put it to you that the deviation was not more than a maximum of 10%. We have been nit-picking, we have gone through the lines and we picked them out line by line to discredit the whole business, and I am saying the margin of error overall is not 10%.

Secondly, on the question of Government expenditures increasing too fast, I pointed out in my original presentation that Government is a contributor to Gross Domestic Product overall and that because provisions are sought here at this point in time it does not necessarily follow that those funds will be spent throughout in the year. It depends on the state of the economy and whether or not we are crowding out the private sector.

A specific case in point is where we have the NCC where people have been released because there has been a shortage in the sugar industry, and I think other Government agencies are also making provision to do this. I read out in the presentation that wages, salaries and other staff costs accounted for 41.28%, amortisation 14.6%. I take his point when he suggested that amortisation should have been below the line, but this is the way it has been treated conventionally over time, above the line. Interest 10.7% and goods and services 9.6%.

I also pointed out in my presentation that over time the percentage of total expenditure going to goods and services has been declining. I am questioning now that once we retain the level of employment and the cost going to wages and salaries, we must have some goods and services with which these people must work. It is futile to talk about discretionary items to cut unless we are actually saying let us cut salaries. If we want to say that, let us say it. If we are saying we are prepared to cut salaries and reduce employment in the Government sector, let us call a spade a spade here today. On the question of interest, we do not want to default, but this is the only alternative, because at times we have virtually cut goods and services to the bone.

On the question of the Japanese Yen loan, to Senator Brathwaite, that the loan was acquired at a time when there was no need, again I said in my presentation that we are looking at a more aggressive debt management approach. That loan was acquired at a time when we had two Japanese

loans outstanding and we acquired it as a hedge against currency changes, valuation in the currency of the Yen. We did not at that point need to draw it down. That is why, when people insist that when we went for $80 million there was no pressing need for funds, but to give us the flexibility in managing the public debt, especially the foreign sector, over which we could not hedge –we had no control over currency fluctuations – we paid 6.85 for that loan, which was the most favourable of any Japanese Yen loan which we had, the maturity was longer and it is at a simple average investment rate of 4.5%. The net cost for insurance to hedge was 2.3% I do not know what is the insurance rate for buying insurance.

I think Senator Brathwaite started getting fairly concerned about the Institutional Investor Report, which is internationally acclaimed and we make no contributions to it. It is circulated around the world. I think there are over 110 countries which are rated independently, and Senator Brathwaite was concerned between ranking and rating. I am saying that on the international scene Barbados' relative position has improved, and that is a statement credit-wise. That puts that to rest. You can continue to nit-pick, but we are dealing with the broad issues and facts of the situation.

Senator Blackman enquired about the Land Development Order and I can assure Senator Blackman that in relatively short order we should have the Order in place. It is under active consideration now. I have seen it and it should be on the books in fairly short order.

Senator Shorey suggested interference with the University. I thought the Senator McClean would have passed the reply to Senator Brathwaite to deal with that, but since I have no particular interest in that area I will leave it to Senator McClean to deal with a free university at another point in time and Government's interference.

Senator Jones enquired why the increases in property taxes. There were absolute increases because there have been more efficient measures put in place to collect the taxes. The base rate has not changed, neither has the rate been changed. We have not brought any new people in or raised the rate, but it is just more efficient collections.

Senator Jordan wanted to know about the Empire Theatre for the culturally deprived of us. I speak for myself in this area, please, not the other Senators. They are all honourable people and I will not attempt to speak for them, but the Empire Theatre at this time is the subject of litigation, and Government is not unmindful of beautiful property located in the City.
6.30 p.m.

I really want to leave Senator Goddard for the last. At this point we are talking about the non-profitable Government statutory corporations. They come under scrutiny by us in both Houses at least once a year, a full dress rehearsal. The staff themselves are qualified in most instances, well-trained, but yet in most of the private corporations around town we do not have the same scrutiny. A Senator has just allowed me to have a look at an annual report coming out of a private agency, and I would assure you that as I looked at it, there is a chronic case of mismanagement in the first case, the equity base needs refinancing, and it is insolvent at this point. But it is still trading; gross sales over $90 million. So I am saying that, because we are able to look at Government statutory corporations, we should compare like with like. I did read out the successful companies, but I know in the private sector itself there are many companies which are totally mismanaged, and more so than Government. So don't let us just hold Government statutory corporations out as the only ones being mismanaged. He didn't say that.

With regard to over-spending on both capital and current account, as I said, Government is not just a user of resources. Government has a responsibility to act as an employer of last resort. It has the responsibility to stimulate the economy where the private sector is not picking up the slack. Government has not crowded out the private sector in terms of borrowing, and, to the extent that there is any growth at all in the economy, it was because of Government's intervention at the level at which it intervened. As a matter of fact, Government found itself on the horns of a dilemma during the wages negotiations, because Government itself had induced the growth in GDP. This was the argument used to supply the same workers in the public sector with increased salaries. So they paid twice almost for the same thing.

I was somewhat surprised when Senator Goddard said that Government was not responsible for the profitability of the companies listed on the Stock Exchange. I would suggest that some of the companies listed thereon have received protection from Government. Some of them currently get concessions in terms of rebates on imports to establish themselves. Government has created and maintained the economic climate in which they could operate, that is, interest rates have remained stable throughout the period, Government has not crowded them out in terms of the capital market. Funds were available to them, and these are all factors. So to say that Government did not make a contribution and that we should not pat ourselves on the back, I beg to differ. I am sorry if you did not say that, but I thought I heard that. If you did not say that, I will read it into the record, but certainly I would not ascribe it to you. I seem to have missed one query from Senator McClean that I wanted to reply to but it is late in the night.

On those few comments, Mr. President, I beg to move that the Appropriation Bill be read a second time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank Honourable Senators for the assistance which they have given in the passage of this Bill, but I would like to ask their indulgence to stay with us a few minutes more so that we can do two things. One is the Parish Boundaries (Amendment) Bill and the other is the Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I do not believe there is any urgency attaching to those matters, and I think it would be better if we should leave them over.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEAVE PASSAGES (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Leave Passage (Amendment) Order, 1989.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, whenever there is a salaries revision, there is a necessity to amend the Leave Passages Order in order to provide for salary limits which will allow persons to benefit from passages outside of the Caribbean and within the Caribbean. The Order giving effect to this was signed a few days ago and the Resolution was recently passed in the House of Assembly to give effect to those adjustments in the qualifying salary points to reflect the two phases of increase in salaries as a result of the revision of salaries which became effective 1st April, 1988.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

THE PARISH BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989

Order No. 3 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Parish Boundaries Act, Cap. 108.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am asking leave for Senator Lewis to take charge of this.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Bill to amend the Parish Boundaries Act has become necessary because of the absence for a substantial time of any clear delineation of the boundaries of the parishes of this country. This Bill passed the Lower House after it had been sent to Select Committee in order to clear up certain concerns which had been expressed. In addition, the Bill was published at several points in various parishes so that it might receive some public examination. I do not consider that I can say too much more than that.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.
6.40 p.m.

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to His Honour the President, the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, we have reached the conclusion of this day's business but before I move the adjournment, I would like to inform Senators that there is a proposal that a Select Committee should be set up on the Tenantries Freehold Purchase (Amendment) Bill.

Government is not opposing this, in fact, we welcome it and it is proposed that this committee should consist of the following members, Your Honour as Chairman, the Leader of the Senate, Senator C. A. Blackman, Senator A. W. A. McClean, Senator J. S. Goddard, Senator Dr. C. D. Clarke, and Senator Phillips, all of whom have agreed to serve. I now, therefore, propose that these persons form this committee.

Also, I would like to announce that the committee will meet at 3 o'clock on Tuesday, March 28 here in this room, and it is proposed to ask the Attorney General who, of course, is a member of the Other Place, and cannot be a member of our committees, to join us informally before the committee settles down to its deliberations. I so move.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I am putting it to Senators, on the strength of having a committee would you give us the Second Reading?

In the light of what I said, I want to know whether the House would allow us to proceed to passing the Second Reading of the Bill before sending it to the Select Committee.

Aside.

Order No. 4 was called – Tenantries Freehold Purchase (Amendment) Bill, 1989.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Is there any Honourable Member through you who wishes to contribute to this debate on the Second Reading of the Bill because, if not, we cannot proceed until the Second Reading is concluded.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I think there is some misunderstanding, Mr. President, as to the implications of the referral of the matter to committee.

As I understand it, and I say so for, perhaps, an explanation is being sought, the conclusion of the debate by way of the Second Reading motion is to facilitate the matter going into committee. When the Bill is considered in committee, we do not know what will come out of committee but the committee's report will be brought back to this House and members will be given an opportunity of debating the matters reported from the Committee to this House. It will not foreclose any debate in committee stage but since the debate in committee has virtually been completed, it would really then be a matter of discussion on the Report after which the House would then have the third reading. So no one is really being foreclosed by this action on the part of the House. You cannot change the rules of the House thus.
6.50 p.m.

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Well, Sir, I can now formally put to the House the proposal that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee, as indicated in what I said before with the names that I put before the House.

I now propose, Sir, that a Select Committee on this Bill be set up consisting of the following:

You, Sir, as Chairman

The Leader of the House

Senator Blackman.....

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg your pardon. With Your Deputy President. Yes, Sir:

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD

SENATOR THE HON. DR. C. D. CLARKE

and

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS

The Committee is asked to meet at 3.00 p.m. on Tuesday the 28th of March, 1989 in this Chamber if Your Honour so approves.

I beg to move that this.....

Yes, Sir, there are two matters pending which we would like to dispose of next week.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I beg, Sir, to move the adjournment of the Senate until Wednesday,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do you know when Good Friday is?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I know when Good Friday is, Sir – ..... the 24th March, 1989 at – Is 11.00 o'clock alright? Good. Thank you.

I therefore beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn until Wednesday, 29th March, 1989 at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, on the motion for the Adjournment, I should like for the record to make just two observations.

One, I think is customary, and I think probably because we were tired, it was an oversight on the part of the Leader to thank the staff for tolerating us for this exercise.

Applause.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: For enduring us, Sir.

And the second point I should like to make, Sir, on the motion for the Adjournment is to ask for some reaction from the Leader to the suggestion I made in my opening remarks yesterday as to whether Government would give some consideration to a review of our procedures in this annual debate so that the Clerks could be of assistance to us, in preparing a draft for the terms of a review of the Standing Orders for discussion of the Appropriation Bill.

I think perhaps some indication of your response would avert or avoid the necessity for bringing a substantive resolution. An expression, at least a preliminary view, will be of some assistance.

Mr. PRESIDENT: But you raised that already in a debate. I am not going to have the opening up, at this stage on the Adjournment, of a debate on that.

This is the motion for the Adjournment. So I am not going to have a debate now on the Adjournment on that motion, because you moved that already. You would have to take it up privately with the Leader of the House. You made that statement in the Chamber already and therefore it is in the Record.

The question of a response is a different thing. But it is a question of procedure.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity myself to have heard the Honourable Senator. I just heard from my colleague the substance of what he requires.

It is enough for me to say then that we would like some time to consider it. That is as much as I can say now because it has taken me personally completely by surprise.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well you cannot debate the question on the motion for the Adjournment. The question is there is a motion for the Adjournment. That is all I am going to deal with now.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Well, Sir,....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Are you speaking on the Adjournment?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Yes, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No. You are speaking on what he raised.

Laughter.

The question that this Senate adjourn until Wednesday, 29th March, 1989 at 11.00 o'clock was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly at 6.55 p.m.

6.55 p.m.

CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PRESIDENT 1173

Receipt of Message from The House of Assembly that it has received and accepted the Message from The Honourable The Senate to attend the Senate Chamber on March 9th 1989 to await upon Her Majesty the Queen for the presentation of Addresses by both Houses of Parliament in celebration of the 350th consecutive year of Parliament in Barbados.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SEN. THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR 1173

The Estimates 1989/90

The Civil Establishment Leave Passage (Amendment) Order, 1989.

The Annual Report of the Immigration and Passport Department for the year ended 31st December, 1986.

The Annual Report of the Registration Office and Supreme Court Registry for the year 1987.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SEN. HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1174

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SEN. THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 1174

Resolution to approve the Leave Passage (Amendment) Order, 1989.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

THE APPROPRIATION BILL 1989 1174

Sen. The Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 1174, 1266; Sen. A. W. A. McClean, 1180; Sen. C. A. Blackman, 1196; Sen. Dr. L. L. Shorey, 1203; Sen. the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones, 1209; Sen. J. C. W. Wickham, 1211; Sen. A. J. N. Phillips, 1211; Sen. J. S. Goddard, 1215; Sen. Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1221; Sen. Anderson Morrison, 1224; His Hon. Sen. M. del. Jordan, 1228; Sen. D. A. Comissiong, 1230; Sen. Miss V. P. Brathwaite, 1237; Sen. Mrs. P. Y. Forde, 1242; Sen. T. A. Prescod, 1243; Sen. Mrs. G. L. Eastmond, 1250; Sen. L. A. Ward, 1253; Sen. Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 1256; Sen. Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1263.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEAVE PASSAGE (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1989 1268

Sen. Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1268

THE PARISH BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989 1268

Sen. Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1268,

THE TENANTRIES FREEHOLD PURCHASE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1989 1269

Sen. Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1269, Sen. C. A. Blackman, 1269

SUSPENSIONS 1190, 1221, 1237, 1253

ADJOURNMENT 1269

Sen. Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1269, 1270; Sen. C. A. Blackman, 1269; Mr. President, 1270.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Senator C. A.
CLARKE, Senator Hon. Dr. C. D.
BRATHWAITE, Senator Miss V. P.
COMISSIONG, Senator D. A.
EASTMOND, Senator Mrs. G. L.
FORDE, Senator Mrs. P.Y.
FRASER, Senator Mrs. V. C.
GODDARD, Senator J. S.
JONES, Senator Rev. Canon I. McK.
JORDAN, His Hon. Senator M. deL.
LEWIS, Senator Hon. L. V. H.
McCLEAN, Senator A. W. A.
MORRISON, Senator Anderson
PHILLIPS, Senator A. J. N.
PRESCOD, Senator T. A.
SHOREY, Senator Dr. L. L.
TUDOR, Senator Hon. Sir James
WALCOTT, Senator Hon. Sir Frank
WICKHAM, Senator J. C. W.

THE

SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 29, 1989

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Wednesday 29th March, 1989 at 11.20 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator Sir Frank L. Walcott, K.A. O.B.E., LL.D., (President);

His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President);

Senator the Honourable Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate);

Senator the Honourable L. V. H. Lewis (Minister of State for the Civil Service);

Senator A. Morrison;

Senator N. W. Boxill;

Senator D. A. Comissiong;

Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, B.S.S., J.P., M.F.C.A.;

Senator Mrs. G. L. Eastmond;

Senator A. J. N. Phillips;

Senator T. A. Prescod;

Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.;

Senator the Reverend 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 Honourable Dr. C. D. Clarke, (Minister of State for Finance);

Senator A. W. A. McClean

and

Senator Miss V. P. Brathwaite.

Prayers were led by Dr. the Rev. L. Crawford, S.C.M.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention and to that of members of the Senate a report which appears on the back page of this day's Nation, Wednesday, March 29, 1989, which is captioned "TENANTRIES FREEHOLD ACT SOON TO BE LAW" and the story, as printed, is as follows: "AFTER BEING held up in the Senate, the amended Tenantries Freehold Purchase Act will be passed into law, after all." Now there is a quotation which starts: "There is no doubt about it now. I think several misunderstandings have been cleared up and a two-thirds majority are now in favour," one Government senator said last night."" It goes on:

> "An eight-man committee met yesterday to review the bill after strong dissent from independent and opposition senators.
>
> The amendment of the 1980 Act seeks to enhance the rights of landowners and provide a generally more just system for dealings between tenant and landlord.
>
> Some senators had maintained the measure would work against people's right to ownership. Others believed the change was unnecessary, as there was existing legislation providing the same benefits.
>
> But last night the senator explained that the genuine and plausible concerns had been aired and explanations given and he was satisfied that the majority of worthwhile objections had been dealt with."

Sir, I wish to say first of all that when this was drawn to my attention some moments ago, because I had not myself seen the report, I took the trouble to speak to all Government senators who were and are members of the Select Committee on the Bill in question,

and out of an abundance of caution, although I thought I did not need to, I also spoke with other Senators not of the Government party, who themselves are participants in the Committee's work.

Without talking to any of them I felt certain that none of them was in any way guilty of this gross contempt of the Senate, but I assured myself by speaking to all the Senators, both Government and others, and individually got their own unequivocal and undoubted assurances, which I accept without reservation, that they were in no way responsible, either severally or individually, for what appears.

In point of fact, Sir, there is no report to be presented today, because the Committee is still pursuing its labours, and it is under no obligation to rush back here to complete, so that the Bill itself is not now under question in the Senate. What is under question is the gross and unforgivable contempt which has been committed by this newspaper against one of the two Houses of the Legislature, and I draw Your Honour's attention to it because I think it is a very serious matter, and I do not know, now standing on my feet, what punishment or what rebuff we can make to this contempt of the Senate, but I am sure that Your Honour will yourself have some observations, so will other Senators.

I am also sure that we would be unanimous in our resentment of this gross slander upon members of the Senate.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think the time has come that the Senate should set up a Committee of Privileges to examine this very serious matter that is occurring from time to time and deal with it, so that the public and the Press will get to know where they stand in relation to the Legislature and get that matter in order. It is a question of the Committee of Privileges meeting as soon as possible to deal with any infringement that takes place.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, taking Your Honour's guidance, I beg to move that this matter be forthwith referred to the Committee of Privileges under Standing Order 64. I am not, however, certain whether that Committee is fully constituted. In the light of changes which have taken place in the personnel of the Senate, I am not certain about this, but to the extent that anything needs to be done to bring about a full and proper sitting of the Committee, we will proceed to that, I hope expeditiously, but I beg to move certainly that the matter be referred forthwith to the Committee of Privileges.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

11.30 a.m.

MOTION RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, there may be a motion relating to the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Committee of Selection was brought up to its full strength recently by the appointment of Senator McClean, and it will be necessary for the Committee of Selection to meet in order to name a person to bring the Committee of Privileges up to full strength. Your Honour is the Chairman of the Committee of Selection, and therefore it will be left to you, Sir, to indicate how soon it will be possible for the Committee of Selection to meet. I would suggest, that, if possible, after today's sitting the Committee of Selection might meet.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: The Committee of Privileges needs to be brought up to full strength now?

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Yes. It was the President and four Senators and it lost one of its members.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY THE CROWN OF LAND AT ST. HELENS, ST. GEORGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW ST. AUGUSTINE'S PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Order No. 1 was called – To approve the Compulsory Acquisition by the Crown of land at St. Helens, St. George for the purpose of the Construction of the new St. Augustine Primary School.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, there is only one Order under Public Business. This matter is a land acquisition matter made necessary by a decision to construct a new school at St. Augustine in St. George, and the purpose is to acquire two areas for the construction of the new St. Augustine School. One is an area of land not yet determined at St. Augustine's Girls School but this belongs to the Anglican Church, so it is a matter of the Diocesan Trustees and negotiations with them, and (b) an area of approximately 1.2 hectares of land at St. Helens, St. George, belonging to Moonshine Plantation.

This proposed new school is one of the several schools to be constructed in the second Education Training Project which is co-financed by the Government of Barbados and World Bank and the IADB, and apart from St. George, new primary schools will be constructed, we heard all this last week in the Appropriation Bill debate,

in St. Michael, St. Thomas, Christ Church, St. Peter, St. John, St. James and St. Philip.

Under the construction civil works aspects of the project, Government is embarking upon a second stage of school construction, rehabilitation and expansion which is aimed at rationalising primary school accommodation as well as increasing and approving accommodation at certain secondary schools. Other components of the programme would include technical assistance and institution improvement for the Ministry of Education itself. So that approval of the Senate is now asked for this Resolution so that the acquisition process in respect of these two parcels of land may be finalised.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I have some small concern in relation to this Resolution. Perhaps there is a plan that one may have sight of, in addition to which I wonder if the Minister could indicate the numbers that are affected by this rationalisation process in terms of the relocation of the primary school, and what improvement it is going to make for the accommodation of the children in the school. I have a recollection that the school adjoins the Church and it is on that escarpment in that area.

Asides.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: This is where the new location is to the existing school, so this would be an improvement because it is on a lower terrain than what currently exists.

The other aspect I am concerned about relates to the matter of the acquisition from the Church, and I think there is an understanding under the Anglican Church Act that when properties which were used as Church schools are handed back, they are put in good shape and condition. The Anglican Church has a long and honourable history in terms of providing places for education in the Island, and the state of hand-back sometimes is of a marginal quality for the contribution which may have been made by the provision of the building for the time it has been used, and I would like the assurance of the Minister that in handing this building back to the Church that it is put in good condition that it could be so utilised for a suitable purpose and not one that would leave a drain on the Church funds, funds which they really do not have.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I think this Bill affords us an opportunity to focus on one or two of the major problems which confront education today and in particular primary education. Based on recent reports it seems as though a crisis is looming in Barbados in relation to functional literacy. We are told now that an appropriate estimate of functional literacy in Barbados is no longer in the nineties no longer 95 per cent or thereabouts, but rather about 80 per cent, and this is something which we must view with concern, something which we must take urgent action to correct.

Going beyond the question of functional literacy is the wider problem of facility in English, and among those whom we classify as functionally literate, many of them have but limited facility in English, and this is regarded as something of an embarrassment to the community at all levels. We speak of persons entering and leaving the University with limited facility in English, and quite clearly this is a matter which the country needs to address as a matter of urgency. It is a national problem requiring a national effort; the teachers, the Government, especially the Ministry of Education, the parents and all responsible organisations in Barbados have some contribution to make to this particular problem. I am thinking basically that at the primary level is where you must make the greatest thrust in terms of making sure that this does not remain a continuing trend of graduating people from school who are functionally literate; but we also have a problem requiring remedial action. There are people who would have left school and are not functionally literate, and we must come up with schemes for rectifying that situation and we must come up with schemes to ensure that we do not continue to graduate persons from primary school and secondary school who are functionally literate.

Now at the moment we have a system in which the primary schools see as their main concern preparing students for the Eleven Plus examination, the common entrance examination, and to see this as a matter of intense competition, and they view success of the school in terms of the number of persons they can get admitted into Harrison College in particular and certain other secondary schools such as Queens College, Combermere, St. Michael's and certain others, and the school which gets the largest number of students into these prestige schools is regarded as one of the best primary schools. No notice is taken ever of the number of functional illiterates that is turned out of any school, and perhaps this is part of the reason why this is happening. We need to turn the spotlight on the performance of schools at the level of the low achievers.
11.40 a.m.

We need to identify which schools are providing the bottom 20% of students in the island so that all schools would want to escape from that situation so that there would be as much concern about ensuring that they can get students from that level where they are functionally illiterate towards some higher level of understanding of English as they would be concerned about getting the students into Harrison College or Combermere.

Until we can get our schools back into recognising that, in a real sense, their greatest achievement would be in educating those who are not so brilliant to a satisfactory standard, recognising that the brilliant ones will find

their way anyhow once they are not caught up into various areas of activities which will direct them away from education, until we get that focus back into our educational system, you will probably find the problem of functional illiteracy will persist and teachers regard the slow learners, children with learning disabilities as handicapped or persons which they have to endure for the time-being of persons who do not really require their full attention in the way the bright students require it.

Going beyond that, we need to look more generally at the curriculum in our schools at all levels, primary and beyond that, and recognize that the world is a very rapidly changing place and that the things that equipped us for life 20, 40, 50, 100 years ago by way of formal education, will not so equip us again and we must focus on the question of marketable skills.

We must be concerned about where the graduates from our secondary schools, tertiary institutions, can find a niche within the world of work with facility. We should not be producing people who have but little preparation beyond their ability to read, write and do things like that for the world of work.

The circumstances in which we could make good use of such people as clerks and so on are vastly diminishing and at the very least you need to have some facility in using some of the modern devices such as computers. You must have some understanding of the business environment and they must have other specific skills that would equip them to hold down a job and we should not see our education process as ending until we have made an effort to equip each and every one with some type of marketable skill and I think that this is not at all sufficiently emphasized in our educational system at any level at the moment.

Beyond that, we have to be concerned with recognising talent, not only academic talent, not only talent in Mathematics, English and so on, but talent in all facets in human endeavour and cultivating it. If we are going to achieve high quality of life for all Barbadians, this would mean that all Barbadians should be able to make use of their greatest talent in the best way possible and so there are some of us who may be excellent at the performing arts, if given an opportunity and there are some of us who may be excellent at sport if given an opportunity and we know that the best living you can make in the world today can be found in such areas.

The sportsmen and the performing artists are the ones who really can make a very good living in today's world because the world is going more and more towards an entertainment orientation, more and more towards the services as the area in which people can make the best living and we must equip our young people in that way and I do not think that our educational system from the primary level up does enough by way of identification of skills and cultivation of skills.

Going beyond the primary stage, it may mean that we need to look at the secondary schools and wonder whether we want 21 schools which are but replications one of the other except that one has higher status and the other one slightly lower status right down the line but they all attempt to do essentially the same thing.

If we need replications of schools one to another quite clearly the pattern of activity within that school would have to change because no one school at the moment is focusing sufficiently on the range of things that I am indicating and there may be room for some schools at the secondary stage that may be fairly well oriented towards the performing arts, fairly well oriented towards developing sporting capabilities and so on within students, and there may be room for a system where children can be transferred at various stages to such schools when it is recognized that they do have those capabilities and inclinations.

I think that these are matters which we have to address not only for economic reasons, but, also in terms of development of the human personality. We need to be assured that we give all persons the opportunity to feel satisfied with themselves in terms of being able to realize their abilities, being able to feel comfortable that they accomplished in some areas as someone and there are few of us who do not have the ability to achieve at least above average accomplishment in at least one worthwhile area and it is the responsibility of our school system to allow people to move in the direction where they can be accomplished.

I thank you.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I am all in favour of any steps taken to improve the facilities available for education in our country. While it is true that quality education can be provided in not such good physical surroundings, I do not think that there is any doubt that better, brighter, more commodious surroundings of facilities are likely to enhance the quality of the education provided and the resultant learning of the youngsters for whom, after all, the whole service exists.

I share the kinds of concerns expressed by the Senators who preceded me, particularly the points made at some length by Senator McClean on the importance of reading. I am aware that the present Government, like its predecessor in office, has, for some time, recognised that we have a major problem in this area and I am sure that

other Senators are also aware of the present experiment I just want to call it that, in I think about five schools where investigations are being carried out with respect to the possible benefits to be derived from some measure of specialization at primary level with respect to the areas. English Teaching and Mathematics.

I think that these are commendable steps which need to be noted, which perhaps, do not get as much attention in the public media and, therefore, not as widely known in the community as would be desirable.

I do not myself believe that there is any single approach to the solution of the kind of problem which our country now faces in the reading area. I think that possibly the time for a one shot approach as a solution has probably long since passed and, therefore, while we are quite legitimately seeking to tackle the problem, as I indicated before, by measures such as possible specialization, would be the likelihood that people who are most competent, most able to do this will get a chance to share their skills with a larger number of pupils, I would like to suggest to this Honourable Chamber that we need, perhaps, to find some means of helping parents across the country recognise that they have a more direct role to play even in so apparently straightforward a matter as reading than, perhaps, many parents recognise.

A friend of mine who writes constantly in the media is repeatedly at pains to emphasise the importance of example.
11.50 a.m.

While it is true that we depend on and expect the teacher to encourage reading and indeed to set a good example in that respect, I am not persuaded, I am not convinced that it is reasonable to expect teachers alone to shoulder this responsibility. With the challenge which reading faces from the electronic media, and I expect that the challenge is going to increase rather than diminish, somehow I think we need to try and persuade the parents that they have got to be more active themselves in assisting the contribution which the school is making. And I would therefore venture to suggest that it might be useful for Government, through its Information Service, to mount a well planned series of programmes aimed at helping parents.

For example, very recently, I think it could not have been more than three, four, five evenings ago, there was an excellent programme dealing with the importance of helping children, including the slower ones. Participating in it were a Paediatrician, the Principal of one of the very well-known preparatory schools and a former Social Welfare Officer. It seemed to me, as I watched it, that it presented precisely the kind of information which could be valuable to the individual parent. I was not high brow. It was down to earth. There were clear and specific examples of the role which parents could play and the kind of help which parents could give. And it would seem to me that it is in our own interest, as a country, to seek to mobilize, maybe that is a reasonable word, mobilize the potential among members of the community which could bolster and support the very commendable and valuable efforts being made in the national educational system. Because I do not think that we can depend alone on the schools.

And the question then is, Sir, how best can we seek to support the efforts being made?

I would wish to support the proposal for the improvement of the circumstances as envisaged in the Resolution before us.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, Sir, I am very happy that I recognise some of what I said last week in the area of education, and that it has been supported. Because my cry and plea, the whole question of why I supported the Bill, was the whole question of calling strongly for grammar as a means of communication. I think we will have to formalize grammar because it is quite clear in the news media that this comes over all the time. It seems to me sometimes as though nobody is making an effort to do anything about it.

It is true that we have to start in the primary schools. I think we should start back with a spelling book as well, Easy steps to Spelling, and a grammar book because grammar seems to be a thing of the past. Unless we do that, we are going to continue to talk about the functional illiterates, in that people are going to get a job in the newspaper or they are going to get a job at a radio station and they are going to end up with all sorts of singular subjects and plural verbs, as they do now. Sometimes you cannot even understand the pronunciation is so bad, everything.

So we need to get back to, if you want to say, the basics. We need to get back to that whole question of grammar. It is the society that will have a great role to play. If the society is accepting mediocrity, well mediocrity will continue, because very few people will dare to complain formally. All they will be saying is, this is bad, this is not good. But have they tried to formalise the complaint? Have they tried to do something about it?

And this is why I welcome Government's reopening of the Adult Education Programme. Because here you will get to the parents in the villages and the parents will be able to read to their children. In various community organizations, we need a lot more reading, exercises in reading. Let people read something. I think if this is

done in the primary school and we bring back formal grammar, I am not saying, talk about it in the Use of English. I am talking about formal grammar because a lot of our children do not understand what formal grammar is, and they do not know. And it must be brought back. If that is not brought back, you cannot build a sentence, you cannot build paragraphs, you cannot build anything. In the secondary schools, it is very necessary.

I am glad for the expressions this morning because it strengthens what I said last week that we should never remove Use of English from the University, if we are turning out these kinds of people and we are so dissatisfied and we are seeing that our country is going from bad to worse in the case of communication. Because language helps you to communicate with people, if you cannot communicate effectively. No wonder we are hearing so many bad words on the streets because people do not know the right adjectives to use. And if they were learning the right adjectives,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: They use the ones they know.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: ... in discussing they would not have to use those kinds of adjectives. There are other adjectives, which can, if you want to say insult, sugar the pill because you know the language. If you do not know the language you tend to gravitate towards the bad language that is being used. And I should like us to look at that as well.

And we keep saying, the teacher, the teacher. But let us look at the teacher and the parent together, the parent teacher relationship, and how the parent and teacher could get over this message to the children.

I recall when I was at primary school, you had to get a list of books that you had to read. And the teacher never told you when they were going to ask questions on these books to find out if you were really reading the books. I think we need to go back to some of these things. Recommend a list of books from the Library. Try to encourage the children to use the Library by signing them up at the school. It is very important. The children would become good readers because they do not want to sound stupid when the teacher asks a question on a particular book. They want to know that they had read the book.

Then it is how our leaders in the community speak. Children will emulate our leaders. If they get up there and they talk all over their faces and they do not use proper language, they do not punctuate when they get to a comma or something like that, children are going to emulate them.

I felt, and I said this last week, that the strongest medium we have in this country, television, should be used to get over the message to help those children, especially now they are on holiday. We should have some programmes on reading and then asking various questions on these various books, people pointing out various grammatical errors, taking the newspaper and stop tearing it to pieces and looking for grammatical errors, and showing the students. If we involve ourselves in these exercises, and I am calling again on the business community to help by sponsoring these kinds of programmes, not only GIS but the business community, we will get a more diverse area of subject matter in communicating the English language to the students.

12.00 noon.

It is always welcome when these schools can have, and some schools I know have, teachers who teach remedial work. I welcome that and I hope we will see that all over because there are always children who are slow learners. But I take the point that business skills can be taught to a number of children – how they are going to market, how they are going to get on with their business, how they are going to make a simple accounting system and bookkeeping system. The fact that they have a skill, lead them on with that skill so that when they leave school they do not even have to go searching for a job. They have created their own job. They know how to manage it. They understand how to deal with the bank. They understand how to deal with people. They understand marketing and costing. These are the areas and it is never too early to begin a child in an area like that if you see the child is not bent towards an academic sphere. Then after that there are facilities for lending money to these youngsters. One agency like the National Development Foundation or WID they can go and make a loan and get themselves well on the way to business. In this way.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of land to build a primary school construction of a new St. Augustine Primary School. I think you are widening your area too much. Do not bring in all of the institutions of learning and relate them as an example to show. Deal with whether or not we should purchase this land and with the text that you are looking at; not everything that you can remember that has happened on the face of the earth since we have been educating people should be raised in the debate. It is not relevant to the debate that we are having. We are purchasing land for the expansion of the school in St. George. I want to draw that to your attention. We have had education in Barbados for over 100 years. So we would have errors. But do not let us go over the hundred years recital of the problems we have had. Let us find out what are the problems now – should we purchase this land or should we not purchase the land.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, if it seems so to you, it was not my intention. My intention

was to conceptualise and to think that we were not only dealing with the physical aspect as others have not only dealt with the physical aspect. But if it is the way that you feel, Sir, I apologise. But I did not think that I could just stand here and deal with construction of a building and did not cover the subject in detail.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no, I am not suggesting that you only deal with the construction. I am not suggesting that. I am saying that the purpose of the Resolution – It is nothing I put before you. This is something you have before you, what we are discussing. We are not discussing all of the ramifications of education. Members of the Senate are a bit inclined to believe that as it is a Resolution that you have the whole parameter. The world is the Resolution. We will never stop a debate if it goes on that way.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Thank you, Mr. President. However, I still felt that I should touch certain areas.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not preventing you from touching the areas.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: I never said that you prevented me. But I said that I felt, and if in my trying to do this I went off, I am sorry.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not arguing with you. Do not argue with me. I am not arguing with you.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: I am not arguing. I said if I went off I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not arguing with you. Go ahead.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Saying I am sorry, Sir, is an argument.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I said to go ahead.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Thank you very much. However, I am still maintaining that the community has to get involved in this whole question of education and our attitude to what we do with our education is going to be a very important part. Various aspects of education people think are not relevant for certain children and I would like to make a serious appeal to the public to be more concerned that their children and not only with their children but in the youth organisations and so on with the whole question of reading, writing, and grammar and anything that they can get back to assist the children in the world of communications.

I close by again appealing to the media and the business community to do the same. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

SENATOR Miss V. BRATHWAITE: Mr. President, in rising to speak on this Resolution which is before this Honourable Chamber this morning, I wish to state briefly that the acquisition of land by the Crown for the erection of the Primary school, affords us an opportunity once again to redefine and to focus our whole education system. I think that we must bear in mind as we set about constructing schools for our young citizens that we must first of all ask ourselves 2 questions. The first question being – education for whom and the second question being – education for what purpose? If I may answer or seek rather to give some considerations to what we should have in mind in answering the second question first, we must direct our thoughts and we must focus our minds on the position of Barbados both in time and in space.

Mr. President, Sir, Barbados is on the threshold of the 21st century. We therefore need to look at our education system to determine what are the consequences that flow as a result of Barbados' position in time. We are a small developing Third World country, Sir, with an open economy. We must therefore start as it were at the cradle, that is, in our primary schools, to apprise our younger citizens of this fact and to educate them that this is the world in which they will have to work and live after they have passed through the primary system on to the secondary.

Sir, I think it is time that we look very closely again at the Common Entrance Examination and rid ourselves of the colonial yolk, of the emphasis only on reading and arithmetic as a means of preparing our younger citizens for life and work after school. I mention also, Sir, we must also look at who we are educating. We are educating the adults of tomorrow and it is not too early at the primary stage of our education system to drive home this fact. It does not, Sir, have to be any sophisticated language. As we know, communication is effective once a message is gotten across and once it is understood and therefore we must in whatever language we may use at that tender age educate our citizens on the direction in which we wish to proceed.

We must also, Sir, stress the application of the theories which we attempt to impart in our primary schools to the practical world. As I have mentioned earlier, no longer is the acquisition of a good grounding in English and arithmetic enough, but the science subjects, Sir, as some Members of this Honourable Chamber mentioned this morning, and emphasis on the arts and sports. I, Sir, would like to see sports elevated to almost co-equal rank to other subjects which are on the schools' curriculum. Sir, I wish to associate myself with the comments made earlier by Senators McClean and Shorey and Fraser.

12.10 p.m.

There are lots of us who for one reason or another find reason to criticise the present products of our education system. I wish to state that I believe very strongly that we have a chance to reverse that decay which has set in in our education system. It is not too late to reverse this trend – bad language, bad grammar, disrespect for seniors in the society and for teachers – and we must start at the primary level.

Senator Fraser mentioned earlier, Sir, and I wish to endorse her comments, that we must educate also by example. There is a place for the parents and indeed all adults in the society to educate by precept, by example. There also is a role to be played by the media in this country, especially the electronic medium, for example, which because of its visual impact has more of an attraction for the younger citizen, and therefore the programmes seen thereon will be of more lasting effect.

We wish, for example, to place on our prime time programmes which are educational, even if it is not a staid, formal educational setting. We wish to put on the back burner, if they must be shown at all, programmes like Days Of Our Lives which had no right being shown at 6.30 in the evening, prime time, when the kids are up. If such programmes must be on, then they would properly be telecast at 10.30 or 11 o'clock when the kids are in bed and the adults can watch to their heart's content.

Sir, I wish not to be much longer, having endorsed and associated myself with the comments made earlier. With those few comments I wish to repeat that all is not lost with our young citizens, and we still have a chance, while we are focussing on the construction of the physical, to redefine and redirect our thoughts to the product we are producing.

I thank you.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate, but we are talking about building and expanding the primary schools at St. Augustine. I think everybody will agree that the greater accommodation we have for primary education the better it will be, but we have to note one or two things.

I have been in teaching for a lot of years and I have been correcting these 11 plus examinations for over 30 years, and I can say this, that several times during those years we have had pupils who were taking examinations at Harrison College and we would have about six or eight of those children getting 0 in Arithmetic and 0 in English, at 11 plus, having spent five years already in a primary school. In my opinion, something has got to be radically wrong there when a child can reach 11 plus, and the first sum in the Arithmetic question paper would be something like this – 9, 7 and 6, what is the answer? – and you get children getting 0 both in Arithmetic and in English. Something has to be radically wrong. I cannot see how a child can spend five or six years in an elementary school, come out at 11 plus and not be able to write a good sentence, not be able to add 5, 7 and 9 together.

That never used to happen in years gone by when we did not have all these new, wonderful things that they are having now in education. When I was a boy at school, when you came out of the 5th, 6th and 7th Standards in a primary school, you knew something about English and you knew something about Arithmetic, and when you went to the secondary school they could not teach you anything about those two subjects. So you had all the time to spend learning your Latin or your Greek or whatever else you had to do. Why is it that today you have the electronic media, you have all these things coming and we cannot get this done?

What I personally feel is this, that there are some schools that need to be really looked at in a serious way. I do not think it is right just to say, as Senator McClean said – I mean it is right for him to have said this – that it would seem today that the prestigious schools, as far as the primary schools are concerned, are those who get most children into the sixth form schools like Queen's College, Harrison College and so on and schools are being judged in that way which is wrong, because you get just a few people getting inside there, the large majority of the people cannot read, cannot write and cannot do these things. So what I feel should be done by the Ministry of Education is to look closely at the schools where the larger number of children do not seem to be able to be getting on with their Arithmetic and their English as they should be. Something must be done there.

My own feeling is that what they are attempting to do in the primary school – I have said it already and I will say it again – they are trying to crowd too many things into the curriculum, making the children attempt too many things, and I repeat, they are trying to teach children less and less about more and more until they know nothing about everything. That is what is happening in the primary school, and I think we need to address that situation.

Another point I would like to make is this. I heard the comment by Senator Shorey that the parents should do a lot to help their children with the reading and so on. I will agree with that, if they could, but a lot of the parents do not read themselves. I cannot help my grandchildren with the Arithmetic and the Maths they do now, so how do you expect some other parents to be able to help them? When they used to do the old-time Maths I could help them with that, but these new-time things they have now I do not know, nor do I intend to know.

What I am saying is, what is happening now is that there are some parents who would be willing to help their children but they cannot help them, they do not know. Even to add and subtract now they do things in a different way. I cannot add and subtract like these people today. I also know this, that if you go into a bank and the electricity is off, you are in trouble to get what you want done. I am telling you. I have been into a bank already and the electricity went off and this person had to subtract something like $131 from something else and they could not get it done at all, because the thing was not working.
12.20 p.m.

This is disgraceful, so something is radically wrong at the primary level, and if we do not do something about the primary level, we are only as the Trinidadian say "spinning top in mud". I thank you.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, in supporting this Resolution, I would like to make a small observation and to voice a short concern. Circulated here this morning, Sir, are two drawings of the area that I believe are the two areas earmarked for the school. However, Sir, I am finding some difficulty in relating the two drawings to each other. I believe that when matters of this nature are brought before this Chamber that Senators and Members of Parliament should be invited to go and see for themselves the location of these areas in order that we can acquaint ourselves before we rise to talk on it. My concern, Sir, would be in the area, for instance, of what is planted on the Moonshine Plantation and things of a general nature as to what is the general environment. I feel, Sir, that when matters of this nature are brought before the Senate, Senators should acquaint themselves generally with the area to make sure that when they rise to speak they know what they are talking about in relation to the area. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, a number of comments germain to the acquisition of the land has been made this morning and other comments about the decline in standards of the product of the primary school system. I have just two or three comments to make. I do not waste words on things like this. The Government needs to be commended for continuing the programme of upgrading the primary schools, many of which have gone into dilapidation over time through neglect. In addition the Government is utilising new premises from time to time to provide playing fields and other facilities, hence the purchase of lands from Moonshine Plantation, lands which from what I understand were not being used for any level of agriculture at the present time.

The matter of the primary school system and the products of the primary school system is naturally of great concern to the Government, and what many commentators fail to say and which I think it is absolutely necessary that it be said, is that the teachers of 50 years ago in the primary school system were committed, dedicated, self-sacrificing people, none of whom you will find today, or if you find any in very much reduced percentage of 50 years ago, and until such time as the human factor is dedicated and committed towards ensuring that the children who pass through their hands come out and make some sort of mark, we will never again reach the stage where primary school children can hold important positions in our society.

If we look around us we can see products of the Sixth and Seventh Standards in the primary school system who were denied an opportunity for secondary education even in my time, persons who were denied an opportunity of secondary education and who still have continued to improve themselves. But the teachers of those years were interested in the pupils and they were able to get across and communicate with the parents. It is true that the parents were not as hostile 50 years ago as they are now. In addition, and it was just commented and I need say this as well, the teachers of 50 years ago did it gratis to assist in developing the human person. The teachers of today have more responsibilities apparently and therefore need more money; so they are not going to teach the average child if he is a slow learner whereas the teacher of 50 years ago would. This is a very important point and it is affecting the primary school system, and until we have the commitment ot these persons who dedicate themselves to teaching our young children, we will not be able to improve the product of the primary school system.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. President, I really had not intended to speak on this, but I am pleased to support the Resolution, and what other Senators have said and especially the points just raised by Senator Lewis. Because while it is desirable that we extend our school plant and upgrade the physical facilities and deal with the question of functional literacy raised by Senator McClean and marketable skills dealt with by another Senator, it is these human qualities that are so very important – standards of behaviour and discipline. Do we attach the same importance today to things like punctuality and courtesy, politeness and respect for other persons, respect for property? I submit, Sir, that children should really learn these first of all in their homes. It is a parental responsibility, but it is a responsibility that the teachers share with the parents, and after all teachers are role models, and I am sure all of us can look back, I certainly can and I don't think I am any different, and think of the tremendous influence that certain teachers, male or female, have had on our lives, on our outlooks and on our careers, training us for life, training us for citizenship; so I am indebted to Senator Lewis because I believe while we are dealing with the

question of physical plant and the acquisition of land and building schools and the curriculum and so forth, it is just as important that we deal with these qualities so that the children of today would become more responsible adults of tomorrow. Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I would like to say on behalf of the Ministry of Education that much appreciation will be given to all the contributions made on this matter this morning, and I shall particularly draw the Minister's attention to all the very helpful suggestions which have been given to us in respect of raising the standards of teaching or learning at the various levels of our school systems in this Island. I therefore do not need to do anything but address two perhaps of my own concerns about this matter.

I have been noticing now with some regret and distress for several years that all of those very highly educated people in our country or most of them, but all of a certain category who profess to find whatever is wrong in our society and to be articulate about it, are the people who tell us on the one hand that we must have a culture of our own, that it must be indigenous, autochthonous, that it must not owe itself or its roots or its development to anything outside of our country, and they tell us this in standard English, in the most impeccable language, as they should, because if you are going to transmit values to people, if you are going to tell them important things, you have to tell it to them in the best possible language. So on the one hand you have a situation in which those who want us to take a radical or more radical point of view and who tell us that, for instance, our dialect is the authentic Barbadian language, they don't tell us that in dialect, but they tell it to us in standard and rather impeccable English.

I see a contradiction there, and it does seem to me therefore that those who want us to go in that direction are not really going in that direction with us, because they are going to preserve all the nuances and the beauty of our language to hand on perhaps to their own children or the people who they influence, whereas a sub-class of Barbadian citizens will grow up believing that the fullest expression of their values can come in the dialect and through nothing else.

I sat at the Commonwealth Summit last October, if I may share this with the Senate, and although what was going on there was what should have gone on, it was a conference, the thing that arrested my attention more than anything else was that of the, let us say, 49 heads of delegation there, all without exception addressed the conference in English, but there were only about 16 delegations of whom English was the first language. So you had 34 heads of delegations for whom English was their second and not their first language, making themselves at home in a common language as fluently, whether it was President Kaunda or the King of Lesotho or the Sultan of Brunei or whoever it was, they all spoke standard, idiomatic English and were understood by everybody else. Yet, of course, each of them would have been proud of their own native tongue, especially for those whom were Swahili speaking, which is not only a basic word language but has a literature of its own, but they all used English and everybody was comfortable with it.

12.30 p.m.

I thought that, perhaps, it is a truism that more people now use English as a second language than use it as a first and this is not only a frightening thing but it means, therefore, that we have to improve our own use of our own language otherwise we are going to be overwhelmed by lots of people who not only use our language because they want to be better at trading, they want to be better at everything, they want to improve their economies, they want to improve their societies generally, and they are using our language because it conveys to them the concepts which may be deficient of which their own language may be deficient.

I also want to share this last observation with the Senate. When I used to be more proficient in the German language than I am now, because it has gone out of use now so far as I am concerned, the opportunities to speak it, I used to notice something by half a dozen or so visits to Germany. If I were in a part of Germany where they had a local dialect and they realized that I could only speak what they call the High German, they would switch, as a matter of courtesy, from their own local dialect to Hoch Deutsch, as they call it, so that I could be understood by them and they by me.

The point I am making, Sir, is that I have no objection to speaking dialect myself. I do it. If I see somebody with whom I can make a familiar joke I would say "Wha you now come from?" But that is not a means of communicating ideas and values and, therefore. I argue for the retention of the language in its purest form, both for speaking and for writing.

I do not knock dialect because I think, as a matter of fact, and I have said this several times, that I believe Mrs. Jeannette Layne-Clarke is so good at dialect because she understands the standard language so well and you cannot really play around with the dialect to its best advantage unless you understand the language.

The two things are not contradictory but I make a plea for the retention of our standard form of English and I want to insist that no matter how Barbadian you are, English is the language of Barbadians and no other language except, of course, we learn a foreign language for ease of reference or from choice and I am not going to make apologies for speaking and writing proper English because I know no other language basically.

I wish to insist, therefore, that my own attitude would be always to promote an interest in the standard language because that is where we are going to be able to compete with those who are now taking our standard English and making it their second language and using it, hopefully enough, against us in competition, in trade and in everything and here would we be not clinging to the dialect because foolish people tell us to, forgetting that if we want to trade with the Japanese, or with the Germans, or anybody in Latin America, we will have to be able to believe that the nuances of our language are, in some instances, more clearly understood and used by them than by us merely because we have been neglecting what is our own heritage.

I would like to say this if it is an input into all the things we have been saying about education because I think the basis of education is the command of a language and I do not know of anywhere you can educate a people unless you teach them their own language properly.

Thank you, Sir.

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, that concludes Government Business but, I believe, there is some Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Order No. 3 was called – Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1988.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I move that this Bill be recommitted because I think on the occasion when it last came to the attention of the Senate certain procedures were not duly complied with. I therefore move that the Bill be recommitted at this stage.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am not clear as to what you are moving. How do you mean you move that the Bill be recommitted?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, if I understand the Senator, at the time at which the Bill was being considered, the discussion on it ended with the Senator moving the Second Reading of the Bill. I believe he had begun to address the House on it when there was an intervention, I believe, on my part, I cannot remember this very accurately, and in consideration of that intervention, further consideration of the Bill was then postponed so that what we can, perhaps, do now is to resume debate on the Second Reading, if the Honourable Senator wishes.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: That is the intention, Sir.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are asking that we resume the Second Reading on this matter that stands in your name?

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: That is right, Sir.

In the interval that has elapsed since we met, perhaps it would be timely just to briefly refresh Honourable Senators as to the purpose of the Bill which is to require a report on compulsory.....

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: The Order Paper seems to indicate that Senator Blackman spoke on the Second Reading already and presumably, his next turn is when he is winding up the Second Reading so I am wondering if there is some explanatory statement antecedent to his final reply because I presume other Senators would want to speak.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Other Senators can speak because he is resuming his own speech on the Second Reading. He was resuming his own speech and adding to it.

Mr. PRESIDENT: On December 8, in the Minutes I have, Senator Blackman spoke and moved the Second Reading of the Bill. Is that what it is?

Aside.

Mr. PRESIDENT: So he was speaking on the Second Reading but he confused himself today by wanting to introduce something other than the Second Reading so he was informed that he cannot go backwards. He has to go forward. He has to go to the Second Reading and take up the threads which is the Second Reading. That is where you are.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I am indebted to you, Sir.

The Bill seeks to require reports to be laid in Parliament of lands compulsorily acquired during the preceding financial year, plus a statement as to whether compensation has been paid or not paid and, when not paid, reasons for non-payment.

It has been a concern of mine in this Honourable Chamber for some time as to the accountability of public officers to the Senate in respect of property acquired. Indeed, there is a question on the Order Paper asking details as to lands compulsorily acquired over a three year period, the question of which notice was given just over a year ago and still remains unanswered.....

12.40 p.m.

I think if the Bill before the Senate is adopted, then it will ensure that Questions of the kind I have asked will not be required in the future.

In the circumstances, Mr. President, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, I should like to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, in rising to support the motion, I should like to direct attention to the purpose of the particular legislation relating to the acquisition of land by Government.

I was perusing the Act itself to indicate whether it was clearly set out there, the particular circumstances under which that Act should be invoked. I see no clear guidance in terms of the provisions of the Act.

But somehow I have the impression that that was intended not to be the normal way in which Government would acquire any and all land or property that it has to acquire, but to be a provision which can be invoked in circumstances where there is not a willing vendor or some other circumstance which would make it appropriate. Not as the ordinary, normal and the only way in which Government would go about acquiring land.

I suspect that in recent years that it seems to be becoming the normal way of Government of acquiring land. I do believe that there are certain dangers that can lie in that direction, if it is presumed that this is the normal way that Government would always acquire land under the presumption that it is in the common good, in the public's interest and so on, and that there is not any deliberate attempt to identify circumstances when it is not absolutely crucial that Government should acquire that particular lot of land, as opposed to another one where there is a willing vendor.

You can find that you can move into a situation where society and future Ministers of Government, not the present ones, might start to think that it is within their discretion to acquire any land willy nilly so to speak, on the grounds that it is within the public's interest.

So I would suggest that maybe Government should give some careful consideration to this matter. As a matter of course, try wherever possible to acquire land in the normal way by way of normal agreement, normal way of proceeding in terms of transfer of title, and use the Land Acquisition Act as an emergency measure when there are road blocks in relation to that process and in relation to land that is truly strategic – not just land that you want because you like it – to have that land for that purpose, or else, for some other good reason which would indicate that the normal procedure is not appropriate at that time. Wherever it is appropriate the normal procedure for acquiring land should be used in preference to the Land Acquisition Act.

Also, I rather think that the Act puts certain restrictions on what Government can do with the land thereafter. I suspect that the purposes for which the land is acquired must be clearly stated and if there is to be any variation, Government should come back to Parliament. I suggest that should be borne in mind and be adhered to scrupulously at all times. I am not so sure that that has been the case historically.

I thank you.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The question is.....

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, having seconded the motion, I should just like to add a few words. I do not know that it is likely to be a controversial measure before this Honourable Chamber and I certainly share the view expressed by the mover of the motion that it will be eminently desirable for somewhat greater accountability to be had with respect to Parliament. It is particularly on those grounds that I should like to urge support for this motion, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: The Government has, Mr. President, no objection to the terms of this Bill.

We see it, at least in principle, as a very good attempt to promote a better way of keeping track of land transactions done on the part of Government itself, and also to make an adequate response to popular demand that when property is acquired it is acquired for purposes which are understood to be national and urgent, and not of course, as some Senators have suggested, because it could be acquired as an alternative way to lengthy negotiations.

However, the Bill will have to go to the Other Place and if they wish to draw our attention to other aspects of the problem which will strengthen the Bill, I daresay they will do so, and it will come back to us in whatever form for us to consider further.

But meanwhile, we accept it in principle.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The question is that this.....

SENATOR Miss VERE BRATHWAITE: Mr. President, in rising to support the Bill before this Honourable Chamber at present, I wish just to make one observation.

First of all, the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, is a very powerful piece of legislation. It enables Government

to acquire the land of private landowners in the society. And as such, Sir, I am heartened to note Senator Blackman's concern in bringing this Bill before this Chamber, particularly the new section which he is seeking to insert into the present legislation, by way of amendment. And more particularly, Sir, Section 8A (1), which would require the Chief Surveyor, in cases where compensation has not been paid in six months after the preceding financial year, to state the reasons for the non-payment of compensation. And I say that, Sir, because, recalling my earlier comments that the Land Acquisition Act is indeed a powerful piece of legislation, that persons should be compensated and within reasonable time.

There are many cases, Sir, of distress and dissatisfaction over the method and the time that is taken for Government to compensate private landowners. It is necessary and the honourable thing to do is to compensate these persons within a reasonable time after the land has been acquired.

So those are just a few comments I wish to make in supporting this Bill.

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

On the motion of SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.
12.50 p.m.

COMMITTEE

Clause 1 was called.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that Clause 1 stand part.....Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Sir, the Clause that we are asking to stand part should be amended to read 1989.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would that be Clause 1?

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Clause 1, yes.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We therefore make the correction that this Clause should now read 1989. Accepted.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN, the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee with amendment, and Mr. PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motion of SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I think that concludes our business for today except that I want to remind Members of the Committee of Selection that we would like them to meet immediately after Your Honour has left the Chair and then perhaps we can get some business done before those Members proceed to lunch. I mean only the Members of that Committee are involved in that meeting as far as I can see they are – Your Honour, Senator Lewis, Senator Boxill, Senator Blackman, and Senator McClean. Right.

So Sir, I take it now that so far as the Adjournment is concerned *sine die* would be convenient. I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn *sine die.*

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

CONTENTS

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS 1272

Senator Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1272, 1273; Mr. President, 1273.

MOTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE.....1273

Senator Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1273; Senator J. C. W. Wickham, 1273.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY THE CROWN OF LAND AT ST. HELENS, ST. GEORGE FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW ST. AUGUSTINE'S PRIMARY SCHOOL.....1273

Senator Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1273,1281; Senator A. W. A. McClean, 1274; Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 1276; Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones, 1279; Senator Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1280; Senator J. S. Goddard, 1280; Senator C. A. Blackman, 1274; Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey, 1275; Senator Miss V. P. Brathwaite, 1278; Senator A. J. N. Phillips, 1280.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1988.....1282

Senator C. A. Blackman, 1282; Senator Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1282, 1283; Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey, 1283; Senator A. W. A. McClean, 1283; Senator Miss V. P. Brathwaite, 1283.

ADJOURNMENT.....1284

Senator Hon. Sir James Tudor, 1284.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Senator C. A.
BRATHWAITE, Senator Miss V. P.
FRASER, Senator Mrs. V. C.
GODDARD, Senator J. S.
JONES, Senator Rev. Canon I. McK.
LEWIS, Senator Hon. L. V. H.
McCLEAN, Senator A. W. A.
PHILLIPS, Senator A. J. N.
SHOREY, Senator Dr. L. L.
TUDOR, Senator Hon. Sir James
WALCOTT, Senator Hon. Sir Frank
WICKHAM, Senator J. C. W.