
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

SENATE

Wednesday, November 27, 1991

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Wednesday, November 27, 1991, at 11.00 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator M. deL. JORDAN, (Acting President);

Senator the Honourable L. V. H. LEWIS (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries) (Leader of the Senate);

Senator A. MORRISON;

Senator Mrs. V. C. FRASER, B.S.S., J.P., M.C.F.A.;

Senator A. J. N. PHILLIPS;

Senator the Honourable Dr. C. D. CLARKE (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce);

Senator Dr. Frank W. ALLEYNE;

Senator Miss Y. V. WALKES;

Senator Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH;

Senator Dr. E. A. SIMMONS;

Senator J. J. PAYNE;

Senator Mrs. Ada STRAUGHN, G.C.M.;

Senator Mrs. M. WALCOTT;

Senator C. O. WILLIAMS;

Senator the Rev. Canon J. L. SPRINGER;

Senator J. G. BELLAMY;

Senator J. A. F. COLE;

Senator T. E. BARKER; and

Senator Miss M. A. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were led by Senator the Rev. Canon J. L. SPRINGER.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: The Senate is in session.

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: We have received the following message from Her Excellency the Governor-General dated August 2, 1991;

"Ref. GG:4 Vol. IX

Dear Mr. President:

I shall be absent from office for medical reasons from 6 August to 13 September 1991.

In accordance with provisions of section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution, the Chief Justice, the Hon. Sir Denys Williams, GCM, will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of my absence.

As the Honourable the Senate will not be meeting prior to 6th August, it will not be possible for the usual formal message to be sent down to your Chamber. Will you therefore please bring my absence formally to the attention of the Honourable the Senate when next it meets."

Another message has been received from Her Excellency the Governor-General dated 30 October 1991 and it reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. President:

I shall be away from the Island from 30 October to 4 November 1991 on an official visit to the United Kingdom in order to receive the insignia of the Dame Grand Cross, the most distinguished order of St. Michael and St. George from Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 29(1)(b) of the Constitution the Honourable Mr. Justice Husbands CHB will perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of my absence.

As the Honourable the Senate will not be meeting prior to my departure it will not be possible for the usual formal message to be sent down to your Chamber. Will you therefore please bring my absence formally to the attention of the Honourable the Senate when next it meets."

I have also been in receipt of the following message No. 2/1991 from Her Excellency the Governor-General:

"Her Excellency the Governor-General
to
The Honourable the Senate

Her Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the Senate that, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, under Section 3(1) of the Ombudsman Act, Cap. 8A, she proposes to re-appoint Sir Frank Milton Blackman, KA, KCVO, OBE, JP, to the Office of Ombudsman established by Section 2 of the said Act.

Her Excellency proposes that Sir Frank Milton Blackman, KA, KCVO, OBE, JP, shall vacate the office of Ombudsman on attaining the age of sixty-seven.

Her Excellency further has the honour to seek the approval of the Honourable the Senate for the proposed re-appointment pursuant to section 3(2) of the said Act."

This message was dated 29 July 1991.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I am commanded to lay the following documents:

Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption Order) (No. 9) 1991, Letter of Intent under the proposed adjustment programme between Barbados and the International Monetary Fund,

Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1990-91,

Civil Establishment (General Amendment) Order 1991,

Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1990.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the financial year 1988-89,

National Insurance and Social Security (Collection of Contributions) (Amendment) Regulations 1991,

National Insurance and Social Security (Benefit) (Amendment) Regulations 1991,

National Insurance and Social Security (Benefit) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 1991,

Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending 31 December 1990,

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for the year 1990.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: The Select Committee has been meeting but there is no report before us yet.
11.25 a.m.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

SENATOR A. MORRISON: At this stage, Sir, I would like to make a request that at some appropriate time in today's proceedings I can move to hear speeches on behalf of the departed Deputy President of the Senate, the late Asquith Phillips.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you. That is well received, Senator Morrison.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that Senator Joseph Payne be appointed to perform the duties of Acting Deputy President of the Senate for today's sitting.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2) for the duration of today's sitting.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS the following Bills were read a first time:-

1. *Bill to amend the Exchange Control Act, Cap. 71.*
2. *Bill to amend the Land Tax Act, Cap. 78A.*
3. *Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, Cap. 355A.*

PUBLIC BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND TO
CONSTRUCT A CAR PARK AND PLAYING
AREA FOR ST. MARY'S PRIMARY
SCHOOL IN THE CITY OF
BRIDGETOWN

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, this Resolution seeks permission to acquire a certain piece of land, the property of the Barbados Diocesan Trustees, situated at Mason Hall Street in the Parish of St. Michael containing by admeasurement 832.6 square metres of land.

In July of 1989 some five parcels of land at Mason Hall Street became vested in the Crown for the purpose of constructing the new St. Mary's School. This school is one of several constructed under the Second World Bank Education Loan. This was the second stage of school construction, rehabilitation and expansion aimed at rationalising the primary schools in this country.

This area of land which was specifically acquired for the school to be used as a car park and playing area is now before us because at an earlier stage it was not possible to determine the precise area of land which was owned by the Diocesan Trustees. It was abutting and bounding on lands owned by the Crown in its right as Government. However, the lack of a survey has now been altered. The boundaries have been established, and agreed with the Anglican Church, that they are a part of the Diocesan Trustees property. The Crown having already used it, it is necessary to acquire the lands.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE
OF A NOTIFICATION RE ABANDONMENT
OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BALLS, CHRIST CHURCH

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, in April 1990 legislative approval was obtained for the compulsory acquisition for some lands which were the property of the Barbados Horticultural Society situated at Balls in the Parish of Christ Church. The land was subsequently vested in the Crown in accordance with section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act for the purpose of allowing the construction of the Industrial Access Road which is now known as the Adams/Barrow/Cummins Highway. Some of the land was used for the road. This other piece was not required for the road.

There was an agreement that the Crown would purchase the land at a certain price. However, the owner subsequently obtained an offer for the land at a different price. Since there was no need for the Crown to retain it a decision was taken by Cabinet that there would be no objection to the abandonment of the land, hence the need for the appropriate notice to be published in the Official Gazette relinquishing the acquisition and allowing the land to go back to the former owners. That is the substance of this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 3 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BOVELL'S GAP, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST.
PETER FOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, this Resolution relates to a parcel of land at Bovell's Gap, Speightstown in St. Peter which has already been used for highway improvement.

11.35 a.m.

As long ago as December, 1981 the Government acquired a portion of land measuring 163.4 square metres from the estate of Archibald Deane in order to facilitate the construction of the by-pass road in St. Peter. The acquisition resulted in the creation of a residual strip of land measuring 63 metres or thereabouts and given the shape of the land acquired and the piece that remained, it was realized that the piece was of no use to the owner in terms of it being used commercially. Indeed at one time it was felt that the land should be retained by the Crown in its right of Government because of flooding problems in that area and thence the land would be retained as Government land.

Government acceded to the idea of acquiring this residual strip of land and the appropriate sections of the Land Acquisition Act were in vogue and now this Resolution is before us seeking to give life to the decision that this 720.5 square metres of land should be acquired since it is really of no use to the owner, the rest of the land having been acquired for purposes of the road construction.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, I rise to support the Government's action in acquiring this land in Speightstown for the purpose of highway improvement.

We in Barbados are very proud of our road network. It is comparable to that of many developed countries. Tribute must be paid to both Governments over the past 40 years and especially my friend in the Ministry of Transport and Works for the sterling work they have done in maintaining our roadway in good condition.

However, Sir, I see signs of deterioration. I happen to live very close to Highway 2A, not the above portion but near the Bagatelle portion. It is scandalous the way how we have allowed our highways, especially Highway 2A to deteriorate.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, this in no way relates to that and that is totally irrelevant. Will you please stick to the terms of the Resolution.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, with your consent, we are talking about highway improvement and we are acquiring land in Speightstown....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: We are talking about the acquisition of a parcel of land at Bovell's Gap, St. Peter for highway improvement. This has nothing to do with Highway 2A.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, but it has something to do with highway improvement. I would like, Sir, with your indulgence to make the point that we are seeing signs that our highways are not being kept in good order. We congratulate the Government on acquiring this land to improve the highway.

I am making a subsequent point that if you are going to work on Speightstown highway that work has to be done urgently on Highway 2A and also Springvale Road.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is totally out of order. It has nothing at all to do with the Resolution which we are debating. Will you please stick to the matter in hand.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, as I read it, the matter at hand is dealing with Highway improvement and I am talking about highway improvement. I appreciate your ruling, Sir, but I am talking about highway improvement.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Are you talking about the improvement of the Springvale Highway? I am not too clear.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: It is a highway, Sir. It is not a lowway; it is a highway. I am sure that it has a number.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: All right, let us stick to the Resolution.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, I am making a general comment on road improvement and I thought that I was within my rights to speak about highway improvement. I am making the point that just as we are improving the highway in Speightstown that we need to acquire land to make sure that the people in Belleplaine, Shorey Village and these areas have the same level of highway as the one in Speightstown. Because they are as much taxpayers as the people in Speightstown are. It is very important that the Government, in spite of the economic conditions pay attention to road improvement. I was reading in the paper concerning the slippage in Springvale Hill and I read that one resident....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is being specific Senator Barker. If you talk about highway improvement, we permit that. But you cannot be specific about others. That is not in accordance with the terms of the Resolution.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I stand corrected, Mr. Acting President. All I would want to say on this matter is that Government use every means at its disposal so that our highways, especially Highway 2A, and I mention Highway 2A because of the difficulties associated with that project where if the Government had done the right thing on highway improvement that they would have made sure that in 1988 that that episode did not happen and, as a result, Highway 2A was allowed to deteriorate, especially the low part of it to such an extent that it is now a danger, it is now a hazard to pedestrians as well as to motorists. I am sure that cars are going to be damaged because of the lack of improvement on Highway 2A.

Asides.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I apologize, Mr. Acting President. Sir, I have no difficulty with the Resolution. I just want Government to make sure that, in spite of laying

off almost all of MTW's staff to make sure that maintenance is done on our highways. There is no sense building expensive highways and then do not make sure that the wells are properly cleaned and that maintenance is done in a timely fashion. Otherwise when the IMF programme finishes in eighteen months...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: This has nothing to do with the IMF programme, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Otherwise down the line, eighteen months from now we will find that when we come to work on those roads, we will have to spend vast sums of money on these highways because of the lack of maintenance that is going on now.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you for your contribution.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I thought I had a longer time. I want to hear the Parliamentary Secretary speak on this Resolution.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: With those words I support the Resolution and urge Government to take heed of the words that I said and make sure that this Speightstown Road that they are acquiring land to improve is not two or three years from now in the condition of Highway 2A.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: On a point of order, Sir. The highway he is referring to, Sir, has already been completed. The road went through this parcel of land and a piece was left back. We are now trying to acquire that piece of land because it was no use to the particular owner because the by-pass road went through the man's land and what remained of the man's land could not be used by the owner. That is the purpose of this resolution. It has nothing to do with any highway improvement at this stage.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Straughn.

SENATOR Mrs. A. STRAUGHN: Mr. Acting President, I support the Resolution wholeheartedly but I should like to submit that special attention be paid during the construction process to look very, very severely at the flood prone areas in that particular district. The construction could make impact on the areas that are extremely flood prone.

11.45 a.m.

Mr. Acting President, I speak, having over 28 years experience in that particular area and fighting with flood

waters. I repeat, Mr. Acting President, while I support the Resolution, I do submit that special attention must be paid to those flood prone areas which any construction or reconstruction can impact upon. Thank you.

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

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the sale to George Holder under the Crown Lands vesting and Disposal Act, Cap. 225 of lands at Rock Hall, St. Andrew, to be converted and used as a residence.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, it is a matter of policy of the Government that disused public conveniences should be disposed of either for community use or to persons who either owned the land before they became lands on which the public conveniences were cited or to persons living in the area.

In pursuance of that policy decision, persons were invited to indicate interest by public invitation and a Mr. George Holder of Rock Hall in St. Thomas, apparently indicated his interest in purchasing this property which was no longer in use as a public convenience.

The offer was for some \$1 000 which according to the Ministry of Housing was acceptable for the property. Permission was sought from the Chief Town Planner to change the use of the premises and that it be converted for residential use and that approval having been given, it is now in the hands of Government to dispose of the property to allow Mr. Holder to proceed with the construction of the residence.

I beg to move that the Resolution be passed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Acting President, I rise to support the Resolution for the sale of the former convenience to Mr. George Holder for the sum of \$1 000 because I believe that as I have said on earlier occasions, one must in the divestment process of making people in this country part of the main stream economic activity, especially where there are resources available that Government is not using, accommodate those of us in the community who wish to purchase.

My only concern, Sir, is that it is a situation where Government seems to subscribe to that view at one level but it does not seem to subscribe it at another level. One perhaps, Sir, is very perturbed that while Government finds it necessary or possible to be able to divest Government property under a certain value to people within this community, and usually the value does not exceed \$25 000, when it comes to assets of Government that is worth far more than \$25 000, in some cases, Sir, \$50 million as in the Bartel and BET shares, Sir....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley that is totally irrelevant. Let us confine ourselves to the terms of the Resolution.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: With all due respect, Sir, I wish to read ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: This has nothing to do with Bartel or BET.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Resolution is ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have it before me and I do not need you to read it for me.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not reading it for your purposes I am reading it for my own purposes.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: We can all read it. Therefore we know exactly what the Resolution is.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I wish to read it and I believe I have the right to read it if I want to, because that is the motion before us.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am aware what the motion is, Senator Mottley, therefore you go ahead with the debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Resolution is to approve the sale to George Holder under the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Sir. The words "vesting and disposal", Sir. In order, Sir, for Government ...

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, this charade has to stop. On a point of order, Sir, this Member comes in here and seeks to twist matters every time. It has to stop or I am going to move an adjournment of the Senate and then bring a Resolution concerning that behaviour. This is the last time I am putting up with it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, the vesting and disposal of government property: For Government property to be disposed ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat, Senator Mottley, we are dealing with the Resolution in hand which has just been read and you will stick to the terms of that Resolution.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225. Sir, in order to dispose of land, Government has to own it. In order to dispose of any asset, Sir, Government has to own it and the

principle underlying Government coming in here to bring this Resolution, Sir, as stated by the Leader of the Senate, is that Government has property lying down that it is not using and that it wishes, Sir, to dispose of because of the fact that Government is not using the property, Sir. I am saying that principle which motivates the Government of Barbados cannot be motivating it in one instance and not in another instance, Sir, and if this Government is frightened of discussions taking place, Sir, within the legislature of this country as is evidenced here for the two month recess that we just had at a time when this country is in serious economic trouble ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley that is irrelevant. Senator Mottley you are out of order. That is totally irrelevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: At a time, Sir, when this Government seeks to approbate on a principle of disposing of Government assets to members of this community and on the other level that principle is not seen to be consistent, Sir, and I have difficulty ...

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, on a point of order. You see this is precisely what we are talking about; the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) and the Honourable Member brings in disposal of assets. In a lower court you can do that but in the Senate we have something to do. We have business to do.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker you will not interrupt, please.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: And that is the only reason why we are here – to do the business. Not to go all around the world.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The definition of assets, Sir ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not require your assistance.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am not assisting the Chair.

Sir, the definition of property owned by Government, Sir, and Property, Sir, includes the word assets, Sir. It is synonymous with the word 'asset' and when Government is motivated by a principle to dispose assets, Sir, one would expect Government to be consistent in its policy of the divestment of those assets to the people of this country whom this Government says that it wishes to dispose a public convenience to somebody in Rock Hall, St. Andrew.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Payne you may speak on a point of order.

SENATOR J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Acting President, I do not very often get involved in these matters. I am speaking on a point of order and I am very well aware of the Rules of this Chamber.

Mr. Acting President, when this Parliament first met, the Senate ...

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER: Senator Mottley you will refrain from your constant grumblings. This is not in keeping with the dignity of this Chamber.

SENATOR J. J. PAYNE: The Senate made a decision, Mr. Acting President, that all of the new Members of the Senate would have a meeting with the Clerk of Parliament whereby....

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You will take your seat, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR J. J. PAYNE: ... the Clerk would go through a number of the Rules and Procedures relating to the affairs of the Senate. The Clerk, Mr. Acting President, had a session and I do not remember some of the Members attending. Let me just say that the matter which is under consideration is a matter specifically, which is brought under the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225.

Mr. Acting President, I find some difficulty in understanding why there should be some dispute in the Chamber as to whether the sale of BARTEL shares comes under the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act. I believe that Honourable Members must become aware of the fact that they should never seek to challenge the Chair whenever a ruling is made. This is something, I believe, that is very important. Members can disagree with the Chair on any matter.
11.55 a.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will take your seat.

SENATOR J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Acting President, Members are free to disagree with the Chair on any matter and there is a procedure to follow if Members are dissatisfied. But I believe that I could not sit here, Mr.

Acting President, and see Members seek to be rude to the Chair. I have nothing against a Member objecting to a ruling but I believe...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will take your seat. I rule that you take your seat, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR J. J. PAYNE: Mr. Acting President, I have not made reference to any particular Member in the Senate. I am saying that I could not sit here and see any Member of this Senate become rude to the Chair without making a comment and I believe it is very much out of place, Mr. Acting President, for Members to be seeking to deprive the Chair of its authority in these circumstances.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, on a point of privilege, before I continue my speech, I do believe, Sir, as a Member of this Senate that I have certain rights and privileges in this Senate and that is the right to be heard and the right...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am aware of your rights, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, Sir, but I am entitled to address the Chair on it and that is your job, Sir, to listen to me when I address the Chair on it.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am aware of my job and I do not wish you to remind me.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I did not expect you to say that, Sir.

Sir, on a point of privilege. When other Members in this Senate get up and make aspersions on Members of the Senate, Sir, the Chair normally and in all usual circumstances rules that you cannot cast aspersions on Honourable Members of this Senate, Sir, whether the aspersions are to be rude or whatever. But all of a sudden, Sir, I do not hear the Chair on this matter and I am asking the Chair to defend my rights and privileges as an Honourable Member of this Senate. If the Chair is declining to do so, Sir, I would like the Chair to inform me that it is declining to do so.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I repeat you may continue with your debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am asking for a ruling on the request of the Chair.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: What ruling are you asking for?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: For my rights and privileges as an Honourable Member of this Senate to be defended against aspersions cast by the previous speaker who sought to address the Chair on a point of order.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have no knowledge of any aspersions being cast and that is my ruling. You may continue with your speech.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: You have no knowledge of any aspersions being cast?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You may continue with your debate. That is my ruling, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir. I am entitled to speak on a point of privilege, Sir. If the Chair is unaware of the aspersions being cast, Sir, refer to the statements made by the Honourable Senator Payne.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat that I have made a ruling on that matter already. I said there were no aspersions cast and you may continue the debate. That is my ruling.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of privilege, Sir. I am asking the Chair to listen to me as I am entitled to be heard in this Honourable Chamber and as other Members for centuries have been entitled to be heard.

Sir, the definition of the word "rude" which was used by the Honourable Senator Payne in describing Members' behaviour in here this morning... Sir, there are only two speakers on this side.

Aside.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I have already told you that I have ruled on this. I rule you out of order and that is the end of the matter.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am speaking on a point of privilege.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have heard your point of privilege. I have heard it before and I have ruled that you are out of order.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: But you have not heard my point of privilege with all due respect, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have heard your point of privilege and I have ruled that you are out of order.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: What is my point of privilege, Sir?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You have stated it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, I have not. I have not stated my point of privilege, Sir. The Honourable Senator Payne rose in here this morning, Sir, supposedly on a point of order and in that point of order he referred to the behaviour of Members in the Senate who had spoken. If Senator Lewis wants to allow an aspersion of rudeness to go down in the records in respect to him, that is Senator Lewis' business. But of my rights and privileges I do not intend for any aspersion to go down on my character in this Honourable Chamber that I am rude. Webster's Dictionary defines "rudeness" as being uncultivated and uneducated and those terms must be unparliamentary. The deafness of the Chair when those statements were made almost cause me to wonder, Sir, whether I have my hearing impaired or not.

I am asking the Honourable Chair, Sir...

SENATOR A. MORRISON: I object to the term "deafness of the Chair".

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison, take your seat please.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I object to that.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison, please take your seat.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, the Chair might be blind but it cannot be deaf. Justice is blind but it is not deaf.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison, please take your seat.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: When those aspersions were made, Sir, I am asking this Chair that in the same way this Chair defends the rights and privileges of other Members of this Senate that my rights as an Honourable Senator of this Chamber, Sir, be defended when aspersions are made to those who had spoken. I was the last one who spoke so any rules of statutory interpretation would suggest that you go to the last in line which would have been myself. I am asking the Chair to rule on that to have those comments relating to rudeness on the part of Honourable Members be struck out, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: The Chair will not make any such ruling. You will continue with your debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, with all due respect, the Chair has to make a ruling. Even if there is a ruling against, the Chair has to rule, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat that the Chair will not make any such ruling and, if you do not desist, I shall have no choice but to deal more severely with your behaviour, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am asking the Chair to rule on matters pertaining to my privilege in this Honourable Chamber. The Chair has a duty to rule, Sir, even if it rules against me. But it has a duty to rule.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: The Chair rules against you. So that is it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am glad that my expectations have been fulfilled, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Please proceed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Now I can continue with my speech, Sir. Senator Payne, on his point of order, made reference to this Resolution of the sale of shares and assets in BARTEL and BET and the Chair at the time did not comment and it was not part of the debate. I, therefore, follow the rules of the Senate which allow me to speak on anything that has been in order during the course of the debate.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat, Senator Mottley, that you will not proceed along those lines and that is my ruling.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I do not know what lines to which you are referring.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat that you will not drag into the debate anything pertaining to BARTEL or BET. So you may proceed.
12.05 p.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am going to proceed, Sir. I am asking on a point of privilege for the assistance of the Deputy Clerk and the Chair in relation to the question of enlightenment to my rights under the Standing Orders and, in particular, the Standing Order which deals that once a matter has been introduced into a debate that that matter can be debated on.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That matter was not debated. Reference was made to your speaking about it, but it was not debated. Therefore you will not now drag it into the debate. That is my ruling.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not dragging anything into the debate, but my understanding of the Rules of the Senate is that once a matter is mentioned in the course of the debate I am entitled to comment on it, once the Chair has not ruled it out of order.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You may comment for clarification. That is all.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am going to comment upon it on this occasion.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, reference was made to the sale of shares at BARTEL...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You can only clarify if you have spoken on it, and I have not given you permission to.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I did speak on it, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I told you you were out of order.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I spoke on it before and if...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I told you you were out of order.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, no, Sir. I will listen to the tape at the end of the day. The Chair finds it convenient to see one side of the table.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I resent that very strongly and I repeat, if you do not apologise I shall take very strong exception to that and I shall invoke the full force of this Chamber.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I apologise, Sir. I will continue with my debate, and at the end of the day... I know only to speak the truth, Sir, and the truth is that Rule 34(5) says:

"No Senator shall impute improper motives to any Member of either House."

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am aware of that. I am not asking your assistance. Will you please continue your debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, "assets" are "property". I am saying and I am accusing this Government in the strongest possible terms that when it suits them it subscribes to the policy of selling off government property to people in this country who are Barbadians only if the property assets are worth less than \$25,000. Once the assets are worth more than that, in the millions of dollars, we don't see Barbadians like George Holder being the beneficiaries of the right to purchase government property in this country.

Within recent months, Sir, we have had a number of resolutions coming to this Honourable Chamber to approve the sale of public conveniences and the sale of former community centres or public baths to various Barbadians in this country. In fact, so many, Sir, that that has been seventy per cent of the matters that this Honourable Chamber has had to debate over the last ten months in this country. Despite subscribing to the principle of selling Bajans when the value is under \$50,000, we can see that they won't sell Bajans when the value is in the millions of dollars, and yet they subscribe to the principle and belief in economic enfranchisement.

Sir, the Barbados Labour Party, and certainly myself, cannot subscribe only to partial economical enfranchisement in the form of vesting Crown lands or government property to people once it is under a certain value. We subscribe that the value is in the millions and where Government is seeking to dispose of government property, where the valuation is in the millions, that it should not exclude the Barbadian public, whether resident in Barbados or resident overseas, who can purchase and bring in foreign exchange to buy the government assets that are for sale.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I am really offended because the Member continues to bring assets into the matter and it has nothing to do with assets and the Chamber should not permit this.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I didn't realise, Sir, that Senator Lewis was now assuming other responsibilities.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat I will not accept any rudeness from you, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am not addressing the Chair...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: If you are not addressing the Chair then you are not supposed to reply.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am sorry that the Chair heard that, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: All right. Therefore, you should have been addressing the Chair. Proceed with the debate. Get to the matter of the debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have been addressing the matter of the debate. With all due respects, assets are property. It is also very sensitive property, and it is obviously a very sensitive topic. I wonder whether when the same George Holder who has bought this land from Government goes to sell this land to somebody else whether he will be given the right to have property transfer tax and stamp duty exempted like BARTEL and BET.

Why is it that certain citizens in this country, corporate or individual citizens, have the right to have certain exemptions under the Duty and Transfer Tax Act and members of this country who are born here and who are citizens don't have that same right. Sir, this is only one of the series of many dispositions of government property and I hope that when we see the other dispositions of government property – some of them we don't seem to have the right to comment upon despite the fact that they are government property, like the same BARTEL and BET shares, and the other dispositions of government property that will take place. I hope that when we see that we will hear the same principle that is underlying this resolution to dispose land to George Holder – that it should go to Barbadians – that that principle will obtain in Government's disposition of the rest of its property, whether in the Barbados Flour Mills or whether it is BARTEL or whether it is the Barbados Light and Power.

I subscribe to the view that there are thousands of Barbadians overseas who have foreign exchange who would be more than happy to invest their money in profitable, government property if it comes up for sale. Give them a chance if you really subscribe to economic enfranchisement in this Government. If not, Sir, one would be left with the inescapable conclusion that this Government, has been in fact speaking with forked tongues.

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

ORDER NO. 5 – TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUL-
SORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SEAVIEW, ST. JAMES FOR
ROAD IMPROVEMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, this Resolution deals with the acquisition of a small parcel of land at Seaview in St. James which was acquired for road construction during 1988 and was utilised for road construction during 1988. This resolution now sets a seal on the transaction which allows the Crown in its

right of Government to pay for the land. Apparently, part of the delay results from a failure to arrive at a price for the land by private treaty, and hence it is necessary to move towards acquisition of 71.6 square metres of land at Seaview in St. James. The land was the property of Albertha Worrell.

I beg to move that this Resolution be passed.

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

12.15 p.m.

ORDER NO. 6 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH, TO
PROVIDE AN ACCESS TO
CROWN LANDS USED FOR
THE RESITING
OF HOUSES

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: This acquisition, Mr. Acting President, is slightly different from others in that the Crown acquired lands at Oistins when the road works were being done. The land was for the purpose of resiting houses in that area. However, on the lands on which the houses were sited, there were no exits from those lands onto any of the roadways. The persons who were resited decided to use an area of land which as it turned out was the property of Mr. Mark Bentham. What the Crown was required to do thereafter was to negotiate with Mr. Bentham for the purchase of that land in order that it would be possible to have an access from the roadway to the houses which were resited. That is the simple purpose of this Resolution.

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

ORDER NO. 7 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
GUARANTEE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BAR-
BADOS OF REPAYMENT TO THE INTER-
NATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUC-
TION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LOANS
MADE TO THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOP-
MENT BANK FOR FINANCING
INVESTMENT PROJECTS

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, this Resolution to approve the guaranteeing by the Government of Barbados for the repayment to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development of loans made to the Caribbean Development Bank arose out of an agreement entered into between the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly known as the World Bank, and the Caribbean

Development Bank on June 18, 1990. At that time the World Bank agreed to lend to the Caribbean Development Bank the sum of U.S. \$20 million in various currencies which would be used to finance investment projects and other regional investment projects in the area. However, the guarantee being given by the Government of Barbados will only cover that part of the U.S. \$20 million that would be used to finance projects in Barbados. It would not be a guarantee to cover funds which have been disbursed for projects outside of Barbados.

A similar guarantee was entered into between the Caribbean Development Bank for a loan of U.S. \$23 million. This was signed by the Government of Barbados on October 2, 1980. There is nothing controversial about this. There has been a precedent for it. We will be guaranteeing just that portion of the funds used within Barbados.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: Mr. Acting President, whereas Senator Dr. Clarke's explanation is very informative, I sincerely hope that the Government takes a serious look at the fact that when the Barbados Government signs a guarantee, it does so particularly on behalf of the taxpayers of this country and everyone in this country. Therefore, all projects to be put into operation to be developed with any of the funds used from this loan should be carefully negotiated for the betterment, in particular, and obviously, in preference to any other, of Barbadians.

It is acknowledged that the money comes from overseas and is, in all probabilities, put up by certain overseas Governments. We are all cognisant of the fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune. It is significant to note that other Caribbean Islands and certain sections of the developmental scenario are allowed certain privileges and somehow attain, some by agreement and rightfully so, others by strong lobbying.

With your permission, if I could elaborate. If a consultant for a project in the Caribbean when bids are called is within 10% or is 10% higher than an offshore consultant, the local consultant would in due course be offered the job because he has a 10% advantage. This does not apply to the people that implement the projects, i.e. the contractors in whatever form if there are contractors with their brain in that they are people doing studies or if they are contractors buying equipment. I find this in particular extremely difficult to accept because, as you well know, a consultant really uses very small capital and he is usually a gifted person and a lot brighter than myself in particular whereas the contractor has to go at great expense to bring in machinery. I shall highlight a simple thing. If a contractor today buys a bobcat he pays 20% duty on it. If he buys a truck he pays 45% duty on it. If this money

generates a job which goes out to international bid, it invariably stipulates that all equipment used on the job will be brought in duty-free. The local contractor is not in a position to go and buy his equipment every time to put on a particular job. He would have to utilise what is there so immediately he starts with a 45% disadvantage.

I think the Government also should look seriously in the awarding of these contracts to overseas contractors with respect to management fees charged to the particular projects by the home offices that are overseas. In respect of what I refer to in strong lobbying, it is significant to note that to date no Barbadian firm has been able to qualify for any work in Trinidad which has been funded by international agencies. It seems peculiar that invariably only Trinidadian firms qualify and it is just the opposite in Barbados.

12.25 p.m.

We are cognisant of the fact that the World Bank schools and other jobs going on here and I was encouraged and ask you to draw it to the attention of the powers that be that there must be some reason for that, that Barbados does not stand equal with others. And that if necessary lobbying for the protection of the local entrepreneurs contractors whatever be given as I would like to describe it, an equal chance. Right now local contractors or contractors of works are at a tremendous disadvantage.

I would hope, in finishing, to think that the Honourable Senator Dr. Clarke could draw to the attention of the authorities these facts and we look forward to positive results.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons.

SENATOR Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Acting President I just want to make a few comments with respect to what the last Senator has said. There is a lot of truth in the fact that when we are dealing with international agencies – and we have to understand how the international agencies operate – that they tie to the release of funds very often some agreement that makes sure that wherever the headquarters for the funding agency is that the contractors in that area have a benefit over the local people.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes, Senator Williams.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: I thought I had made that point clear, Sir, I understand that but it is significant to note that it is not happening in Trinidad. Jobs are being awarded there now and firms being pre-qualified and works that are a quarter the size of what we have pre-qualified in the Bahamas, in Dominica, in St. Lucia, in Barbados, in St.

Vincent and Grenada. I am aware of that. There must be a reason why Trinidad has some sort of dispensation.

SENATOR Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Acting President, I heard clearly what the last Senator said and I understood what he said but that is not the point I am addressing.

We have to understand in Barbados that we are an intelligent set of people. We have to get into the international arena and fight. We have the expertise in Barbados that we must join these organizations and compete at the level of the World Bank, *et cetera*. That is the place where we must fight. We cannot continue to sit at home and let decisions be made other places when we can infiltrate or join and rub shoulder and shoulder, have consultants in those areas where we too can make decisions. We must be part of the decision-making process. The problem we have in Barbados is that we are too hesitant to compete at that level. I am speaking from experience because I operate at that level. Caribbean people are too hesitant to send representatives to these organizations to participate and make decisions. If we are not in a decision-making position, we are going to always lose out.

I am suggesting, Mr. Acting President, that what we need to do in Barbados is to look again at our approach, do not sit and wait for the crumbs to fall off the table. Let us get up there in the decision-making halls and make decisions that are beneficial to the people of Barbados. I am saying that Barbados per square mile has some of the greatest expertise to be found anywhere on the planet earth but we have to understand that we cannot operate from Bridgetown alone. We have to get into Europe, we have to get into Washington, we have to get into Canada and if necessary we have to get into Japan. Because when the jobs are advertised we have to apply for them. We have to impress on our young people with the qualifications that it is not just good enough to sit in Barbados and allow people to make decisions for us. We have to go up there where the decisions are made and make some input into that decision-making process. That is the response I wanted to make. I understand what you are saying about Trinidad. But do not wait until it gets to our level. Let us go up to that level and help make the decisions.

Thank you.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, I rise basically to support this Resolution. But I want to issue a few words of caution. The Resolution is to guarantee by the Barbados Government repayment of any funds that might be used under this loan that is coming from the World Bank to the Caribbean Development Bank.

As I said, I support it, but I am hoping that this Government knowing full well that these funds are available will try unlike in the previous few years to utilize funding from the Caribbean Development Bank and perhaps some of these same funds that are being lent by the World Bank to the CDB.

I believe that there have been very little CDB projects being carried out in Barbados within recent years. One is perturbed that a situation like this could exist when CDB has available funds for projects within the productive sector. The same very sector whose decline has led us to the state of economic turmoil that we now find ourselves in. It is imperative on Government's part that they utilize funds that are available like the funds at the CDB or like the funds from the European Investment Bank and other international institutions to ensure that the help and the structural changes that need to take place within our productive sector are allowed to take place.

The Government must not allow itself to be cowed off or not to use these funds because of the very numerous requirements on the part of these lending agencies and banks like the CDB and the European Investment Bank and the World Bank. They must not be turned off by the fact that they are extremely intricate and competitive bidding practices that are required by these international lending agencies, Sir.

One cannot help but remember this Government's decision on the Highway 2A Project and what happened in that Project, Sir, as it related to money and funds from the World Bank \$5 million. One wonders whether as a country who understands that its very existence in an open economy is precarious that we can allow opportunities like this to pass by and allow our productive sectors with all the infrastructural development to enable our productive sector to thrive to suffer because of the fact that Government is not making use of available funds.

There was the Speightstown Fishing Project which was financed by the EEC, funds from the EEC and LOME I believe, Sir, which was abandoned, although a tremendous amount of funds had been spent already in architect's fees, in planning fees. All of a sudden it is abandoned. An industry which is part and parcel of one's major productive sectors that of agriculture suffers from the lack of infrastructure for fishing development in the north of this country. That may have led to the development of fish processing in this country. Jobs in the north, export earnings as a result of fish processing, all because funds were available for the Barbados Government to borrow.

And, Sir, to do the very same thing that Senator Simmons says that we need to do and I agree with him that we must set our goals – but I go further than him. Senator Simmons mentioned Canada, Washington, Japan and Europe and I talk also now about Latin America and Africa

because there must be south-south exports and imports; there must be south-south trade with goods and services. But the point is Barbados does not have the resources to put the productive sectors back on firm footing. They have to utilize opportunities that are presented to them by these international lending agencies when they occur.
12.35 p.m.

It cannot be right that we have not made use of the Caribbean Development Bank's funds for projects in this country as we should have or for other projects or other funding from various other international institutions like the same European Investment Bank or the same European Economic Community, Sir, who are prepared to put funding on the ground for us in a lot of these areas. But the question must be asked why is not Government utilising them. Why hasn't this Government utilised them in the last four to five years? So that I hope that coming here to ask us to approve this Resolution, Sir, is not an academic exercise and that indeed all efforts will be made, especially at a time like this when our productive sectors, Sir, are in crisis (they are not even in decline anymore, they are in crisis) and that we will make use of the opportunities available to try and rebuild these same productive sectors that exist and also use the opportunities, because the time has come when our development strategies, Sir, I believe as a nation, needs broadening.

We need, as I like to say, Sir, a reindexing of our productive sectors. What do we consider to be productive sectors in this country and what are we prepared to channel our help into in order to earn the foreign exchange necessary to get us out of the problems so that we do not have to tax our people to the point where they can't survive or remove jobs from them where they can't survive.

It starts at this point, Sir, and I hope that our actions in 1987 in relation to the World Bank will not prejudice any further dealings that we have with the World Bank or indeed how they regard us in terms of their willingness to deal with us, due to the fact that we were prepared to accept a bid that was not the most competitive bid. I hope that Government will not pursue a practice similar to that again which will disqualify us from further funding from overseas that we badly need to aid our productive sectors.

We have to be sensible, Sir, and it is impossible for us to talk about stabilising our economy now, Sir, without putting on the ground now because it would take time to work through the system, measures that will rebuild the productive sectors.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Alright, Senator Mottley, don't let us get into that, measures that will rebuild the productive sectors.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The money that is being lent by the World Bank to the Caribbean Development Bank is money that will be used for infrastructural development and development of our productive sectors. So that I am constrained to refer to that in my debate, Sir, because that is the purpose of the funds and if the Barbados Government subscribes to any part of that money from the Caribbean Development Bank for a change that will be the purpose for which it will be used in this country.

I am urging this Government, Sir, that that must be priority for them to locate any funding that is possible to help out the same productive sectors, Sir, because Government has imposed an austerity programme as a result of its inability to earn foreign exchange and build up its foreign reserves and it has been unable to earn foreign exchange because of the absence of proper development, Sir, and proper reform within our productive sectors, Sir. That proper development and that proper reform within the productive sectors which should have occurred has not occurred, partially because Government has refrained from accessing funds that have been available from international lending institutions as well as they should. They may have done one here and one there but, Sir, we hear complaints that they have been unable to implement the proposals in the Landen Mills Report in agriculture. We hear complaints, Sir, about the tourism report which has been sitting down. Government has not done anything with it, Sir, and there are a whole host of reforms and recommendations within these many reports that have found a comfortable existence on the Prime Minister's desk and a dusty existence, Sir, in the sense that they are not being used, Sir, which can be used ...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, I don't think the Prime Minister's desk has anything to do with the report before us. We have a simple measure before us, dealing with a Resolution to guarantee loans as they are drawn down and really I cannot see what this has to do with the motion before us. Thank you.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you and Senator Barker you will refrain from that. Please go right ahead with the debate, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: My commitment to loyalty is heartened by the fact that other Members of this Chamber find it necessary to express such deep reverent loyalty.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not understand you Senator Mottley and I told you to continue with the matter that is before us, that is, the Resolution.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am continuing with the Resolution.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I insist that you speak on the Resolution and not on other matters not related.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, as I was saying, those reports contain a number of recommendations which we need financing to implement if we are going to refuel the productive sectors to earn the foreign exchange so we do not have to take eight per cent out of people's salary or, Sir, to reduce ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That has nothing to do with this Resolution. I repeat. You will speak to the terms of this Resolution.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am speaking to the Resolution and I am making the point, Sir, that if the productive sectors do not receive the funding from these international agencies because the Barbados Government don't even have, according to the Letter of Intent, 1 1/2 weeks of foreign reserves, that if they don't receive this international funding, Sir, the productive sectors will never get back on proper footing to ensure a proper build up of foreign reserves in this country so that we do not have to go cap in hand begging other international institutions for foreign exchange when we have no bargaining power, Sir.

That is the point, Sir, and there is a very crucial connection, Sir, between any attempt to borrow foreign exchange, Sir, from any other international institution in the same way that there is an attempt on the part of the World Bank to place funds at the disposal of the Caribbean Countries for developmental purposes in the form of the CDB.

Sir, if we were using the funds at the CDB and if we were using the funds, Sir, that have been made available at other international lending institutions, we may not find ourselves in the position today where we have had to go cap in hand begging for foreign exchange.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating yourself, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am not repeating myself.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat that you are repeating yourself. That is the ruling of the Chair.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I have not finished my sentence so you do not know what ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I heard you perfectly well Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I will finish the sentence, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You will continue with the debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am saying, Sir, that when you have to go cap in hand to international institutions, Sir ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I heard that three times already.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: When you have to go cap in hand to international institutions, Sir, to borrow money, Sir, when you are placed in that invidious position, Sir, then when you have access to funds that are available, Sir, you have to make the best use of it, Sir.

There was a shift in the late seventies, Sir, from multilateral financing, Sir, to bilateral financing because a number of countries in the world who controlled or had influence within the international institutions felt that if they gave countries bilateral aid they would have greater control as to what took place within those countries, especially on a political level. One well remembers the manner in which this form of financing was used to exclude Grenada from ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is totally irrelevant. I repeat, you must stick to the terms of the Resolution. Proceed now, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, Grenada is part of the Caribbean Development Bank.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I did not say otherwise.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, Grenada is also entitled to access funding from the World Bank that is coming through the Caribbean Development Bank. And, Sir, there was a move in the late seventies for those of us who remember to move from multilateral financing which would have been the form in the Caribbean through the form of the same Caribbean Development Bank, Sir, to the form of bilateral financing and that, Sir, led to less funds coming to the Caribbean Development Bank, Sir, in the late seventies, early eighties than are presently available now, Sir. And, Sir, if you understand anything about international finance and the movement of...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I resent that inference, if I understand anything about it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, if one understands. I am not talking ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you for couching your language differently.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, I hope that my privileges would be defended, Sir, in the same way. Sir, if one understands anything about international financing, Sir, one would understand, Sir, that this sudden move in the latter half of the eighties back to multilateral financing, Sir, has resulted from the fact that a lot of these international governments no longer have to worry as far as they are concerned to the same degree about the political events in countries in the third world because of the absence of the cold war now, Sir. This is meant then that institutions like the Caribbean Development Bank will have a renewed burst of activity because they will have a greater set of funds which are being made available to them. There is no threat of communism to be calmed in Grenada so there is no need for them to give funds to countries only on a bi-partisan basis. They can afford to go through the multi-partisan way. Sir, I am to see that happening because it means that the CDB is in a perfect position to focus and to fine tune certain programmes that are complimentary of each other within the Caribbean and hopefully would be part and parcel of persuading the Governments in the region to avoid any duplication of services within the productive sector.

12.45 p.m.

Sir, there are a number of dimensions of this Resolution here today. There are those which relate to us locally, Sir, and these funds have been accessed over the years. There are those which relate to the fact that it is hardly perceived that the CDB will have a renewed burst of activity but one hopes that it becomes even more powerful in its ability to cater to the economies of the region, Sir, which are in bad need of the funds, and in so doing that it will help in the coordination of macro-economic policies and policies relating to the common productive sectors throughout the region, Sir, so that we in the Caribbean will truly make the best of what limited resources we have available to us at a time of this economic turbulence.

Sir, I support the Resolution but I urge this Government to please make use of the Caribbean Development Bank funds and do not let the funds sit down there and not being used by the Barbados Government at a time when our productive sectors are in serious trouble and we are forced to take serious domestic action.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: While I recognise you, Senator Fraser, I was just thinking of the luncheon break. All right, Senator Fraser.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Thank you very much, Mr. Acting President. First of all, Sir, I support the Resolution. I want to look at what Senator Simmons and

Senator Williams were looking at and that is the whole question of those persons who have had the opportunity of attending international fora. We note with some concern on many occasions when we hear that Barbados is entitled to certain sums of money but there was nobody to put up a proposal. I think this worries me a lot and I believe that we are on the road now to having special persons through External Affairs, something I was calling for in here for a while, to be involved in the area as not just a diplomat but to be in charge of certain areas of activity which will include the productive sector like people who would have an agricultural lobby at the EEC whether it is LOME or whatever. We must have these lobbies and we must have these lobbyists in position.

The one thing that worries me is that Barbadians tend to believe that when we are sending people to these places that we are just wasting money. If you were to be aware of what goes on in the international arena, you would realise that you could never waste money if people are going to use their influence and knowledge to get money for their own country to help with its development. I sincerely hope that we have more attaches or we will have more Barbadian citizens who will form some lobbyist groups overseas whether it is in Canada, England, or Germany in order to speak to the powers that be. Some of us do not believe in cocktail parties. But I can tell you from my own experience at the time when we had that Resolution to pass remedying agriculture that all the little functions that we could go and talk to the "biggest", if you want to use that Barbadian word, and it surely helped us in getting funding in many areas of development for our women. This goes also for development for countries. There are many people that you get to know and these people have to make certain decisions. You become involved with them and you use your diplomacy. You tell them about your country and what your country wants. I am sure, Senator Williams, will not be bothered much more if we have people doing this.

When you are talking about being nationalistic, you have to be serious. It is one thing to get up in here and say that I am nationalistic, but it is another thing that when I am at an FAO Conference or a UNICEF Conference and there is money to be had for Barbados and I sit down and say nothing. You have got to fight. It is a very serious fight. Blows going left, right, and centre because everybody is trying to vie for a position for their own country. I think that some of the other Caribbean countries seem always to win out even in terms of staffing to get their people in the arena. We have to support our own people and to me in Barbados that is one of our biggest problems. We go out there to conferences and we support other people. I am not telling you to support a fool. I am telling you to support a person who has been sent there and who is knowledgeable in a particular area. I am sure that in selecting here in Barbados we will always try to select the best and if the

best is there we have to support the best in order to get the benefits for Barbados. Let us then when we get out there close our ranks and be serious about how we want to develop this country, the areas we want to get the foreign exchange from, or the areas of export where we can get foreign exchange. But we have to spend money in order to get money.

There is no need about sending people on a trip. It is not a trip. It is a serious working time for the person. Sometimes you have to spend a whole day at a meeting. You keep on the same clothes and then go to a function in the evening and that is because you are committed to your country and you do not want to leave any stone unturned. 12.55 p.m.

Another thing we have to look at: when we are sending people on those missions, we have to look at not sending one person. We must have a back-up. Somebody might become ill. I want Senators to understand that our Barbadian citizens have to understand that it is time they stopped talking the nonsense they talk when people are going to these agencies – that this body shouldn't go and such. We need people with back-up information, people who are serious and understand how to negotiate. If you don't have that kind of person then you are wasting time.

I think that we should have a programme to inform citizens about lobbying, about raising funds abroad and the sort of hard-line people you have to deal with who have been doing this thing morning, noon and night, who are going to look at simple things that happened. For instance, if Barbados gets a name to be a place where we have a lot of rabble rousers, you have to work harder to attract funds to the country. Therefore it behooves us to stop the foolishness of trying to put ourselves on television as rabble-rousers and showing every little thing that goes wrong. In their countries they have things that go wrong every day too, but they are not putting it on their television to show you, and they are not going to explain their business to you. It is high time that we understand that we have been known as people who have always been people of good manners, decency, common-sense and great intelligence.

The same way that Barbadians have been professors abroad and they can be working for the World Bank and all these institutions, let us utilise the resources of our people and let us not cry down these people because they make a mistake. Let us get other people to bolster them so that at the end of the day, Barbados will be better.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I have to confess I wasn't minded to intervene in this debate, but there are some things which were said which necessitate my intervention.

I don't think any right-thinking Barbadian would have any reservation about supporting this resolution. The purpose of the resolution is very clear: the Government and the people of Barbados are being called upon to underwrite money which is being loaned to the Caribbean Development Bank, and the ultimate purpose is the financing of investment projects in Barbados. No person residing in Barbados could have a difficulty in supporting this resolution.

However, I am constrained to comment that I would support the Leader of the Opposition in broadcasting debates of the House if for no other reason than for Senator Mottley's contribution would be heard. Mr. Acting President, Senator Mottley's contribution is full of sound and fury signifying nothing. It is the most empty contribution I have heard in this Senate while I was here – a bundle of nonsense. Imagine an Honourable Senator talking about the Government earning foreign exchange. That is in the record of this debate. Imagine an Honourable Senator getting up in this debate and talking about international governments. Where are the international governments? It is a lot of nonsense. I would like to see these things broadcast to expose the nonsense which goes on in the House for debate. It is more than getting up and making noise. You have to talk sense.

Senator Mottley talks about the decline of the productive sectors has Barbados in a crisis. I am glad the Senator said that because her party does not say that, it says that it is Sandi that has Barbados in a crisis, not the decline of the productive sectors. She has a lot to say about the productive sectors and I am not going to comment on what she has to say because it isn't worth detaining the Senate on that.

The main part of my intervention, Mr. Acting President, is to say that given the present state of the Barbadian economy, this resolution is welcome and is timely because I believe that at an earlier time the Prime Minister said that he would be attempting to access funds from the multilateral institutions. I recall that the Caribbean Development Bank was one of the institutions named. I would hope that these funds would be channelled into those sectors which have the capacity to generate foreign exchange quickly for Barbados.

I would also hope that the entrepreneurs who access these funds have the loyalty to Barbados to return the earnings to this country. It is Barbados where they are accessing the funds, and I repeat, I hope they will have enough loyalty to use those funds to earn foreign exchange and return it to this country rather than looking for some haven overseas to hide it. It is no secret, Mr. Acting President, that the decline of the productive sectors have reached a critical point in Barbados and that is why these

funds are so timely. It didn't start yesterday. Anybody who has respect for evidence on the Barbadian economy knows that the real turning point in the productive sectors which the Senator has been talking about all morning, started in the second half of the nineteen seventies.

In Barbados we were able to access funds from the overseas markets starting in the second half of the seventies and we borrowed very easily because our foreign debt was very low; but you reach a point in time where your debt service is so high that overseas lenders will be reluctant to lend you, unless you put certain corrective policies in place. As I understand it, those are the corrective policies which are being put in place now to be followed by others later.

Mr. Acting President, I am moved to say these things because there is a lot of misunderstanding in Barbados about where we are. I said earlier in a previous Senate that there are long term structural causes for the state of the Barbadian economy. What we are focussing on in Barbados are the proximate causes of our difficulty and we are using language which is emotionally charged.

I looked at the newspapers this morning and I saw somebody talking about printing money, that you have a printing press. Mr. Acting President, what is all this talk about? What do we mean by printing money? Quite simply all we mean is that the Government is resorting to the use of its overdraft facility with the Central Bank. That overdraft facility has been set there so as to bridge the timing difference between inflows of revenue and expenditure. When, however, people start to talk about printing of money, I think what they mean to say is that the Government has used the overdraft too liberally.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT : Keep your asides more *sotto voce*.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, the Senator mentioned the Letter of Intent and the availability of foreign exchange to Barbados. A lot has been said about the Letter of Intent and it has been most revealing to me. It is the first time I have heard laymen and supposedly non-laymen say that a Letter of Intent does not make provision for recovery of the productive sectors. Mr. Acting President, I would humbly beg all those persons making that statement to show me a single country anywhere in the world which has ever negotiated a Letter of Intent with the IMF which has made provision for the recovery of the productive sectors. What this country is being bombarded with today, unfortunately, is a level of nonsense which is incredible. Whenever you go to the International Monetary Fund you are looking for short-term financial accommodation to stabilise the balance of payments position. What the Fund will require of you is

that you live within your means so you have to cut demand. But if you are thinking about recovery you have to do what the Government says it is going to do, that is, look to the...

1.05 p.m.

Asides.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, may I take my seat until Senator Barker can stop interrupting me?

I am saying that if you are serious about recovery then you have to look at those multilateral institutions which provide long-term finance. I say this for the benefit of the ordinary people who do not understand these things. I am happy to see at least one source of funding, and I believe a source of funding being made available to Barbados at this time which will not attempt to put unnecessary encumbrances on Barbados.

Before I conclude my submission I wish to say that I am not going to support any calls from either side for domestic protection of Barbadians who make bids for contracts on projects funded from these multilateral sources. My reason is simple. Protection breeds inefficiency and complacency. Barbados is a small country. If Barbados is going to earn its way it has to get on the world stage and compete. Garfield Sobers did not stay in Barbados and decide he would become the best cricketer in the world. He went on the world stage and he showed off his talents there. I am against any compromise which says that because you are a Barbadian you can be 10% less efficient or 15% less efficient and that is all right. We will protect you.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: Mr. Acting President, on a point of order. I deny emphatically that I asked for any 10% advantage.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not recall your making that statement.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: I ask that we be put on equal basis, that we were loaded with duties as against the overseas contractors. I never asked or will ask for any advantage for local contractors. I merely ask that everybody be put on a basis of apples for apples and not one oranges and one apples. That is my point, Sir. I do not ask anybody for any advantages. We have competed outside in the world and have been successful and will continue to do so.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I am sure the Senator is aware that I never meant Senator Williams. I am dealing with a point of principle. I reiterate my principle irrespective of who objects to it.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I did make that point when he rose.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: As a small country we have to recognise that if we are going to make our way in the world and improve the quality of life for all of us who live here, we have to stop looking within our shores and get on the world stage and make it there. I have no doubt about that. That is how Japan has become the world's trading guru. Japan does not have any abundant natural resources but it understands what a small country has to do to survive, that is, you have to put yourself in a position to guess what the market is going to do better than the market itself.

Mr. Acting President, I welcome the opportunity to support this Resolution. Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: In winding up the debate, Mr. Acting President, on this Resolution, there are a few items I would like to touch upon. I believe it was Senator Williams who wanted assurance that the guarantee is given to all Barbadians and will be used on behalf of all Barbadians. I can assure you that this, indeed, will be the case.

I understand your concern too, Senator Williams, that our playing field between local and foreign contractors as they bid on projects in Barbados should be even recognising within the constraints itself that we have to be as efficient as Senator Alleyne pointed out but that in those cases where the foreign contractor is allowed to have his goods duty-free we cannot then expect our people to compete with different rates of duty on items being used. This Government has, and you know this only too well, addressed this question of ensuring over time that the playing field is level – not that there is any advantage or any protection being given but rather that we have an equal and level playing field for both local and foreign competitors.

On the question of Trinidadians benefiting from certain contracts in Barbados, within the last two weeks Trinidadian owners of buildings and investors were in Barbados talking to a group of our consultants and other suppliers of goods and services in connection with the rebuilding of the downtown area of Trinidad. I would hope that within the CARICOM countries as we talk now (1) about the single market, and (2) about the movement of people, that we begin to look at the countries as one area rather than seeing somebody from Trinidad as a foreigner in a Barbadian market or a Barbadian as a foreigner in a Trinidadian market but that we begin to see it as one market. This was evidenced by the President of the Downtown Owners and Manufacturers Association presence in Barbados talking about the opportunities which are available in that country to the tune of E.C. \$90 million in the rebuilding of the downtown area.

On the question of trips if we must indeed become competitive on the international scene then we must have a presence in those areas where the decisions are being made. We cannot sit back in Barbados and hope that from here we can influence the decisions taken elsewhere. Too often when our Ministers and other officers of Government have to travel we run up against the question of trips as vacation trips. We cannot stay in Barbados and learn everything that is happening in the world. If, indeed, there is a shortcoming, I think that too often we do not avail ourselves of the opportunities to perform and act on the world scene.

Earlier this year, and I am sure Senator Dr. Simmons, who is not now in his place, would confirm that it was Barbados' intervention at the LOME meeting of the EEC/ACP groups of countries, that Barbados, through its intervention was able to secure for the sugar producers in the ACP countries an additional 30 million ECU's to be divided among those countries. I suppose that we normally see and hear only about the trip being made. This is a matter of record. It has not been widely reported or widely known but this is a fact.

I think Senator Mottley touched on the question of loyalty and I believe it was Senator Alleyne who spoke about the Letter of Intent. In this whole area there has been all sorts of misrepresentation. I was not quite sure I was going to deal with it at this point but it seems as good a point as any to deal with it.

In today's "Nation" at page 3A there is a comment from the Anglican Bishop of Barbados calling upon Cabinet Members to either state their support for the policies of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance or resign.

Mr. Acting President, let me say at the outset, (1) I am a Member of the Cabinet of Barbados; (2) I was baptised an Anglican, I was confirmed an Anglican, and when I do practise my religion I practise it as an Anglican. It is therefore within this context, both as an Anglican and as a Member of the Cabinet of Barbados, to enquire of my Lord Bishop if it would not be intellectually honest and christianly charitable to assume that learning or hearing no dissenting voices from Members of the Cabinet to conclude that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has the full support of his colleagues because it is normal that any individuals within the Cabinet who do not fully support the Prime Minister or Minister have within that individual's power to resign. Nowhere have we ever encountered in Barbados anyone asking Members of the Cabinet of the country to get up and state their support for the Prime Minister of the country. It just is not done. Anyone asking Members of the Cabinet of the country to get up and state their support for the Prime Minister of the country...It just is not done.

1.15 p.m.

I must confess that although I am not as well versed in the Scriptures as my good Lord Bishop I would still like to remind him of the scriptural passage that says words to the effect, how can I recognize the mote that is in my brother's eye when I cannot see the beam that is in my own eye.

Mr. Acting President, it is against this background that I would like to humbly suggest to my Lord Bishop to subject himself to the same text by asking his own clergy to come out and vote for or against his Lordship's leadership. At least the Prime Minister of Barbados went to the polls. Can my Lord Bishop make the same claim to his cleric.

Mr. Acting President, if we must remove the representations, I feel compelled that we address these questions head on. With those comments I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2.20 p.m. today.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT suspended that sitting accordingly at 1.20 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1991.

Order No. 8 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1991.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President the Electricity Act Cap. 277 provides for the inspection and control of electrical works and other purposes connected therewith. Under that Act certain responsibilities are prescribed as falling to the Electrical Engineer designated subsequently as Chief Electrical Engineer and by this Resolution would be redesignated as Chief Electrical Inspector. These duties are myriad and over time with the expansion of the electricity services in

Barbados remembering that the Act was a 1936 Act, recognizing the expanded electricity services, the introduction of traffic lights, more use of air-conditioning in Government buildings and all these things, the duties of the Electrical Engineer continue to grow. These duties include responsibilities under the Bridgetown Electric Lighting and Power Order of 1907 and other legislation.

The functions which have accrued to this officer over the years include the maintenance of street lights on the Adams/Barrow/Cummings Highway and the Spring Garden Highway, maintenance of automatic systems in car parks, responsibility for the installation and maintenance of traffic lights systems, responsibility for the installation and maintenance of air conditioning systems in all Government buildings, installation and maintenance of Government public address and simultaneous transmission systems for conferences, installation and maintenance of electronic systems in Parliament.

Over the years; because of the inability of this department to function efficiently, many of these responsibilities have not been carried out to the satisfaction of the public of Barbados. In 1988 some action was taken when the staff of the Electrical Engineer's Department revolted and the Chief was asked to go on leave. There was an investigation done into the department by two consultants and the Report recommended that because of the obvious stress that Mr. Campbell was going through, and the low morale of the department, that something should be done about the situation.

At the beginning of 1990 Mr. Campbell was allowed to return to the department. Whereas some progress in dealing with a backlog of work happened on his return a back log built up again. The complete breakdown between the officer, the department and the Ministry to which that department is responsible – And what the Resolution seeks to do is to abandon the post of Chief Electrical Engineer and substitute for that a post of Chief Electrical Officer at a different level; it restyles the post of Deputy Chief Electrical Engineer and calls it Deputy Chief Electrical Officer and it also provides for the transfer of a Maintenance Supervisor and a Maintenance Technician to the Ministry of Transport and Works. The Ministry of Transport and Works are fortified in taking this position because under the Act dealing with the responsibility for the Ministry of Public Works, Communications and Transportation has submitted that under section 3 of the Highways Act the Chief Technical Director of the Ministry is now designated Chief Technical Officer and is required to perform all duties relating to transport and road traffic which may be required of him by or under any enactment of the island. It is this particular provision under the Act that is being seized upon to transfer back to the Ministry of Transport the responsibility for the lighting say on the Adams/Barrow/Cummings Highway as well as on the

Spring Garden Highway. So that the provision of adequate lighting on those highways would be achieved, we hope, by the Ministry and that the maintenance of them will fall under the responsibility of a Senior Technical Officer for traffic engineering within the Ministry itself.

This manoeuvre, Mr. Acting President, can be described in public service terms as reorganization of the Electrical Engineer's Department and I am certain that it is intended that the citizens of this country benefit from these proposed actions for reorganization. I do not know that there is any basis for any opposition or contrary view to the necessity to ensure that Government agencies function efficiently. My own personal view, Mr. Acting President, is that we need a series of reorganizations within the total public service if we are to achieve the objective of providing a more competent and efficient public service for the citizens of this country.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.
2.25 p.m.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, you must excuse my having to cough. I was talking to Mr. Acting President, please do not butt in. Mr. Acting President, we on this side are going to oppose this Bill and I want to make it clear from the outset, we are not opposing any reorganisation of any department but we are expressing our opposition to the sneaky way in which it seems as though a public officer is being deprived of his job.

Sir, first of all this Resolution, as I said before, resolved that the Order entitled the Civil Establishment General (Amendment) Order 1991 be made by the Minister responsible for the Civil Service on the particular date under Section 2 of the Civil Establishment Act, and we are asked to approve this.

Now, I am not a legal person but I took it upon myself to read the Civil Establishment Act so I am asking, Sir, for a little bit of help in this regard. Section 2 of the Act which is Cap. 21, and Sir, I must say that I am not aware that there has been an amendment subsequent to 1967. If there is I stand ready to be corrected. Section 2 says that the Minister may, from time to time, by order, and it lists five things that he can do –

- (a) he can establish offices in the public service,
- (b) he can determine the number of persons who may be appointed to such offices,
- (c) describe the qualifications to be possessed by persons appointed to such offices,
- (d) determine the emoluments to be attached to such offices, and

- (e) authorise the payment of the cost of passages of officers and their families travelling outside the Island.

Sir, unless I am terribly mistaken, this section does not give the Minister the power to abolish offices. Unless it is somewhere else stated, but under section 2 it does not give the Minister the power to abolish offices. Sir, if I am wrong I am willing to be corrected on this point. Yes, Sir, I will gladly step aside and hear corrections because ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Will you proceed?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I am asking for clarification.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: The Minister will respond to any questions which are asked when he is summing up. Please proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. Sir, the same section 2 says that the Order under Section 1 shall be provisional only and shall be of no effect until it has been laid before Parliament and approved by a Resolution of each House. So I take it, Sir, that if the Minister does in fact have the power, and I want to go on the assumption that he has the power, but I cannot find it, and I am going to go on that assumption because I am sure that the Leader of the Senate would not bring a Resolution in here if the Minister did not have the relevant authority.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you for your confidence, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you, Mr. Acting President.

Sir, this Resolution calls for two basic things:

- (1) the abolition of the post of Chief Electrical Engineer, Electrical Inspection, and the creation of a post called the Chief Electrical Officer.

Sir, I note that there has been a slight down-grading in the status. I think it moved from S3 to S4 and,

- (2) it called for a redesignation of the title Deputy Chief Electrical Engineer to be Deputy Chief Electrical Officer.

If, Sir, it was just a reorganisation, why then did you not re-designate both the Chief as well as the Deputy Chief. Why then are we calling for an abolition for the post of the Chief and when it comes to the post of the Deputy Chief, we are calling for a re-designation.

I would like to hear, Sir, the Minister respond to that when his time comes, because it is important to me, that

here in one case you are abolishing a post and creating a new post, you are not redesignating but in the junior post you are saying, I will just call it something different instead of calling it the Deputy Chief Electrical Engineer, I am going to call him, Deputy Chief Electrical Officer.

Sir, it would lead me then to believe that this Resolution is *ad hominem*, that beneath all of the veneer it can be seen as though this Resolution is trying to get at a person and I have a lot of difficulty with that. The Public Service gives security of tenure and there is a very good reason for security of tenure. Now I know that it has been knocked by people on both sides who feel that the provision for security of tenure allows inefficiency and slackness and tardiness in the public service. But, Sir, there is another aspect to the whole question and it is one that we should bear in mind.

Governments change, Ministers change, but for the continuity and for the proper governing of the island it is essential that the public servants, the ones who carry out the policy directives of the political directorate, it is important that they be shielded to some extent from any infelicities in the political system. Don't let us fool ourselves, we are all honourable men but some are less honourable than others. So, the security of tenure shields the public servant to the extent that he knows so long as he behaves himself properly and does what he should do he is shielded from the actions of a Minister who may, for one reason or another want him to do things which might be contrary to common sense and good governing.

I think it is essential that we support the idea of security of tenure. We would hate to see, Sir, that important posts in the public service are subjected to political manoeuvring and one way to ensure that is by ensuring that the public officer has security of tenure. But that is not the whole story because there is also a body called the Public Service Commission which is made up of reputable members of the community. This is one Statutory Corporation where you want to ensure that the people chosen on this Commission are above reproach, men of good standing, men of good character and no doubt, Sir, as you may well be aware ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, did you say this is a Statutory Corporation?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I thought I said Public Service Commission. I don't think I did, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Oh, all right. I thought you had.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: The Member did say, this is one Statutory Corporation but I think that was more a slip of the tongue than anything else.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am extremely grateful for the Leader of the Senate to be coming to my defence like that and I am very grateful for his intervention.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: It is not to your defence but to the record.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am accustomed to interruptions from the Honourable Senator and as usual they are of little value. Sir, we should allow the Public Service Commission to do its job.
2.35 p.m.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I thank the Senator for telling me that, but I would have expected that the Leader of the Senate when introducing the Resolution would have stated to us that this matter had gone through all the channels.

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: You did not mention the Public Service Commission.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Morrison, will you refrain from that process. If you wish to speak, you will ask for permission to speak afterwards. Senator Barker, you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: The Public Service Commission is the body that is mandated by the Constitution to investigate and control basically the Civil Service. Government is asked today, Sir, to act in a situation where it seems as though there is a breakdown of relations between this particular officer, the Chief Electrical Engineer, and the Ministry of Transport and Works. So there is a breakdown in communications between the officer and the Ministry and a breakdown between the officer and his staff. Now we in the Senate are asked to mediate. We do not have the facts.

The Public Service Commission has the facts. So we have to ask them to make a judgment when we are not in possession of all of the facts of the matter.

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Now if you know the facts, let me know the facts. Mr. Acting President, it seems as though some Members in here have the facts and others do not and, Sir, I find that to be strange. All of us must have the relevant facts before we can make a determination

in this matter. This is very important because this will be the second time in the last five or six years that the Government has come to Parliament to abolish the post of a public servant and it sends the wrong signals to the public servants.

If a man is misbehaving, there are better ways of dealing with the man. There must be provision in the Constitution to deal with a Public Officer who is not functioning properly. Do not ask Parliament although some Members may have the facts, but I do not have the facts. Do not ask me to adjudicate in this matter when I do not have the facts. It is wrong to ask me, Sir. That is all I am saying. Leave the matter in the hands of the Public Service Commission and, if they find that the man is guilty, there are constitutional provisions for dealing with such a case. This is a back door method. If the man is either incompetent or acting illegally or whatever, dismiss the man. There are provisions for that. But do not ask us to come and abolish the man's post. It must be wrong. It must be sending the wrong signals.

After Government having done it in two cases, now you come in here with another Resolution to abolish the post of Chief Electrical Engineer and you are calling it Chief Electrical Officer. It can be that ridiculous. I am saying that it has to stop. It is not setting a good precedent in the Public Service. If a man is guilty, put him before the board of correct bodies. We should not be participants and I feel very strongly about it because today me and tomorrow you. All of the civil servants must feel a bit threatened especially when they have the day to day dealings with the Ministers. They must feel threatened because if a Minister does not like what I am doing and if I mash his corns that he can come to Parliament where they have majority in both Houses and abolish my job and send me on the unemployment list. I am saying that has to be wrong.

The Leader of the House told me already that he was the last President of the Civil Service Association and he said that with a matter of pride. I did not see the pride now when he brought this Resolution which is contrary to all what the union stands for. Sir, I am very disappointed that the NUPW is silent on such an important matter. I am distraught that the NUPW...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are very distraught did you say? Well, we regret that but proceed anyway.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am unhappy (if you want the word unhappy) that the union kept silent in the face of an assault on one of the fundamental principles of the public servant, that of security of tenure. It is setting a bad precedent.

Sir, if the officer in question was having difficulty... Note that he was appointed to the post in 1987 and by 1988 problems, as reported by the Leader of the Senate, trouble started in the camp.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I think the record indicates 1986. That is what I am told.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, I checked the Civil Service List yesterday and it stated 1987. I am willing to be corrected on it but my civil list that I got a couple of weeks ago said 1987. It is not too important whether it is that. But the point remains that trouble started. Sir, where was the Training Division? Sir, remember that in some of these posts in the Public Service that you appoint a man who is an engineer to a post where he has to manage people and in most cases he has never been exposed to the principles of management. Now you are asking him to manage thirty, forty, or fifty persons and he is not trained for it. I thought that the Training Division of the Public Service should be assisting Heads of Departments and other managers, especially those who have not had any training. They must assist them in the proper running of their department. In my view, that is what the Training Division is about.

SENATOR Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH: On a point of order, Sir. I think you are not quite correct about that. The Training Division does train people in supervisory and management positions.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am very glad that Mr. Campbell was a recipient of the training that was offered.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I did not understand Senator Barker-Welch to say that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Well, is she then saying that he was not trained?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Who is she?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I would never disrespect the Honourable Senator. Is the Honourable Senator saying that the present officer was not trained?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, I did not hear the Honourable Senator say either one. It was a general statement.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I am glad that there is training and I only hope that in this case the officer in question had access to that training because the public service is about 15,000. There must be a mechanism where you can early identify people who need help in their

departments. Instead of coming and abolishing their posts in a back-door manner we should be offering help to that person and then if they can't use any help then the Public Service Commission, not us, would then decide on the matter. Sir, I find that this is setting a very dangerous precedent. Maybe I am repeating myself but I feel very strongly...
2.45 p.m.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you for your input.

So, Sir, we are not going to support this because we believe that the matter should not be before us but rather the Public Service Commission should be dealing with that matter. On that basis, we are not going to support this resolution.

SENATOR Mrs. M. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting President, we are asked here today to put our attention to the staffing structure of the Electrical Engineering Department. I hope that the proposed adjustments will work effectively and satisfactorily in future. In addition, we should have our attention focussed, not only on the titles of these officers but on the functions of the officers.

Among other things, they are required to issue electrical certificates in respect of connections with the electrical installations in constructions and buildings and especially new ones. This has to be done before the actual electric power is connected. Now this system works satisfactorily when it comes to small installations and probably single dwellinghouses, but when it comes to large installations infrequently there are long delays and these are very cumbersome, very costly and very inconvenient for people who are investing in these large installations.

I submit that a more modern approach should be adapted whereby the licensed electrical contractors in charge of the actual electrical installations should themselves be responsible for issuing certificates for the work done. The Electrical Officer would then in his discretion be able to go and check at any time, any of the buildings, at any stage, to be satisfied that the work is being done or has been done properly. All of this would have to be done under the rules and regulations laid down for the electrical installation in Barbados.

Nowadays, when big installations are put down the first thing that the contractors like to see in position is the electrical transformer because it is from that and through that that so many other of the machines and gadgets on a building site operate. I think it is time that we get closer to this. I would suggest that the present method dealing with

the issue of electrical certificates be upgraded and updated. Having to wait for an inspection, having to wait for a certificate, all of that before a building can be put into use can be very wasteful of time and energy and money. These are precious commodities in these days.

I think that if this could be looked into while the name is being changed and the functions could be upgraded, it would do well.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I sat patiently here and listened to Senator Barker. I want to begin by identifying the problem as I understand it. I have to use that ABC Highway; and I have been wondering for how long would I have to wait before the Government intervenes to do something about this problem. Senator Barker reminds me of the disease afflicting Barbados. You see a problem, you bury your head in the sand, and you pretend the problem is not there. We have to get out of this foolishness and out of the habit of trying to defend the indefensible. I wouldn't wish Senator Barker, if he were a lawyer, to defend me for the simple reason he does not know when he doesn't have a brief. I am not intervening in this debate to defend any man. I am not interested in that. I am interested in a speedy and efficient resolution of the problems affecting Barbadians. I am interested in the proper use of the resources belonging to Barbadians, not wasting time with foolishness. This Bill has been slow in coming. I would have liked to see a bill which dealt in a more fundamental way with the services delivered by that department.

I believe that two types of services should be provided by the Government Electrical Department – regulatory services and commercial services. I categorise maintenance services as falling into the category of commercial services. I believe that the Government at such future time should consider a more fundamental restructuring of the delivery of its services now within the ambit of the Government Electrical Department as part of a wider public sector reform.

To be specific, then, I think a case can be made out for retaining regulatory services within the Government Electrical Department. This is where I depart from Senator Walcott. Senator Walcott is addressing, if I understand her correctly, the issue of certificates that should be done by the electrical contractors and then the officers of the department can have a final check. I have no difficulty in that because I do not believe that the same agency or agent should appraise as well as reprobate. I believe that the whole business of regulatory services should be kept within the ambit of government. Irrespective of what Senator Barker has to say about security of tenure, I will deal with that shortly. These public servants must be accountable. This business of walking into the public service and because you are in the public service nobody can touch you, that has to stop. You can't go into Senator Williams'

business and do it. You can't go into Senator Cole's business and do it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order, Mr. Acting President, I never said they cannot be touched. I said that there is an authority vested in the Public Services Commission. I am saying that if the man is incompetent, fire him, but we are not to do it. Let the Public Service Commission do it. The politician should not be preempting it.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you for your elucidation, Senator Barker.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: You cannot go into Senator Phillips business and fool around. You have to perform. The only way Barbados is going to survive and improve is by holding people to account, whether you are in the public service or the private service. This notion of hiding about behind some nebulous body and evading responsibility for our actions is bound to destroy the country.

I am of the view, Mr. Acting President that the regulatory services should be kept within the ambit of Government, but those officers must be accountable. They are being paid from the public purse. Too many people in Barbados believe that because there is something called – they don't even say Government; they say "Guvvament" – Government, you can do as you like. You walk into work at ten o'clock. You leave at eleven thirty. Go and spend three hours for lunch time. By three o'clock you leave and go and pick up your children and you are finished working. Barbados is plagued with that. That is what I said in this Senate on the 20th September and the news media went out and held me up to ridicule.

I have to say, Mr. Acting President, neither the print media nor the electronic media in Barbados have contributed a single thing to my development and they can take nothing from it. They have not made me and they cannot break me. They can talk from now till God comes. I said then: "the public service should no longer be treated as an employment agency" and I repeat it today. The loafers have to be thrown out. No Government in the history of Barbados was better at brutalising and dismembering the public service than the Barbados Labour Party under the late Tom Adams. When you start to talk about wrongdoing in the public service, remember your history.

I am of the view that regulatory services should be kept.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, if you do not desist from that, I shall have to ask you to leave the Chamber. Senator Alleyne, you may continue.
2.55 p.m.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. I am firmly persuaded that Barbados is better off by retaining the regulatory services within the public sector framework. But let us be very clear. There has to be full accountability on the part of those whom the taxpayers pay to provide those services. I believe it is time to split off the commercial services.

I believe the maintenance work, for example, maintenance of the lights on the ABC Highway, the air-conditioning systems in certain public buildings should be contracted out to the private sector and the benefit in Government contracting it out to the private sector gives Government greater flexibility in the management. If you contract from A and A is not delivering quality services, fire A and offer it to B and if B does not perform to its competition out there take on C. The Government must learn that lesson. It should choose this juncture in our history not only to restructure the economy but to restructure the Public Service.

I have heard Senator Barker speak on this matter and it was not even good semantics. The fact of the matter is this. Over the last two or three years the failure of the Government Electrical Engineering Department to function has disrupted the lives of every one of us who live in Barbados. I do not know who is responsible for it. Notice what I said – the failure of that Department to carry out its duties. The Government has a responsibility to the people of Barbados to do something about it.

Mr. Acting President, so many people were denied the opportunity of moving into their homes at the time they had planned it. They could not get an inspection done by the Government Electrical Engineering Department. You have the lights on the Highway which became a national disgrace in Barbados. You have spent so many million constructing a highway and it is darker than hell. How can you get up in this Honourable Chamber and justify such a situation?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order. Mr. Acting President, I never justified that situation. Could you please, Mr. Acting President, ask the Senator to stop misquoting what I said? All I said was, and I will repeat it, that there must be proper channels for dealing with delinquent public officers, not us.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, the fact of the matter is that the failure of this Department to deliver the services which it was charged with has to be dealt with. Notice I have suggested that a more fundamental surgery needs to be done on that Department. That surgery needs to be carried throughout the Public Service. I say so without any apologies.

I am not, Mr. Acting President, going to try to ingratiate myself with any public servant. I do not want any public servant to love me but to respect me for what I stand for. I want to be very clear on that. To the extent that the public servants fail to deliver every working man in Barbados is disadvantaged because the Government is the working people of Barbados. That is who the Government is. Lots of people have some nebulous notion of Government. They believe Government is the people who sit in the Cabinet and those who are elected in the House of Assembly. It is not true. It is those of us who work. To the extent that you have loafers in the Public Service who are hanging around, they are putting an unnecessary charge on us the working people in Barbados.

Mr. Acting President, I support the Bill. I would have liked to see this Bill go further. Senator Barker spoke about security of tenure. I have addressed this matter in this Chamber before. I said on September 20 that we have gone too far in removing the checks on efficiency in the Public Service.

When I left school in the late 1950s to get into the Public Service you had to go through all kinds of scrutiny. I remember going to Government Headquarters and it was deliberately set up in such a way you had to walk down a long corridor and you were being observed when you were coming down that corridor. They checked you for your social graces. You came in and if you made the mistake of going and pulling out a chair and sat down you knew you failed the test before you started. There were certain efficiency bars once you got past the initial hurdles in the salary scales. You had to write examinations. You had to have reports from heads of the Departments. We have gone too far in dismantling a lot of them.

Once people are in the Public Service nowadays it would appear as if they become untouchables. I have said before that Barbados has to move into the modern era. I said on September 20 I wish to see a professional Public Service in Barbados. I am not going to fool myself that public servants do not have a political agenda. I know that too well. Some of them have their own political agenda which cuts across that of any Government, not only this Government. They can cut across the political agenda of any government. What I am concerned about is the development of professionalism in the Public Service.

Earlier I called for the rescinding of the 1974 amendments to the Constitution which allowed politicians to appoint certain public officers. I called for this rescinding earlier. I repeat it again today but it has to be done within a particular context. You just cannot repeal it when you recognise the amount of politicalisation of the Public Service without doing a massive job of training within that Public Service.

Mr. Acting President, I support this bill. I am very clear that it is very limited in its perspective because I would have liked to see a more radical restructuring in the delivery of services provided by the Government Electrical Engineering Department. I repeat. I think quite strongly that the regulatory services should remain within the Department. The commercial services should be taken off and be put up for bid by private contractors.

Thank you Mr. Acting President.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: Mr. Acting President, I do not think in all of my sitting in here that I have been more pleased to see something come before this Senate than this Bill. I endorse everything Senator Alleyne said. The only thing is I would like to multiply it 100 times.

I would like here now to go on record as congratulating the Honourable Minister, Evelyn Greaves and his remarks. This Department under this gentleman has been the single largest disruption of progress in Barbados in the building industry that there ever could have been. It is a national disgrace.
3.05 p.m.

And I call now, Sir, for the Minister responsible for this department to set up an investigation and enquiry into the purchasing of the lights that were put on the ABC Highway. And if it does not reveal tremendous skulduggery nothing in Barbados ever will. Those lights were put up against the advice of every single recognized, efficient, knowledgeable electrical contractor in this island and the enquiry would find out who they were recommended by.

It always takes sometimes more than one way to skin a cat. I heard the Honourable Leader of the Senate, Senator Lewis say once that he wished he did not have to go through certain channels to get rid of people because of the impossibility and the slowness of it.

As a practitioner and a person deriving some benefit from electrical contracting, I would have to highlight Senator Walcott. Her proposition though well meaning would be impossible. You cannot be judge and jury too. You will get people who will take advantage of the situation.

Like I said, Sir, there is not anything that Senator Alleyne said in here this afternoon that is not true. I would like to add to ways I think that we could improve the regulation of this department. It would make it a lot more efficient.

Let us look at it in reality. The electrical department in respect of construction is to see that malpractice is not indulged in with, corners cut, inferior materials used and practices that could end up... And you know what electrical

faults cause, burn down, fire. Nobody in here is more aware of the word insurance than yourself.

I would like to suggest and propose to the particular Ministry its insurance, the particular Ministry to consider the following: Set up a tripartite organization. There are three people that are responsible that bear the faults for the mistakes made. The Government, they must have a part in it. The Barbados Light and Power because one of these good days and it is not far from now they are going to get sued for connecting and possibly killing or burning down something. Then it brings me to the obvious, the insurance company that is going to insure the property should have a say as to if it is right or wrong.

I am telling you now, Sir, that there were times in my life when I have borne the brunt of tremendous pressure from the department. And in my opinion under certain heads, it was totally corrupt.

Aside.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: I said corrupt. I say you had to pay to get your certificate. If you had three people looking at it, you have the insurance company who is responsible, the insurance companies of Barbados can get together and appoint a consultant, the Barbados Light and Power is full of Electrical Engineers, the Government has people in whatever position, how hard is it for the three of them to visit the site the same time and then you would know who is not pulling their weight. I would like the Minister to think of it.

I congratulate him sincerely in doing what he had to do, Sir. In respect of this thing you call security of tenure, I will tell you that, Sir... Mr. Acting President whenever you see the Minister you tell him for me that he sent the right message. You know sometimes if you cannot rip a rock out with a bulldozer you get some dynamite and lick it out. The right signals have gone down to all of them that think they are in there for life. Like Senator Alleyne said wait until 10.00 o'clock to go to work, go at 11.30 a. m. and eat lunch, go for your children at 2.30 p.m. and go home at the taxpayers expense. Criminal – nothing short of criminal.

It is too dangerous for people doing the work for them to inspect it. A fire is a dangerous thing. Being electrocuted is like being on a plane when both engines stall or all engines stall, there is no hope, Sir.

Again I want to congratulate them for several reasons and I sincerely hope that some enquiry will be initiated immediately for all the people concerned and for the satisfaction of Barbados into the checking out, the purchasing – get all the correspondence and see how many people said they were inadequate and they were the wrong things. But he who checks them is he who said buy them.

them. That is what we are landed with today. Unfortunately I am one of those idiots who come in at least once a week and have to drive that Highway coming from the Airport to home. I sympathize with Senator Alleyne because he lives up there too.

Sir put three people together, set a meeting, let us turn up at this building and you would soon prove who is doing their work and who is not. There is nobody to check. The Minister cannot run around every house that is being built in Barbados and check and see if the man turns up on appointments. You know how many times our company has made appointments with this man and he just does not turn up and does not say anything at all. If you complain, he says well you are complaining, I am now going to put you in your place. They gave him too good a job. They should have sent him up with Mr. Weekes up there one time underneath him at the Ministry of Transport and Works.

I will support it, Sir, and gladly. It is the fastest aye you will ever get out of me for a long time in here. Anybody that wants to support the kind of dreadful performance that this department has been indulging in has to be not interested in the development of Barbados.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons.

SENATOR Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: Mr. Acting President, I do not want to detain this Honourable Chamber. I just want to make a couple points. I think that Senator Barker in his contribution said that he was not aware of the facts of this matter. I think one would have to be living outside of Barbados or not in contact with what is going on in this country not to know the severe problem that we had in Barbados for the last two years with respect to electrical inspection, *et cetera* in Barbados and how it retarded the progress in Barbados.

I am not for looking at the personal issue. I want to look at the philosophy. We in Barbados have got to be more productive. We cannot be more productive if we allow people to sit in a position and retard the progress of this country. In the final analysis the same voice that says that the Government had no right taking a decision will blame the same Government for sitting idly by when nothing was done. It is time that we be not afraid. If there are impediments in the way, we have to move them.

The Parliament of this country is the highest legal body in this country and when these decisions are to be taken in the interest of the country I think it is right that Parliamentarians have their say. Opting out...

Aside.

SENATOR Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: As I said the facts are there for everybody to see and hear. As a matter of fact

if somebody took the time out to go and look at the Civil Service List and did not talk to contractors and ordinary people who were inconvenienced, then you have not done your homework.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order I think that that reference referred to me because I am the one who said I looked at the Civil Service List. I said. I want to say that I also talk to contractors and they were not all convinced that the gentleman in question was the problem. I would like the Honourable Member to know that I also spoke to contractors.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you. You have finished your point of order now.

Aside.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker you have finished your point of order. Will you be silent now. Senator Simmons you may proceed.

SENATOR Dr. E. A. SIMMONS: I live in this country and I know the disadvantage this country was put to because of that Department and action has to be taken and if it has to be taken at the highest level in this country I think it is well done.
3.15 p.m.

Just a minor point I want to make, and it has to do with this. I think the time has come in Barbados, in terms of street lighting, where we maybe ought to look at newer sources of energy. There is available in the world today, where there is tropical area, that we ought to look at alternatives such as solar energy. If we have modular lights one single light as a unit along that highway as a solar unit and one goes out it does not affect the other.

I know we are strapped for finance at this time but I think that we have to look toward the twenty-first century and when you have things like solar lighting that once you buy the unit and instal it the maintenance is minimal and in terms of upkeep it is also minimal. I think it would be an advantage to the country and to the Government purses to look at the possibility of investing in solar street lighting. That is the point that I wanted to make that we need not to drive down a highway where a series of lights goes out because a switch has gone bad some place or because when the car shakes the whole thing goes out or when you run pass jogging it goes out. I don't think that would happen with solar lighting and I think we need to look possibly at alternative sources of energy in this particular respect, solar electricity. I thank you, Mr. Acting President.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON J. L. SPRINGER: Mr. Acting President, I am going to be fairly brief.

First of all I would like to say that I will support the amendment although I think it is unfortunate that we have to go to such an extent in order to have the desired effect which means that we are going to have to take a look at our employment arrangements at all levels so that we will be able to make the necessary adjustments from time to time.

I think this is a problem, not only in this regard; but in many instances across this country at the moment. It has become exceedingly difficult to be able to make adjustments in terms of personnel in certain positions. I must say that this must be a great source of frustration to all employers especially in this case when the employer is really the Government of Barbados.

That is not my main concern. My concern is to do with the wording of the amendment. For me the title engineer conjures up a certain kind of person, a person who is academically qualified in a certain way with certain professional degrees or diplomas and also a person who qualifies to work with certain professional organisations or to have membership in these organisations. That is how I see an engineer whether you are talking about a civil engineer or an electrical engineer, whatever kind of engineer.

Now I am fully aware, Sir, that a number of people have been going around faking at being engineers, carrying the title engineer but yet not qualified and it may well be that the original wording here had made it possible for persons who were really not qualified to hold this position and call themselves "engineers". It might be a good thing to have the adjustment that labels the person as an electrical officer rather than an engineer, but I hope, Sir, that the change from "engineer" to "officer" is not an indication that somewhere along the line we would be caught settling for a lesser qualified person. That was the real warning that I got up to suggest, Sir, in this amendment which I said I would support as long as we understand that what we are doing is changing the label and not downgrading the qualification of the person. Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. Acting President, I should like to make a few observations on this Resolution, Sir. Sir, we are dealing with a department and we are dealing with certain posts. I don't want to relegate myself to the position of talking about the present incumbent of that post.

It has been very well established over the last five years that the workers of that department have been working hardship on everybody in this country, on electrical contractors, on electricians, on people who apply to get certificates for house inspections. Everybody in this country has been complaining about the work of that

Department, Sir, and while we examine the law which established the Chief Electrical Engineering Department and the powers that have been given to the electrical engineer under the law, they are almost formidable, Sir.

The Chief Electrical Engineer under the Laws of Barbados has more power than any Prime Minister or Minister of Government and when people cavel at the fact that Ministers' names appear in certain Acts of Parliament and that Ministers have so much power they should read the Electrical Act and see the powers that have been vested in that Chief Electrical Engineer's post and when you find a holder of that post who is not prepared to reason or to engage in conversation with people with whom he has to come into contact with, it spells ruin and disaster to a country as small as Barbados is.

That is the sum total of that Department. It has wreaked havoc in this country and where you find a Department where the staff and people in higher positions are at war and nothing is being relegated to the staff to do and when one man has the power and insists on his power in order to sign certificates or to okay certificates, then you mean that all the work that goes on this whole country revolves on the whims and fancies of one person. If that person is not cooperative, Sir, then you get the big backlog of cases building up day by day and even when the Permanent Secretaries who worked in the Ministry of Transport and Works, there were two Permanent Secretaries involved, and they have all complained to the Chief Personnel Officer by way of going to the Public Service Commission. This case has been tried, a committee was established at one time to teach certain managerial skills and techniques to the present holder. He was given special leave and as the Leader of the Senate has told you not long ago, when he came back from leave everything that happened before continued to happen again.

Get this straight, it is no political interference because the Ministry of Transport and Works has no control over the Chief Electrical Engineer. He is his own boss, he directs the work and if he does not certify things to be all right there is nobody else who can make him do it or can issue a certificate to that effect. For that reason I don't think that this building which has been rewired, this same Parliament has been rewired and it has not been certified yet. Work has been done on Government House, which houses the Governor-General, that has not been certified and there are numerous jobs which have been done in this country, even belonging to Government which have not been certified yet by anybody from the Government Electrical Department. We did not get into the Civil Service problems, we are outside of that. I would like Senator Barker to understand that no Minister can direct a Permanent Secretary about people under the control of the Ministry. Personnel matters are under the purview of the Public Service Commission. We can only complain. We

have complained about the ABC Highway which is one of the most difficult problems we have had in Barbados. I sympathize with the remarks made by Senator Williams and Senator Alleyne. At night there is a complete blackout. At least I do not drive there at night. We have not gotten the lights working on that highway for the longest time. They got some to work not so long ago from Sargeants Village to Graeme Hall and they work so well that they do not go off in the day. They are burning all through the day. When you want them to burn, they will not burn. That is a fact. But from the time you leave Graeme Hall Round-about back to the airport, you are in complete darkness. There is no amount of persuasion which is coming from my Ministry which can get that department to act to regulate those lights. Even when the Chief Electrical Engineer was on leave and the Deputy made some effort to have them corrected, when he came back from leave he undid everything the Deputy tried to do to help relieve the situation.

3.25 p.m.

I am not here to deal with any personnel matter. We are reorganising the Department in order to get certain efficiencies going again and we have designated the two posts from the Chief Electrical Engineer to the Chief Electrical Officer and from Deputy Electrical Engineer to Deputy Electrical Officer. Both of these posts have been redesignated. Do you not understand the language and the qualifications for those posts will remain as they are. They have certain duties under the Act which have to be carried out and we are taking this occasion now that we will have a bite in it for the first time so that the Chief Electrical Officer will be under the direction of the Ministry in order that we can ask him to do certain things that we want done which was not done before. In addition to the statutory provisions, we have now put in a provision so that now the Ministry of Transport and Works will be able to ask him to do further things to help people in the country get their electrical work carried out.

So we are not dealing with a Mr. Campbell *per se*. I was sorry that Senator Barker brought that in the debate. His case is being looked after by the Public Service Commission which I will not comment on. We are responsible for the electronic lights on the highway but we had no say in getting that carried out. With this new reorganisation, we are transferring that aspect of that Department to the Ministry itself. It will be at the Pine under the direction of the Chief Technical Officer up there where he can get his work done promptly as far as the highways are concerned and certain installations in the Public Buildings. He will be able to observe those things and the functions of those officers.

He is not even aware that when we advertise these posts – you have been jumping the gun – who is to say that Mr. Campbell cannot apply for one of these posts? Therefore, he is not being treated unfairly. I cannot

understand what you are telling me. The posts are there for anybody to apply for. We have redesignated the posts and, when they are advertised again, they are there for anybody who is qualified to apply and to be interviewed by the Public Service Commission. This is purely an Establishment matter. You are always mixing up Establishment matters with personnel matters. We are here to create and abolish posts. We do not appoint people to a post nor do we fire people from a post. A Minister cannot fire anybody or hire anybody in the Public Service. You should not bring these things in the debate and give the public the impression that somebody is trying to get rid of somebody. A post is a post and people fill posts.

Sir, we would hope that in this new organisation we will be able to get something going and that the staff will be more manageable. There are lots of functions to be carried out which we cannot give to anybody in private enterprise. These are regulatory. They have to be done by a competent authority. We cannot have people who do their own work and certify their own work because with the amount of fires we have had in Barbados in the past few years we have to be very careful. He has to manage the Electrical Department. That is one of the things he has to do. He has to inspect all electrical installations in all Public Buildings and public places of entertainment. He also has to inspect all buildings both public and private before energy is supplied. He has to inspect all buildings requested by the Police and the insurance companies and he is superintendent of all electrical installations in Government buildings, maintenance of all street lights and maintenance of automatic systems in car parks, responsibility for the installation and maintenance of all traffic lights in Barbados, air-conditioning systems in all Public Buildings. He also has responsibility for the installation and maintenance of the electronic systems in the Parliament Buildings and he is principal electrical adviser to the Government.

With the present arrangement with this new system, we are transferring some of those functions to the Ministry where we will have direct supervision over the staff who operate in those areas. We hope that in the new organisation the staff will be able to become more stable. We hope that the conflicts which have gone on before between the Head of Department and the staff will be minimized and they will get down to providing a real service to the public.

Sir, with those few remarks, I would like to support this Resolution.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, I believe that most of the responses that were required were given by Senator Morrison. But I would like to get it into the record that, with this reorganisation of the substitution of posts with a different title the post which was held substantively by someone who was Chief

Electrical Engineer, the person will be required to retire in accordance with the Pensions Regulations 1947 and will receive the appropriate compensation under that Regulation 22. The substantive holder was, in fact, appointed in 1987 and therefore has less than ten years of service but will still be entitled to compensation.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 9 – A BILL TO AMEND THE EXCHANGE CONTROL ACT, CAP. 71

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, this Bill seeks to amend Section 26 of the Exchange Control Act so that there will be a transfer of the Comptroller of Customs to the Exchange Control Authority who has the burden of satisfaction with respect to matters referred in Section 26 of the Act. That is, in respect to the exportation of goods to ensure that payment has been made or is to be made to a person resident within Barbados within a prescribed period of time. It is also designed to provide a legal basis for the use of a form to be completed by the exporter for the purpose of monitoring compliance with the requirements of the Act and that such form is returned by the exporter to the Central Bank within a prescribed period. It also provides for a penal sanction for failure on the part of the exporter to return the form within the prescribed period and also to authorise the Exchange Control Authority to attach conditions to the requirement of being satisfied under this section of the Act – Section 26 of the Act – as proposed by this amendment. The current section 26 as it now stands prohibits the exportation of goods from Barbados except with the express permission of the Exchange Control Authority, unless the Comptroller of Customs is satisfied that the payment for the goods has been made, or is to be made, not later than six months from the date of export of the goods and that the price paid represents a reasonable return for said goods.
3.35 p.m.

In actual practice, the Central Bank of Barbados with the assistance of the Comptroller of Customs monitors the export transactions for the purpose of ensuring that payments made in foreign currency are received and surrendered to an authorised dealer, that is, a commercial bank under the said Act. As the matter now stands, the Act notwithstanding, it is the Central Bank of Barbados that seeks to satisfy itself with respect to the matter about which the Act requires the Comptroller of Customs to satisfy himself. *De facto*, the Central Bank is asking, *de jure* it is the Comptroller of Customs who has the responsibility. What this amendment is seeking to do is to ensure that the *de facto* requirements and the *de jure* requirements are

settled and satisfied and repose in one authority, and that is the Central Bank of Barbados.

With these few comments, Sir, I move that the bill be read a second time.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, to support this amendment to the Exchange Control Act, I want to say from the outset that for too long people in Barbados have been taking advantage of the system and doing things that they should not be doing. I believe that when an exporter exports, he should bring back the foreign currency as that applies to everybody in Barbados, including Government, and to do less is to be acting immorally as well as illegally. I am very concerned that too many of our businessmen have not been acting in accordance to the spirit and letter of the Law. Only a while ago, we had the situation where in St. Lucia some people were accused of illegal practices concerning Barbados. I don't know what happened to that. There were rumours all over the place, but we have not heard about anybody being brought before the Courts for such a contravention of the laws of Barbados and St. Lucia. It does not look good for our image in the Caribbean and the rest of the world when these things happen. I hope that our image in St. Lucia will be improved as a result of the guilty parties coming and having to explain their actions, if indeed any illegality was carried out.

This Bill meets with my approval and that of our side, because we believe in fairness and in respect for law and order. I note that this bill was on the order paper of the other Chamber since May. It was introduced in the Lower House and we were looking for a long time for a debate to take place in the other place and for us in this Chamber to have an opportunity to discuss it. It is perhaps fortuitous that what happened last Tuesday happened, that is, our men in the Lower House walked out and gave the Government a chance to bring the bill in the Lower House and hence, in the Upper House.

Sir, we shall now turn to the Act and while I support it and I have no problem with supporting it, I always feel that voluntary measures normally work better in most cases than compulsory. In the past, we had a voluntary system and as far as we know, there was not much abuse of the system. That was because exporters or importers and citizens had no problem getting foreign exchange. If they wanted foreign exchange for legitimate purposes you could go to the bank and invariably they could get it to carry out their transactions. The fact that this bill is before us, to me, indicates that all is not well in the foreign exchange market.

People believe that when they go to the bank, as happened two months ago, towards the end of October, when the hatcheries wanted hatching eggs, they found that there was no foreign exchange to buy them, and for a

couple of weeks there was a lot of difficulty in getting chickens to process for Christmas. When this happens, it sends a signal to the exporters and they will behave in all sorts of manner in order to protect their business.

When you have to bring in this bill, you are sending signals to the people, not only in Barbados but outside of Barbados that all is not well in the foreign exchange market.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: I didn't want to interrupt Senator Barker because I am afraid that even at the best of times, he can't keep on track.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Is that a point of order, Mr. Acting President?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I will rule, Senator Barker. You may take your seat.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: What we are trying to do is that there are two functions here. I thought I was at pains to point out that what was in fact happening was not consistent with what the law was. That's the difference between *de facto* and *de jure*. It is only a matter of a cleaning up operation where you are bringing these two matters into one place and vesting them in the authority which is actually carrying out the work. It is a rather simple matter and we don't have to go around the world to deal with it.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, I would like you to advise the speaker that I will deal with it how I want to deal with it within the Rules of this House.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I will direct that. You will proceed. Go ahead.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Thank you. Sir, the Central Bank now is given quite rightly... Talking to people in the Central Bank, they felt that they did not have the authority to deal with any delinquency that was creeping into the system in the last five years. Sir, the Central Bank is ideally placed, and I will take the liberty to read from the Central Bank of Barbados Act Cap. 323C. It says in Section 26(2):

"The Bank shall use its best endeavours to maintain the Reserves of External Assets at a level adequate for the international transactions of Barbados."

3.45 p.m.

"(3) If the Reserve of External Assets has declined, or in the judgment of the Board appears to be in danger of declining, so as to jeopardize the adequacy of such Reserve, the Bank shall submit to the Minister a report on the reserve

position and the causes which have led or may lead to such a decline, together with its recommendations concerning the measures it considers necessary to forestall or otherwise remedy the situation.

- (4) The Bank shall make further reports and recommendations at intervals not exceeding six months until such time as, in the judgment of the Board, the situation is rectified."

The Bank has a clear legal mandate to manage and to use its best endeavours to make sure that there is enough foreign exchange for the international transaction of the country. It is fitting then, that if you give them this new responsibility that you must give them the powers which they can use in the exercise of this new responsibility. So I support the Bill very much.

While I am on that point with the Central Bank I am very worried because I would want to know if the Central Bank carried out this provision of the Central Bank Act, if they adequately warned Government about the fall in reserves that occurred since mid year 1989 and if all through 1990 and 1991 they were submitting semi-annual reports to the Minister of Finance as how to remedy the situation.

I say that, Sir, because a former Director of the Central Bank has said in public that the Central Bank was warning the Minister and he was not taking their advice. The said Director resigned in frustration with the whole position. I would like to know, Sir, if the other Directors agree or disagree with the said learned gentleman in his assessment of the situation because if the Act tells them that they are supposed every six months to report on the situation. Now, if one of them is saying they have reported but Government did not take their advice, then it leaves me to wonder what the other Directors and the management of the said Central Bank is doing with regard to the whole matter because it is a very serious matter.

Here you have a bank legally mandated to do certain things regarding our foreign exchange. They are saying they did them but nobody took them on. What is the sense of (a) having a central bank and (b) having the legal mandate to do certain things if nobody took them on. Probably when the other Director speaks after me, in his usual way of castigating me, he would explain what really happened with that legal position because it is very important. Our institutions have been set up to do their job. They cannot introduce the measures but the Act tells them they are supposed to give remedies for the situation.

Another point that interests me is how does one or the public know whether or not the particular agency, in this case the Central Bank, has acted in accordance with the law because I would assume that any communication

between the Central Bank and the Minister has to be of a private nature. How do we know in the Senate that the Central Bank has, in fact, acted according to its legal mandate. I guess I would never know. Probably the next four years I might be able to look at the files and find out but until then, it seems as though we will never know. It will be about four years and two months. I am counting.

I want to talk a little bit, Sir, about the management of the foreign reserves because, as I have said, before the Central Bank has that particular mandate. The foreign reserves and the foreign exchange in this Island were in a perilous state for the past two years and maybe six months. It was in July 1989 that we in the Barbados Labour Party alerted the Minister of Finance and the country about the impending state of affairs with regards to our foreign reserves because we noticed that in the second quarter of 1989 we recorded a dip which was above that which we normally would expect as we move from the first quarter to the second because the reserves of the Island follow a seasonal pattern. They are highest probably in the first quarter and lowest in the fourth quarter but they vary from quarter to quarter. We noticed that there was a variation greater than usual between the first quarter 1989 and second quarter 1989.

Now, Sir, the Central Bank would know that also because every morning the first thing the Governor of the Central Bank would see on his desk is the print-out of the foreign exchange position of Barbados. A copy is immediately sent to the Minister of Finance. Every morning those two persons would have a record of the foreign exchange position in Barbados. It worried me that for over two years we have had a worsening foreign exchange position and nothing was done to arrest the situation.

The Central Bank was mandated to suggest remedies. As I said before, we do not know if they did. I hope they did, but we see nothing has been done. If they did not, the Board should resign because they would not have fulfilled their mandate. If they did and the Minister of Finance ignored them they should also resign. In either case, they should have resigned because either it is a dereliction of duty or a case of spitting in the wind, so to speak. The point I want to know is, why did it take two years to try to remedy the situation? In the meantime what happened in those two years? We see a further deterioration especially in the export earning sectors in the country.

Now, the Barbados Labour Party has been in the forefront of such innovative measures to get foreign exchange. Indeed, Sir, it is interesting to note that Dr. Richie Haynes when he was Minister of Finance in 1986 when he took over in his Mini Budget of July he made sure that provisions which were introduced in the April Budget by the then Prime Minister Mr. St. John remained in force. He recognised that they were far-reaching and they were almost revolutionary because it encouraged

Barbadians if you are an accountant or a builder or whatever to go out there in the real world and earn foreign exchange. When you earn foreign exchange, because of the benefits they are bringing to the country the profits on the operation will be taxed at a different rate than the profits of the local operation because we want to encourage people to go out into the world and earn foreign exchange. I am sure that some companies have done that rather successfully. That was an innovative measure which would redound to our benefit.

Secondly, the thrust to international business, the Offshore Banking and Insurance Company, has been of tremendous help to Barbados with regards to the foreign exchange position. I am proud of the fact that my party was instrumental in devising these ways of enhancing the foreign exchange earnings to rehabilitate the country. But since 1986 we see that the Government Taxation Treaty with America ran into problems because they waited until the last minute, as usual, to renegotiate and we lost a lot of benefits that they had.

3.55 p.m.

For example the sugar industry which was 111 000 tonnes in 1986 is now 66 000 tonnes last year and next year we are lucky if we get 50 000. The thing is sugar brings in an average of \$1 100 per tonne so you can see the amount of foreign exchange that we have foregone as a result of the destruction of the sugar industry. In my view it is an order of about \$50 million a year that we could have got if we had the foresight and the commonsense to persevere with the sugar industry given that there are very little alternatives in the short run to earn that level of foreign exchange. We could have had \$50 million more. Just think of what that would do in our economy if we could have had that \$50 million. I do not think that right now we would be in the clutches of the IMF. I do not think we would be in the clutches of the IMF now if we had put the amount of attention in the sugar industry that we should have.

Not only that, we are now told that next year agriculture can earn \$2 million from sweet potatoes. I believe it because our sweet potatoes are of a good quality. When I was in England the ones I had to buy were of inferior quality to the ones we produce here. To me it is amazing that over the years we have not exported that crop especially since it is a crop that we know how to grow well. It is not a very difficult crop to grow. The foreign exchange needed to grow sweet potatoes is very little because it hardly needs fertilizer. All it needs is just enough rain to get them growing and then they would produce.

The collapse of agriculture both sugar and non-sugar meant tremendous harm to the foreign reserves of the country. A part of our problem is because we have not made any effort to keep the sugar industry going at a

different level. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture when he gets up to talk will agree with me on that point, that not enough effort was put into the sugar sector and for that matter the whole of the agricultural sector.

For example under us we helped the beef industry enormously by putting a surcharge on the importation of foreign beef and it allowed certain of our entrepreneurs to get into the beef industry in a big way. I am very worried now that we are now trying to turn the hands of the clock back by threatening to impose duties on raw materials which could possibly include peas. That is going to hurt the agricultural sector tremendously. I hope that the Minister of Trade would do everything in his power to ensure that peas are still allowed duty free access next year.

Agriculture is one area where if we play our cards correctly we can not only achieve foreign exchange savings because do not forget the imports of food have increased around \$150 million when we left office in 1986 and is now \$213 million. That is over 25% increase in the importation of food. I am very grateful to the Minister for advising me that freight rates went up. Perhaps he can check and see if that is the real cause for the importation of food. Because I want to make the point, we have had a rapid increase in the tourist industry over the past maybe three, four years. To me it does not make sense in terms of the foreign exchange position to be importing tourists and at the same time importing food with which to feed the tourists. You are not getting the trade off that you should be getting. The benefits to the economy would not be as great as if you were able when you import the tourists to help develop.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order. You do not import tourists, you export your tourism services. They come here to consume them. But you do no import tourists. Just for the record, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: All right. Proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: We need to get the linkages between tourism, manufacturing and agriculture to make sure that when the tourists spend a dollar in Barbados a large portion of that does not go back out by way of imports. For example we bring 400 000 tourists here but we also bring artifacts from Korea or from Taiwan or from wherever that have on it marked Barbados. To me that it is a waste of time. I am particularly – I use the word again – distressed or distraught that the IDC could be closing its handicraft section as reported in the press.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Clarke.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, nowhere in this debate has it been said or

even suggested that anyone is closing the Handicraft Division of the Industrial Development Corporation. I would hope that Senators would behave, especially at a time like this in a rather responsible way. We are not here to spread panic within the population. If we want to play games we can go at a street corner and do it.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: I am on my feet Senator Barker.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker you must behave in a more orderly fashion, one more becoming of the Chamber we are in.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I apologize, Mr. Acting President, but I do not need a lecture at this time.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat, you must behave in a more orderly fashion.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes, Mr. Acting President, but it gets annoying every time the Senator interrupts me.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: He certainly had to set that record straight. Will you proceed with your debate.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, the report said that 50 persons from the IDC Handicraft Division had been sent home. If that is not tantamount to closing down I do not know. But 50 persons from the Handicraft.....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: What has that got to do with the Exchange Control Act?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am talking about the fact that we are bringing in tourists and before the IDC Handicraft centre gets involved in making things for the said tourists to buy they have sent home 50 workers from the IDC Handicraft centre.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating yourself. You are being repetitious.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I was explaining for your benefit because, Sir, you asked me what that has to do with....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have heard you. I have heard you twice on this same thing. Will you please proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir as I was saying before Dr. Clarke got up on his point of order, we need to make sure that in order to enhance the stability in the foreign exchange sector that we have all of our productive sectors operating efficiently. I mentioned agriculture in

total disarray. The manufacturing sector which at one time was exporting \$500 million in goods when the year comes and one time went down as low as \$214 million. I do not think the Honourable Senator was Minister of Trade then so I would not blame him for that. In the space of about three to four years, almost \$300 million were lost in exports. I know that the Honourable Senator is going to lecture me on the fact that INTEL closed down.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Do not anticipate another speech, Senator Barker. Will you please continue your own debate and not anticipate what other Senators will say. Will you continue your own debate? So the record of this Government in both the agriculture and manufacturing sectors ... I mentioned in manufacturing the loss of some \$300 million in exports; the effect is being felt now and the last two years in the market downturn in reserves available for Barbadians to conduct their business. Sir, we are bringing in a Bill which tells the manufacturers to bring back the money when they export but we are not putting the means possible where the said manufacturers ... 4.05 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir, the Bill does not say the manufacturers; it is the Exchange Control Bill; it says nothing about the manufacturers. I assume that you can read and read accurately.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Manufacturers export, Sir, and we want more of them to export. Most manufacturers are exporters, so I don't know what his interruption is about.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Confine yourself to the debate, please. Do you have to be tutored all the time? Will you please continue?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, as I was saying, whereas we should be encouraging our manufacturers to export we are now introducing measures which will further lessen their ability to get into the export market in a big way. Now, it is true, Sir, that the duties on raw materials are only for those goods which are sold locally. If the manufacturer exports he gets back the duty. Sir, we all know that if the manufacturer has a strong home market this would further his ability to get into the export market because he would then be able to get economies of scale which could eventually bring down his cost of production and hence enhance his competitiveness in the export market. So, the removal of duties for the home markets is not going to do anything to enhance the capability of ...

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, please. I cannot sit here and hear this erroneous information being disseminated. The Minister of

Finance, the Prime Minister of this Country, has agreed that there be no changes in terms of importation of raw materials to the manufacturing sector through December 31, 1991 which is yet to come. In addition to which the manufacturers will meet with the World Bank people when they are here to discuss the whole problem. In the meantime, people who are exporting and demonstrate that they were exporting will be able to import the raw materials duty free. Do not create an argument and create a straw man then to knock it over. Let us deal with the reality of the situation, please.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I don't know what all the fussing is about. I have said before if you are exporting do not pay on raw material but he mentioned December 31. Now what is going to happen ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Who is he?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Senator Dr. CLARKE.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Speak of Honourable Senators in a different manner, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: If you say December 31, I have no quarrel with that but what is going to happen January 1, and the World Bank does not run our economy? The Minister of Finance runs our economy; do not give me that the manufacturers talk to the World Bank.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Address the Chair, please.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am just responding, so the point I am making is that when we should be encouraging our manufacturers to go out there and penetrate, note that they have to go, in my view, out in the extra Caricom market because they are not allowed any scope in the Caricom Market for a big increase in exports. So we have to be encouraging them to go beyond Caricom, but we are destroying their ability to do so with the imposition of these duties and in addition interest rates have gone up.

I am told that overdraft rates on amounts of over the limit is close to 40 per cent. Not only that, but transportation costs have gone up, fuel costs have gone up, so we are increasing the cost to the manufacturer and at the same time ...

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: On a point of order, Senator Barker is misinforming this House. Overdraft rates are no way near 40 per cent. It is not true.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I said, Sir, overdraft rates exceeding the overdraft limit. He did not listen. I said over the limit. So we are saddling the manufacturer with

all of these costs and at the same time you expect him to go out there and earn foreign exchange. Sir, it can't be done. If we are serious about the foreign exchange earning capability of the manufacturing sector we are going to have to do what all the other countries in the world are doing, that is, offering special help to the manufacturing sector in order to help them to achieve competitiveness.

The IMF and the other agencies make this big fuss about duty concessions, but, Sir, why don't they advise the United States to remove some of the barriers to trade, both tariff and non-tariff, that are barriers to trade? Why don't they let the Europeans remove all the barriers to trade? I was reading a magazine and it was saying, Sir, that it cost US 18 cents to produce a pound of beet sugar and it cost US 12 cents to produce a pound of cane sugar and yet in Europe they are subsidising their growers to make them grow high cost beet sugar and we down here are denied access to those markets with cane sugar which can be produced at a cheaper rate. And yet, Sir, those same agencies, through their agencies like IMF and the World Bank are going to tell us now, in the Developing Countries, that we have to import all of these barriers on the inputs for agriculture and for the manufacturing sector.

I am saying, Sir, that has to be wrong and I believe that Government should use whatever means at its disposal in conjunction with the other Caricom and other Third World parties to make sure that these international agencies do not penalise us and at the same time the big countries with powerful might do as they like with regard to imposing barriers, both tariff and non-tariff to imports from the developing countries.

Sir, that is why I am a bit distressed when I read the Letter of Intent, where we were made to impose these conditions. Probably, Sir, it is because when we went to the IMF we did not have the bargaining power to go and say: "Look this ..."

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not relevant, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, with due respect, it is relevant to what I am saying. I am talking about the exchange earning capabilities which are going to be lessened by the IMF and the World Bank imposing conditions on us. I am saying that is going to further aggravate our foreign earning capabilities.

I am saying, Sir, that if we have the bargaining power we could have given our track record in the international community and we could have bargained for a better situation for our manufacturing and agricultural sectors because it is so vital.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, you are repeating yourself.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: It is vital, Sir, that we make sure that we maintain our exchange earnings capabilities.

Sir, I have no problem supporting the Bill. I have said so from the start but, Sir, all I am worrying about is:

- (1) the action of the Central Bank, and
- (2) we are not doing enough.

We are talking here about all of these punitive measures with regards to people exporting and all of that but we are doing nothing to make sure that the machinery is put in place for a great improvement in the sectors of the economy – tourism, manufacturing and agriculture – and the services which earned us foreign exchange in the past.

Sir, with those few words and many interruptions I support the Bill.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, it is something of an imposition, I am not sure to what extent I am prepared to continue to bear the cost of that imposition of hearing Senator Barker present himself in this manner. This Bill is straightforward. It is 18 years late in my view. The Exchange Control Powers responsibilities in law as resided in the customs of Barbados should have been transferred to the Central Bank when that Bank was first established. To come in here and to suggest otherwise and to start to talk all around the world is either to indulge in filibustering or to display ignorance of an incredible level. The Customs could never have been the proper place in a Central Bank system to have this responsibility and I would expect anyone who has either practised in management, trained in management, or who knows anything about economics to understand that. 4.15 p.m.

This Bill normally should be a routine affair. We should not be spending as much as 13 minutes debating this particular Bill. But because of the red-herrings and the errors which have been introduced into this debate some of us on this side have got to try to set the record straight. Mr. Acting President, I will try to set the record straight with respect to some of the errors of fact and analysis. But before I do that, I think it is necessary for me to say to the Senate that I am aware that at December last year there was more than \$100 million outside of this country and the people refused to bring it back and the Central Bank had no power to call them into account. I will not be like Senator Barker who indulges in these practices. There are only a few businessmen who get into this kind of thing. There are only a few of them. A serious businessman gets on with the development of his business. He does not have time for these kinds of practices.

I welcome this Amendment which gives the Central Bank full powers with respect to the monitoring of flows in and out of Barbados. Mr. Acting President, this particular Amendment is important with the development in the tourism sector of these all inclusive tours where you pay for everything overseas and they come here and even the food and beverages are already paid for. This raises a problem for a small economy like Barbados if we are not careful. What we will see are the numbers but the foreign exchange will never be realised. That has plagued Barbados in the last couple of years. This is not the time for me to be specific who is doing this and who is doing that. I am not prepared to do it on the floor of the Senate. But suffice it to say that some of the largest establishments are the culprits. It has got to stop.

We have done some major renovations in hotels within the last couple of years and I would wish the Minister of Finance to investigate how some of those hotels got permission to get around the Ministry of Finance and raise the funds locally. People talk about politicians and Ministers. They do not understand that people who are not Ministers can indulge in skulduggery at the highest level. I repeat that I would like the Ministry of Finance to conduct an investigation to see how some of these foreign hotels got the consent. I would like to see that done. I heard Senator Williams say something here. That is where he called for licensing of the highway. I fully support that.

Now tourism is the dominant sector in this economy and we have got to put ourselves in a position where we do not only talk about numbers. More importantly, I would like to see the Central Bank now that they have the power to investigate these matters... I believe the Government should do all in its power to deposit the foreign money in the local banking system. I want to make myself crystal clear. I am against the giving of external accounts to firms in the distributive sector. I know the Barbados Labour Party would want to give it to them. I am against it and I will tell you why.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, on a point order. The Honourable Senator is misleading us. He does not know what the Barbados Labour Party would want to do. He should not be so presumptuous.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Would you please be specific please?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: He said what the Barbados Labour Party wanted to do. He is not in a position to know that. We do not want to give anything to the distributive sector. Let him keep his mouth off the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Please, not that language in here. That is for the street corner. In here, we address ourselves to more parliamentary language.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes, I apologize but we also tell the truth.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Are you suggesting that someone is doing other than that?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: He is misleading the House because he purports to be able to say what the Barbados Labour Party will do or will not do.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating, Senator Barker. Senator Alleyne, you may continue.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I was making the point that I do not agree with giving permission to hold external accounts to the distributive sector. I was going on to make the point that I have good reason to believe that when the Barbados Labour Party is talking about giving permission to hold foreign exchange accounts they would have the distributive sector in mind and my reason is that they take instructions from their paymasters.
4.25 p.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Senator is seriously misleading this Chamber. The only thing that the Barbados Labour Party is on record as stating in relation to foreign exchange accounts is that we believe that all Barbadians, regardless of who you are, should be entitled to hold foreign exchange accounts. We do not, and have not, subscribed to any discrimination on the part of anybody as to the holding of foreign exchange, in the same manner that this Government has discriminated in terms of whom it is prepared to dispose assets to.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: No. This is a point of order and you can only speak on what has been stated before, Senator Mottley. Will you remember that in future?

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, my position quite clearly is that some ranking ought to be introduced into the process of granting permission to hold external accounts. The highest priority ranking has got to be given to the foreign exchange earners. At this time in Barbados, it does not make sense opening up the flood-gates and saying Tom, Dick and Harry can hold foreign exchange accounts. What you need in Barbados now is an increase in the supply of foreign exchange and just granting foreign exchange accounts to Tom, Dick and Harry will not achieve that purpose. What is desirable is that foreign exchange accounts be given to the exporters so that they don't have to line up at the doors of the Central Bank, apply for permission and then they

are not sure at the end of the day if they will have foreign exchange coming their way. They must have first call on the foreign exchange which they are bringing into the country. That is the point which I am making.

I promised, Mr. Acting President, to deal with some of the errors of fact of analysis which were introduced with Senator Barker and I will start with the last first. Towards the end of his contribution, he said that the IMF and the World Bank will reduce the foreign exchange earnings of Barbados. That is a statement on record.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, I was saying that when they come and introduce those measures they are reducing our capabilities. I never said that they have reduced our capabilities. Please ask the Honourable Senator not to misquote me.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Barker, for the explanation.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I am going to take Senator Barker on his word and accept what he says and I will prove that he is factually and analytically incorrect. He says with the measures which the IMF has introduced, the kind of conditions which they have kind of forced the Government to introduce that those measures will reduce the foreign exchange reserves of the country. First, I want to point out that it is incorrect to include the World Bank because the World Bank has not had any interface with Barbados at this time. That is the first point. Leave the World Bank out altogether. The Government at this time is not in any negotiations with the World Bank, so they could have had no effect on the foreign exchange earnings of the economy.

To get back to the more important point which you were trying to make, you cannot say that a country does not have foreign exchange or the foreign exchange reserves have collapsed, as you have been preaching up and down this country. You cannot say that in one breath and then come in another breath and say that measures which give you access to short-term supply of foreign exchange that those measures will destroy the foreign exchange earnings of the country. In fact, if you didn't have access to that short-term supply, the export industries which require imports inputs would collapse. Tourism would collapse because you could not import the inputs which are required to service the tourist industry. The manufacturing sector, where would they get their inputs from, if we don't have any foreign exchange and the foreign creditors decided to withdraw their credit because those fellows can't pay? Where would the agricultural sector continue its business if it can't import fertiliser? How will it be able to reap the crop?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, I object to your constant interruptions. I have repeated this is not

that sort of debate that you have around street corners. Your constant interruptions are very unseemly and they interrupt the very tenor of the debate. Will you please desist from it? Senator Alleyne, you may continue.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, the point which I am making is that the argument which Senator Barker is trying to lead is unsustainable. In fact, the facts are wrong and the analysis is totally incorrect. If I accept that what they are saying is correct, that the foreign reserves situation is so difficult, the logical consequence of that – because you can't go to the external commercial markets to access them – is that if you can't do that and you are not going to the Fund, what are you going to do? You are going to bring a fully paralysed situation to the economy which will disrupt all your foreign exchange earnings. Therefore, to argue that in going to the IMF and facing the conditions which they put on you will destroy the foreign exchange earnings is a contradiction of what you are saying.

I am making the point, Mr. Acting President, so that the record will show that not all of us in this particular Chamber do not appreciate these things. Senator Barker spoke about the voluntary aspect of foreign exchange control in the past. Notice, he never told this Chamber which past he is speaking about! Prior to the central banking system which we got in the early seventies, there was the British Caribbean Currency Board and then the East Caribbean Currency Authority, and in that system which was fully backed in terms of foreign exchange (a dollar for a dollar), so that if we had a currency in circulation of \$300 million, you had to have \$300 million in foreign currency to back it. There was no need for any foreign exchange monitoring because you had 100% backing of your currency. Theoretically, it is possible, but in real terms it is impossible that it could have happened that all the local currency would be wiped out and people would want that foreign exchange. To suggest that that was a voluntary system is a failure to appreciate what was happening. It was a self adjusting, self-correcting mechanism, which is different from a voluntary mechanism.

Once you move into a central banking system, you have to have management. That is the logic on which any central banking system is established. It is the apex of the system.

Senator Barker has asked a number of questions of what goes on at Board meetings. It is not for me to speak about those things, Mr. Acting President.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of order. I never asked what goes on at Board meetings, Mr. Acting President.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I recall Senator Barker referring to Sir Douglas and so on and so forth. Suffice it to say. I notice the Governor of the Bank just last week in correspondence to the Nation newspaper spoke to the public about the responsibilities of the Board, and that is where the matter rests. The Governor speaks for the Bank. Oh yes. He is Chairman of the Board.

This notion which Senator Barker raised when he said the overdraft rates exceed the limit or close to forty per cent, I said earlier that it is not true. The most recent communication from the commercial banks will tell you that if you exceed the overdraft limit you have to pay a minimum fine of \$200 or \$300 or the penal rate, which they have to pay the Central Bank which is thirty-two per cent and which is closer to thirty than forty per cent. The reason for that is to force Barbadians to recognise the necessity to adjust to demand. You are in a situation in Barbados where you cannot continue business as usual. Anybody in Barbados who believes that you can continue business as usual that person should be sent to take residence at the Psychiatric Hospital. Unfortunately, in Barbados today, Mr. Acting President, there are too many cheap politicians who walk around this country night after night making people believe that if you give them power, by the waving of some wand they can restore the situation in Barbados.

I said on September 20th in this Chamber, the reality of Barbados is that the national economic cake has contracted, and when the national economic cake has contracted, each of the interest groups have to get to settle for a lower absolute slice. Even if you continue to receive the same relative portion, in absolute terms it has to be less and that is something which all Barbadians have to understand at this time. There are times when you have to mark time, and sometimes you even have to take two steps backward in order to go forward. All of us in Barbados have to understand this.

I notice Senator Barker has this refrain that the members of the Board of the Central Bank should resign. I can assure you, Mr. Acting President, I understand my duties to Barbados, as long as I am on the Central Bank Board. I also understand my duties as a Senator. Irrespective of who makes the call, I will ignore them as long as I am convinced that my intervention will be in the long term interest of Barbados. I am not going to jump because somebody says jump. I am not into that. But I fully well understand why some people in this country would like everybody to resign because in so doing they will create opportunities for a lot of unemployed people and people soon to be unemployed.

4.35 p.m.

This matter before us on exchange control brings something to me which has been exercising my mind for

a long time. I would wish to know to what extent the Exchange Control Department and the Supervision Department of the Central Bank of Barbados was fully apprised of the goings-on at the Bank of Credit and Commerce International. There is information available to me, Mr. Acting President, which leads me to believe that the public interest would be best served by a full and thorough enquiry into the activities of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International in Barbados.

Mr. Acting President, I can tell you that some of us in Barbados who are keeping the most noise now would commit suicide overnight. It is that serious. Some of us in Barbados who are keeping the most noise now if there is a full disclosure of the activities in Barbados on the Bank of Credit and Commerce, they will jump the bridge and drown themselves. I hope the Minister of Finance is hearing what I am saying. I say this. The time is going to come when I will be in the position to speak without any encumbrances.

Senator Barker spoke about the record of this Government with respect to earning foreign exchange. This is another erroneous statement which I would like to clarify. The Government of Barbados is not in the business of earning foreign exchange. I am not talking about this Government. I am talking about Governments over time. What Governments are supposed to do are to put in place the kind of macro economic policies which will encourage the private sector to get on with their activities and so earn foreign exchange for the country. The Government itself is not involved in earning foreign exchange.

I find it difficult to fathom the logic of Senator Barker when he speaks about the Government destroying the sugar industry in Barbados. The Government used to own 3 500 acres of low-class quality land, reject land that people did not want. The sugar industry is owned by the private sector. Anybody who understands the performance of the sugar industry in Barbados would know that for over 27 years you could detect a long-run structural decline in output in that sugar industry.

I think it was around 1967 the last time we got 204 000 tonnes. When were we ever close to that? Yields have been declining. The acreage under sugar has been declining. The fundamental reason is the decline in net profitability in the industry. In fact more than that. Since 1982 everybody in sugar cultivation has made losses, losses to the extent that the equity of lots of businesses have almost disappeared and Senator Barker has the effrontery to get up in here and say the Government destroyed it. He does not understand the movement of market forces. Market forces are beyond the control of the Government.

SENATOR C. O. WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I would like to reinforce a remark Senator Alleyne just made as an example. In 1980 with the exchange control

in Barbados, the sugar industry received just over \$1 000 a tonne for sugar. By 1983 because of no act of the sugar industry managers or anybody in Government but purely by the strengthening of the American dollar the sugar industry received \$564 for the same identical product.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, on the revenue side, yes. The average export price declined dramatically but average cost production went up in Barbados. That is the reality of the sugar industry. We must not as legislators get in these Chambers and make people believe that we have a control over the productive sectors which we do not have. The very people in the private sector are at the mercy of market forces external to this economy. We must not get up and do these things. I have some sympathy for Senator Barker. These might be matters which are too high for him.

Now, Senator Barker speaks about sweet potato as a crop which is easily grown in Barbados. My information tells that in the last couple of years this is a crop which has been affected by disease, yams as well as sweet potatoes. Never mind we have a good market. The Extension Services Department in the Ministry of Agriculture has been battling to find means to get rid of the disease which has been affecting the sweet potato. We must have respect for evidence. Senator Barker speaks about the food import bill in this country. It is about 70% of our food imports which comprise four food items, cereals, meat and meat preparations, dairy products, fish and fish preparations. 4.45 p.m.

Even in the area of meat and meat preparations, with the best of will in the world, what we can do is encourage local production but that local production will not account for a substantial portion of total consumption in Barbados. I think we have to recognize that in Barbados the private sector farmers are suffering. I have addressed my mind to this matter for a long time. They are not devils as some people would suggest they are. It is time – we still have time – for the people who own the lands in Barbados and the Government or representatives of the Government to sit down together and decide what are the most profitable activities to be put on the lands of Barbados.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Alleyne, you have just two more minutes.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Thank you, Mr. Acting President. The cross talk and recrimination which has gone on over the years have brought us to the juncture where we are in agriculture. If we are going to turn it around there has to be a turnaround in the relations between Government and the owners of the land. We have to understand this.

Mr. Acting President, I wish to say in closing nothing disturbs me more than the partisan politicking and the

destructive talk which is going on in Barbados at this time because if ever all Barbadians needed social cohesion and a Government needed goodwill in order to turn around social and economic trends in this country it is now. If we fail to act with foresight, if on this 25th Anniversary of our Independence we show that we are so immature as a people that we do not recognize that we are at the crossroads we will disadvantage the outlook not only of this generation but generations unborn.

Mr. Acting President, I am much obliged to you.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Mr. Acting President, I rise to support the Bill. I want to say here that I believe too like others that this bill was long in coming. I feel that if you set up systems you have to make these systems work by putting the necessary regulations in order. I am happy at this stage that the necessary regulations are in order. I realize the number of contributing factors to the decline in most of our productive sectors. I have stuck to my point because I am experienced in the matter that any family needs foods for body building and repair of worn out tissues. They need what are known as the carbohydrate foods and surely in Barbados we have a large number of those foods, the energy giving foods. We have cassava, we have yam, we have potato, we have breadfruit, we have green bananas, we have eddoes and you can go on and on. We have the potential to make these into export crops. It has been clearly demonstrated by the unit of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. Just two weeks ago we exported 80 000 lbs of sweet potatoes. Thank God whatever problems were there with the sweet potatoes were not insurmountable. The problem that we have really is a problem that we had with the yam. I believe we still have some of these problems. But with the kinds of high quality scientists that we have produced as Barbadians they will be working on these problems. It takes time to work on problems – like the pawpaw has been taking an awful lot of time because you do not want to spray from the air and kill people. We have people here who have to live on this planet earth and therefore we cannot hope to have a few paw paws and no people. We prefer to have the people so it would take a longer time.

I want to make it quite clear that there are a number of foods in the supermarket that we are importing that we can do without. All of these peculiar things that we are importing – lobster tails in some kind of sauce and shrimp and cake mixes. And when it comes to cereal we could have good sweet potato cereal. What is wrong with the corn meal porridge? As a matter of fact some of our children are getting too fat so we do not necessarily need to have a cereal for breakfast. We could have the fruit, we could have the starch and you have your beverage and that settles the order of breakfast for the day. People stick to cereals when they are living in a cold climate where they

need to have something more sustaining. But in a hot condition like Barbados we do not necessarily have to go for cereal. When we are talking about cereals especially things like cornflakes, you only get the nutrition when you add the milk. So you could better give the child a glass of milk and forget that.

Mr. Acting President, that is a fact of life. The corn flakes is just the shaft of the wheat. It is nothing more. I wish that sometimes those persons who do not know much about nutrition leave it out.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Fraser this is very informative and it is correct. But please let it be more relevant:

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: I beg your pardon, Sir?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: This is very informative and it is correct but please let it be more relevant.

SENATOR Mrs. V. C. FRASER: Well I thought that this was very relevant if we are talking about importing and exporting and we are dealing with an exchange control Bill, Mr. Acting President. If it is not relevant, I am sorry. But this is very relevant because right now we are in a string because of our high import food bill and we have to get foreign exchange in order to get that food that we do not need. I was in the supermarket yesterday and I have been in supermarkets for the last two weeks and when I see all the cake mixes and all the various canned peas and beans – we used to be able to produce our black eye peas and our rouncivals. Why do we have to import them? Why can we not grow them between the same canes? We used to grow these things between the canes. We used to grow cassava, potatoes. Now every moment we are thinking of importing things. What is wrong with us doing beans in tomato sauce right here in Barbados?

We are doing a beef testing now, local beef, Barbados beef. I dare not say Bajan because Mr. Williams will say his piece. People who come to the supermarket are surprised at the quality of that beef which is being grown in many cases by small farmers, being slaughtered at the Barbados Marketing Corporation. So if we want to look seriously at the foods that are necessary for growth and repair, they are necessary for giving us energy and for protecting our body from diseases and we compare them with what is on the supermarket shelf, I would say about 80% of those things we do not need. We have a lot of fruits and vegetables in this country. We are too lazy sometimes to go around and look and see what we have. That is the big problem, distribution. One of my friends up there at Lemon Arbour he had any amount of peppers, any amount of squash, any amount of cucumbers, beans that he would have ploughed back in the land had I not gone and told him that there were lots of people who needed beans

and I would put it on Rediffusion for him. It is not a question of not having the ability to produce and help ourselves but it is a question of being lazy, a question of attitudes and indifference towards what is Barbadian and what is going to help us on to the Twenty-First Century. It is time that we recognize that there are a number of things that are not imported in other countries. When we talk about tourism, you go to somebody else's country they are not going to import anything for you. You will eat what they have. If you want something that they have not got you would have to get it from somewhere else.

People have to learn to fashion their tastes to things Barbadian. If they never had to do it before and as I learnt in the war years they did it and they did it well and I think Barbadians have the same mentality, they have the same brain, they have aptitudes, they have all the necessary gadgets and things like that to even do it better on this occasion, Mr. Acting President.

I want also to reiterate the point about bringing in food for tourists. I have found, and I give credit where credit is due, that many of our local hotels are now preparing local foods in a variety of ways. I am saying that there is still room for improvement. I am saying there are still things on the shelves that some of them buy that they do not need to buy. We do not need asparagus since we do not grow them. If we grow them, yes, we need them because the farmers will be getting money from them. We don't grow mushrooms and I don't see we have to spend foreign exchange to buy mushrooms when we don't grow them. Let us stick to the things that we can help the farmers because in the final analysis the crucial thing is money for the farmer who depends on that for a living. 4.55 p.m.

We were saying that we could not produce bananas and now look what has happened. We are producing some of the best bananas and plantains you could ever see. Not only that one man has proven very quickly that in ten weeks time that his business got so big with producing banana chips and plantain chips that he had to turn it over to Alamac Trading to market for him. That is just one success story.

I am saying there could be many if we would only pay attention to taking a look on the Supermarket shelves. Ask if we need fish cakes from Formosa. We don't. We now have local salt fish and I think from my taste and the taste of other people it has been going pretty good and it has been made into fish cakes and people have been eating them.

We need to give things a chance. We need to be our brother's keeper. We need to get together as a people and recognise the technology that we have available, the human resources, and utilise the technology along with the human resources. We have been doing sins of omission. We

have been saying buy local, eat local, and then with another voice some people have been saying, don't ban anything keep importing them. Why do we have to keep importing them? It is even dangerous for our health if we look at some of the labels. Some of these things have in all sorts of nitrites. They are banned by the USDA but yet you can find them in Barbados and we will continue to say, let our children drink the dust that is made in juice when we have fresh juices there at our own dairy. There is a lot of dust coming in here and making juices and people are selling this dust and this should be prohibited because it is harmful to the existence of our people and we are going to get a whole lot of sick children on our hands very soon if we do not look at this whole question of how we are spending our foreign exchange. Are we spending it to destroy ourselves? That is one of the big questions we should be asking ourselves. Do we need iceberg lettuce? That is the question we should be asking ourselves or do we need all of these different drinks or do we need fresh juices? Do we need to go up there at the various plantations and buy some fresh oranges and grapefruits? These are the things we ought to be buying.

Why is it that so many people in Barbados know that Pine Hill Dairy needs cherry pulp and we are not growing it and we are going and buying cherry filling for pies when we could do jamoon filling or we could do guava filling. The Hilton Hotel has been doing jamoon filling for pies and this has been very great. I wish a lot more people in this country would take a leaf out of the book of some of these hotels who have innovative chefs who are really trying their best to keep people in jobs by buying local and eating local.

I know, Mr. Acting President, my voice has been out there in the wilderness for a long time, it is like trying to prepare ye the way of the Lord, but I tell you, I was telling you to prepare for these hard times ahead and all those people who do not grow something or they do not buy local and they keep trying to spend away the little foreign exchange they may have they are going to regret it in sack cloth and ashes.

Mr. Acting President, in closing I would like to say that there must be a greater respect for the profession of home economists in this country. I feel that home economists should be employed in the media so as to prepare television programmes to teach people to eat local and to buy local. Home economists are found in every area that sell cooking appliances throughout the world and we have to adopt this same strategy. You go to buy a stove or a fridge they tell you how to use it. They also give you little hints on what you can do to put in it. It is strange to me that with all of the money we are spending on broadcasting we have not got one single consistent programme on our television talking about buy local. It has

taken a private sector firm to team up with the Barbados Marketing Corporation to spread the gospel of eating local beef and we are very pleased with the kind of reports that we have been getting from the public.

There is also another private sector person who will be promoting the butter-basted turkey and it shows there is some good relationships still going on between Government and the Private Sector. We would like to encourage this but we would also like the private sector, and we have private sector representatives here in the Senate, to look seriously, if this is but one thing I want you to look seriously at, is sponsoring a programme in prime time. If we do not compete with the advertisers from overseas our people's attitudes will not change and there we have to have a very consistent programme of buy local.

I am appealing to the business sector to assist us with that programme on both television which is the strongest media, the written and the radio, and also to sponsor some of the courses to people to teach them how to grow their own things in their backyards. I feel that this can do a lot to help press home the problem. In the National Organisation of Women we have done these courses before with limited funds, but we are asking those people now who feel a conscientious commitment to their country to let us do something about it.

We need the foreign exchange. Whatever crops you have growing you need to let the BMC know. There are markets abroad. It is not to say there are no markets but we have to be able to spread the information through various channels. We do not always have funds to spread information. We cannot just depend on two radio programmes a week to spread that information so we would like assistance with spreading that information so that people who have golden apples and ackees and plums or whatever will be able to feed that information to the Barbados Marketing Corporation or other private exporters, because we have other people who export these crops too.

Mr. Acting President, I want to thank you very much and I sincerely look forward to the time which I believe will be very soon when we will understand the reality of buying local and eating local.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Acting President, I rise in support of the Resolution but once again there a number of things that concern me very greatly. Indeed, it is ironic that it is Senator Alleyne who made reference in his speech to the fact that erroneous information was being imported by Senator Barker and, indeed, that this statement should come from Senator Alleyne who then proceeds to mislead this Honourable Chamber by talking about the decrease in the average export price of sugar in this country one wonders how he can at the same time reprobate and approbate.

5.05 p.m.

Sir, Senator Alleyne told us that there was a decrease in the average export price of sugar, but it is unfortunate that the Central Bank of Barbados of which he is a Director...In fact, it would be interesting to find who are the new directors.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not relevant, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is relevant to the Central Bank of Barbados who has authority.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, that is not relevant. I rule that that is not relevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is imperative that those who are charged with the responsibility of the management and the policy of the Exchange Control Authority, which would be the officials of the Central Bank, that we as legislators know who are in charge of the responsibility of ensuring that matters which we pass in this Chamber...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: It is imperative that you know it in time. You may proceed.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is also imperative given Section 26(3) of the Central Bank Act which imposes a certain duty on those who are in charge of the responsibility and management, Sir, of the Central Bank of Barbados and the foreign reserves that they be faithful, Sir, to the words and to the law as stated in Section 26(3) of the Central Bank Act which places a strong duty on them to report when the foreign reserves are not in crisis but in danger of becoming in crisis. In the context, Sir, of that duty and in the context of Senator Alleyne being a Director of the Central Bank of Barbados who is also charged with the responsibility of publishing something called the Annual Statistical Digest in which can be found statistics relating to the economy of this country. I refer now more specifically to the year 1991 that on Page 178 of the Annual Statistical Digest 1991 under the table of Sugar Production and the sub-category "The Export Price of Sugar Per Tonne" we see there was a rise in the price of sugar in those years.

Sir, when Senator Alleyne wishes to speak about the erroneous information...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Alleyne.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I rise on a point of order. The record will show that I was speaking about the 1980's and the trend which started off in 1982. I am absolutely sure about what I am saying. I do not have that document but I am absolutely sure about it. The movement in the exchange rate, that is the U. S. dollar, strengthened against the ECU as Senator

Williams confirmed and almost slashed the price which we received from the United Kingdom for sugar. If you permit me, Mr. Acting President, since the Senator spoke about it, all I mean is a weighted average of the export price which we got from the United Kingdom and from the sales from the United States which were different. That is what I spoke about on the export price.

Thank you, Mr. Acting President.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Senator Alleyne must be more specific when he is speaking in this Chamber, Sir. Senator Alleyne used the words, "decline in the export price of earnings". He made that statement in the context of having earlier accused Senator Barker...

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I never spoke about decline in the export price. I would be a fool to do so.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, Hansard will tell us when it is printed. But Sir, I have a note and Senator Barker also has a note, not only one note but two notes, of the average export price on sugar, Sir. If that was not said, I would have not gone to the Annual Statistical Digest.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. There is a fundamental difference between what the Senator just said and saying that I said that there is a decline in the average export price of earnings. That statement is an asinine statement. That is what I mean to say. How could I say that?

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I really hope sincerely that the cause of the protestation will not be in vain after tonight. Sir, Senator Alleyne has made his position clear in respect of how he perceives his duties under Section 26(3) of the Central Bank Act and he disagrees with Senator Barker that the fact that the foreign reserves are in a crisis stage as is exhibited by the Letter of Intent submitted by the Prime Minister of Barbados to the International Monetary Fund stating that Barbados' foreign reserves were down. The fact that our foreign reserves have reached this stage is either as a result of dereliction of duty on the part of the Board of the Central Bank of having to warn of danger as they are required to do by law or, indeed, having warned that no action was taken by the Minister of Finance and they, too, are still accountable because their accountability is not only to the Minister of Finance but to the people of this country and the laws of this country as they...

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, the Honourable Senator is not speaking the truth. The Central Bank Act requires the Board to report to the

Minister. The Board cannot in law under the Central Bank Act report a disagreement to the public of Barbados. We would be acting *ultra vires*.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: That is the responsibility of the Central Bank that gives them the responsibility and the duty and I am glad that Senator Alleyne now acknowledges that duty. There are others of us who have a duty who have sworn to uphold and do all that is best on the part of this country whether as privy counsellors, senators, or in whatever capacity upon which we have sworn that oath. Those of us have found it necessary that when there are deaf ears, who refuse to listen to advice if such advice was even put forward, that certain action would be taken then to save the future of 250,000 people living in this country and their children to come. But no, Sir, we find ourselves in a position where our foreign reserves on the admission of the Prime Minister and only Minister of Finance are at a level of 1 1/2 weeks supply, Sir.

How do you explain that it is either dereliction of duty or a failure on the part of the Minister of Finance to listen to the advice of his advisers? It is very simple. If there are people, Sir, who find it possible to remain in a position, offering advice where that advice is not being taken...

5.15 p.m.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is irrelevant, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I don't know what point I am making, unless...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I said that statement is irrelevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I don't know if the Chair is ahead of me, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am not ahead of you because I have heard enough to tell you that that is irrelevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is strange and ironic that Senator Alleyne can defend faithfully the decline in foreign reserves despite the fact of section 26(3). I would have the utmost difficulty in remaining anywhere if nobody would listen to me; but then, Sir, in the pursuit of defending other people whom you must remember and fear that those other people might not remove us before we get a chance to resign...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That also is irrelevant. I insist that you withdraw those remarks. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I will withdraw the remarks but I have very serious doubts, and I am asking the Honourable Senator who is in charge of winding up on the part of the Government to inform us whether the Board that has the responsibility for the management of the affairs of the Exchange Control Authority has a valid quorum now because it must be of interest to us in this Chamber to know whether there is a valid quorum that can carry out the duties as they have been charged, and especially, as they are being charged under the Exchange Control (Amendment) Act, as we are asked to debate here this evening. That is in the context, Sir, of there being two vacancies in the posts of Directors, as has been reported.

Sir, Senator Alleyne went further and he talked about the fact that more than \$100 million left Barbados by December last year. He is once again...

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I wish on a point of order to say that I never made that statement. I said that it is my certain knowledge that at December of last year more than \$100 million was out of this country and that some of it was out of this country unaccounted for more than five years. I believe the Senator's ears are bad.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, my ears may be bad, but at least I know when it is time to leave somewhere before somebody moves me.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat, Senator Mottley, that is not the kind of statement which we construe to be contributing to the debate. You should attempt, at least, to keep the tone of the debate up to a very much higher standard. We do not appreciate those snide remarks. Will you please refrain from any of those snide remarks and keep to the relevant points of the debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am responding to allegations made by Senator Alleyne which are important enough to merit rebuttal when they are incorrect, and I will continue to do that.

Senator Alleyne said that, to his certain knowledge – the words he just used – that more than \$100 million in foreign exchange went out of Barbados at December last year and in some cases for more than five years. It is strange that we hear all these remarks about all these wrongdoings. All I would have to say is that if you have evidence of wrongdoing you must take it to the correct place and that is the Director of Public Prosecutions who is independently under a mandate to take action where the laws of this country have been breached.

I move from that stage to question how it is possible that once again the Central Bank which has responsibility for the Exchange Control Authority not to publicly

demand or privately demand an investigation into the report that a large sum of Barbados dollars were being carried down to St. Lucia by businessmen and that this large amount of money drew reports that it was to be converted to US dollars. The same Central Bank is the institution which is going to have to accept the Barbados dollars when they are brought back or sent back up here from St. Lucia.

It is strange that one has not heard any sort of great effort on the part of this Government, Sir, or of the Central Bank to determine those who are responsible for taking that Barbados currency out of this country. This is at a time when there were Barbadians who were being prosecuted for carrying \$5,000 out of the country. Once again, Sir, the initial reports on the money being carried down to St. Lucia was not of \$5,000. It was of a much larger sum and frankly speaking, Sir, there must be some reason why this has not been the subject of a proper investigation and enquiry in this country. I submit, Sir, that you cannot be seen to be condoning silence on that point, while at the same time poor Barbadians are being harassed and prosecuted for carrying three and five thousand dollars out of this country. That is the epitome of this Government, Sir. I would wonder, Sir, if there are any Honourable Members in here who can assist me on the point as to why the Barbados Government or the Central Bank have not found it necessary to pursue with any diligence who it is behind carrying vast amounts of Barbados currency to St. Lucia.

Certain remarks made by SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I still await, Sir, and hope that before the evening is done that the Honourable Senator within this Chamber, if it is possible, will enlighten me as to why there has been a dereliction of duty on the part of the Central Bank or the Government to make further and diligent enquiry and to report to the public of Barbados.

Sir, Senator Alleyne said, and he made reference, that you would have to be a visitor or member of the Psychiatric Hospital to think you could solve the problems overnight. There is no implication on the part of anybody, certainly not on the part of the Barbados Labour Party, that it is possible. However, I would understand why Senator Alleyne has comfort in using those metaphors all the time. The problem, Sir, is that Senator Alleyne all of a sudden recognises since September 20th that Barbados' foreign reserves are in serious crisis, but I want to know whether he didn't recognise that in December – I am speaking of December 1990 and January 1991 – when he went on platform after platform in this country saying how good this country was doing.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is irrelevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: ... that the foreign reserves of this country...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, I say that is irrelevant.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I am moving on.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You may move on but you will withdraw those remarks. It has nothing absolutely to do with this. Senator Mottley, you will withdraw those remarks.
5.25 p.m.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I will withdraw them, Sir, but I wish to refer to Senator Alleyne's part of his speech when he talked about cheap politicians moving on platforms night after night.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You will withdraw that also. That has nothing at all to do with the debate. I must insist that we keep this debate up to a much higher standard.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I would with the greatest of pleasure keep the debate up except that being a young person I cannot help but follow sometimes the examples of elder Senators who have spoken before me. It is impossible and difficult to understand how all of a sudden people can realise that Barbados' foreign reserves are in a bad position now when in December of 1990 our foreign reserves stood at...

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, on a point of order. I am saying to this Senate that Senator Mottley can reproduce no written statement or no voice recording of my making a statement to that effect or the substance to that statement in December of 1990 or thereafter. Through you, I call on her to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, you will withdraw those remarks.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I believe I withdrew them some few minutes ago. I do not think Senator Alleyne is listening to the proceedings in the Chamber. I withdrew them. He is obviously rising on a point of order that has been withdrawn...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: All right, Senator Mottley. I will decide that.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is impossible to understand how all of a sudden Barbados' foreign reserves are in such a state and so bad that it calls for people to make remarks that you would have to be a

mad person not to realise that the national economic cake has shrunk when in December of 1990 Barbados' foreign reserves stood at \$165.9 million. Out of that \$154.7 million was for the CMCF debt. In other words, it did not exist, leaving a difference of \$11.2 million.

If one looks at the import bill for Barbados for the whole year you would realise that Barbados needs on average \$27 million a month. Eleven million dollars was what was in foreign reserves of December 1990. Yet we heard how good things were in this country. All of a sudden there is a difference of less than two weeks' foreign reserves in December 1990 and one and a half week's foreign reserves in August 1991.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr Acting President, on a point of order. Senator Mottley is misleading this House. She just said Barbados needs \$27 million in for exchange a month. It is totally untrue. The figure is much in excess of that.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: The figure is \$27 million a week. If Senator Alleyne wishes he can look at the Annual Statistical Digest of which he as a member of the Board of the Central Bank...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes. You did say \$27 million a month, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: That may be so. I will correct it and say \$27 million a week, as I had said, Sir, and that will make it worse because if you only have \$11 million in foreign reserves and you need \$27 million a week how many day's foreign reserves that is? That is three days' foreign reserves in December of 1990. The only reason they were able to survive was through a number of short-term borrowings and eventually the requirement that we must sell off the family silver whether it is Government's family silver or the family silver owned by the Pension Funds in this country by requiring them, as is their right - I am not quarrelling with that - to return their funds to this country but funds which they will have a far greater chance of making a far greater return on their investment outside of the country as they have done because the funds over the last 10 - 15 years have moved from \$20 million to \$40 million.

We must remember the owners of those pension funds are not the big six in this country. It is people like the Port Workers Fund. It is workers in the Port and all the other workers in this country whose pension funds were being invested overseas. That is what I mean when I say I have to sit down here and it is with great difficulty that I do it when I hear statements being made that all of a sudden people realise that the national economic cake in Barbados has contracted. What is different between the position of August 1991 and December 1990?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating yourself, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: No, Sir. I am now asking what is different.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating yourself.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I made a statement and I am asking what is different.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I repeat. You are repeating yourself. If you have nothing further to say...

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I have a lot more to say.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Well, then, please get on with it or else you will not be able to say it in this debate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, Senator Alleyne called for an enquiry into the Bank of Credit and Commerce. He may well be correct on that. I just hope that the information that he says leads him to believe that they need an enquiry into the BCCI was not information that he had when the National Insurance Scheme deposited over \$30 million in BCCI. I just hope that information was not in his possession then, whatever information it is.

Sir, the economy and economic business are all about confidence, Sir. The earning of foreign exchange and the maintenance of foreign reserves is ultimately about confidence. There is a crisis of confidence in this country because let us remember that at the end of the day the Barbados Government is not a primary owner of foreign exchange. It has to rely on those people who earn the foreign exchange in the various sectors to bring the money back and deposit it. For them to do that they must have confidence.

When it is clearly stated that there is no confidence, when a central bank director can state that there is no confidence in the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, one has to wonder what hope do we realistically have of people taking up the foreign exchange and depositing it in the Central Bank.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, Mr. Acting President. I have been piloting this Bill. I have not heard the Honourable Senator Alleyne make a statement about confidence in the Minister of Finance. I think this needs to be struck from the records.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, with all due respect. It seems as though Senator Clarke is not listening to the debate either because I never said Senator Alleyne said anything to do with confidence. I said that I,

Senator Mottley said, that at the end of the day economics, economy, business all of that is a matter of confidence. I would wish, Sir, that Senator Clarke, perhaps, could listen more closely to the debate. He might listen and pick up one or two things to help the Prime Minister out of it.

Sir, the point I am making is that the Barbados Government is not a prime earner of foreign exchange. Unless that confidence exists, there is never going to be a rebuilding of those foreign reserves because even if the money is earned, the people are going to be reluctant to deposit this foreign exchange into the Central Bank.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That is the second time you have made that point, Senator Mottley.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, I was in the process of making it when I was interrupted by Senator Clarke.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley you have two more minutes.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, my watch does not, but I will abide by the ruling of the Chair. Your watch seems to me moving faster than mine.

Sir, the question of confidence cannot be escaped regardless of whatever protestations are made. Senator Alleyne made a point about prioritising those who are entitled to foreign exchange accounts. Perhaps, he is differing from the position taken by the Government side in the Throne Speech as it outlines the Government's programme for the next five years when it was delivered in January of this year, when there was clearly the stated policy of this Government, mind you, they had not stated it prior to the election, but they stated it after the Barbados Labour Party and the NDP proposed the holding of foreign exchange accounts by everybody that this Government supported the position that foreign exchange accounts be held by people in this country. I do not know if he is choosing to differ from the side and the position taken by the Government of which he is representing as a Government Senator. These things do happen. There are turnabouts not only on his side but there may well be a turnabout on the part of the Prime Minister as to whom he wishes to be responsible for the affairs of the Central Bank on the Board too, Sir.

I hope that we do not in this country fall to the propaganda being put that anybody is advocating that the affairs of this country can be solved overnight. They cannot. It is a fact that the economy is in crisis and no one seeks to move away from that point. We are maintaining that there has been an absence of policy on the part of this Government to put the productive sectors back into gear to earn the foreign exchange and by putting the productive

sectors back into gear I do not want somebody to say that I say that the Government operates the productive sector. 5.35 p.m.

But the Government creates the environment in which the productive sectors can thrive or can fall. And if the Government does not ensure that that environment is one in which the productive sectors can thrive, the 8% cut is going to look like child's play in addition to what is going to have to come next year, Sir.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Your time is expired, Senator Mottley. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, in winding up the Second Reading of this Bill there were a few comments made which I would like to address. I believe it was Senator Barker who talked about the decline in export goods over the period from about the middle of 1982 through 1990. Around that time the first problem that we had was the problem with the licencing requirements in Trinidad...

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: On a point of elucidation, Sir. My records indicate that in 1984 domestic exports were \$583 million and it was \$496 million the following year. The decline did not start in 1982.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator....

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am just clearing up that point. He said that I said. But I am saying I never said 1982. I said around 1985. Around 1985 it was \$496 million. So he must not misquote me. I never mentioned 1982.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you Senator Barker.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Declines in exports started in the 1980s when as a result of policies by the then Government *vis-a-vis* the Government of Trinidad licences were instituted and then the ECO form. That started the decline in the exports of goods from Barbados. Following on the heels of this we had certain enclave enterprises which folded operations especially those within the electronic industry.

The local companies contribution to the export effort was not sufficient to take up the slack. Since 1990 what has been happening although there has been a marked decline in goods on the productive sector there has been a significant increase in the services sector. As a matter of fact for the first nine months of 1991 compared with the first nine months of 1990 foreign sales corporations

registered within Barbados have actually increased well over 25% registered companies. I think it is over six hundred and something companies.

There has been much talk throughout this debate about the productive sector and Government's ability to earn foreign exchange. I think the point has been made repeatedly that Government has responsibility for creating the climate. Government has done this with respect to services and goods. Because anyone going over the Budget Speeches year after year would clearly find that Government year in and year out was granting additional incentives to that sector without the compensating returns in terms of export earnings, that those concessions were used primarily for increasing profitability on the local market rather than penetration of – not that some effort was not made but success for the concessions given to facilitate and promote the return in terms of foreign exchange earnings, that return was not consistent with the concessions surrendered in that area. However I would wish that greater attention be paid in terms of reporting earnings from the foreign exchange earnings sector to reflect the contribution which is being made by the services sector in addition to what is already being made by the tourism sector.

I think Senator Alleyne dealt with a question in response to Senator Barker's total confusion between the role of a currency board and a central bank, the automaticity of the currency board *vis-a-vis* the monetary management *vis-a-vis* a central bank. I think they are both at Cave Hill and if you spend some time you will learn more about that. I am not prepared to go into the merits of the two.

As a matter of fact one thing I will say before I leave this and it is that you can be assured of one thing, there is no foreign exchange crisis if there is a currency board, never, by definition. But if you would like to revert to that then of course the growth which we have sustained in Barbados would not have come about. There is a trade off. If there is money management as long as it is discretionary there is always room for error. However one is free to choose whether we want the system of a currency board or even run the risk of having a Central Bank, a monetary authority with special powers in place.

I do not want to delay this Chamber too much but there is one final thing in response to a question raised by Senator Mottley: Is there a quorum at the Central Bank? The answer to that is unequivocally yes there is a quorum at the Central Bank to conduct business. I would like to add at his point in time that under the Central Bank Act anyone wanting to resign from the Central Bank is required by the law and under the terms of one's appointment to that Board to give one month's notice. I am only saying this because there has been much talk in this country about the lawlessness which is around the place and about the

breaching of certain provisions and yet we read of people resigning from the Board at the Central Bank forthwith. It is a requirement. It is a responsible Board and one would expect certain courtesies. We talk about the hooliganism and the bad manners that we are experiencing throughout society and yet when we find people who should know better and who should set examples behaving in this way we seem to turn our face and accept it as a way to do business. We cannot hope in this society to set one set of standards for one group of people and another set of standards for another set of people. If you have to give notice, give notice, it is a common, decent, courteous thing to do.

Based on that, Mr. Acting President, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR J. J. PAYNE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called and passed.
5.45 p.m.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment and Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as the Exchange Control (Amendment) Act 1991.

LAND TAX ACT, (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1991

Order No. 10 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Land Tax Act, Cap. 78A.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Mr. Acting President, this amendment seeks to treat all property, whether owner-occupied or rented equitably and also to ensure that properties with a site value of ten thousand dollars or less be subject to a tax of not more than \$30 per annum.

With respect to all residential property whether owner occupied or not, these will now be required to pay a 70 per cent tax on the improved value. This allows a person who owns land on which a dwellinghouse is erected and the dwellinghouse is used exclusively by that person and his immediate family for their permanent habitation to pay tax on 70 per cent of the improved value of the land. This amendment now will remove the restriction that the dwellinghouse should be occupied by its owner in order for the owner to pay land tax on that property of 70 per cent tax of the improved value of the land.

The other major aspect of the Bill is to remove the 0.6 per cent of payment of a tax in the value of ten thousand dollars or less to a flat rate payment of \$30 throughout. So it does two things, it removes the inequity between owner occupied and rental and also on property with a site value of ten thousand dollars or less you now pay a flat rate of \$30. As an example, if you had a property of ten thousand dollars and the original rate was 0.6 per cent you would end up paying a tax of \$60. This will give relief to such a person so that he would pay one half of that now.

I don't think this Bill should be controversial. It gives some relief to people in the lower bracket and removes an inequality in other areas. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, the Party which I have the honour of representing, in its Manifesto of January 1991 stated that it would abolish land tax for residences valued one hundred and fifty thousand dollars or less and an adjustment for those of value higher than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Sir, the rationale for us proposing this revolutionary measure is that after we introduced the Freehold Tenantry Act we recognised that thousands of people were now able to own the land that they had previously rented, they and their parents and grandparents, and as a result could improve the value of their property and this meant, Sir, that they would now be subject to land tax on what was for them a basic improvement in their housing condition, so we saw it as a penalty basically, and we wanted to encourage a wider ownership of houses in this Island so we made that proposal.

Sir, we have no fundamental difficulty with this Bill because we propose whenever we get into power, and of course, depending upon the situation at the time, to relieve many people from the land tax provision.

Sir, we make a distinction between a person owning a house and living in that house and a person who is building a house to make profit therefrom. We make that distinction clear. If you own your own house we believe you should get tax concessions on it, but if, Sir, you build

a second or third house and you are deriving income from that house we see no reason why we should give you that concession.

Sir, the timing of this is also important, because this is coming at a time when it is becoming increasingly difficult for people in the middle and lower income to own their own houses because of many reasons: the unavailability of mortgage financing, the high rates of mortgage interest, the cuts in salaries, the imposition of various taxes and the massive layoffs. So all of these things are operating against people in the lower and middle income owning their own houses. So, I do not see the equity now in a situation where on one hand you deprive them of the ability to look after themselves and on the other hand you are giving tax relief for a person who owns two or three houses.

I find, Sir, that in the present circumstances that that is almost unforgivable and it must be seen to be that. I know, Sir, and the DLP in their Manifesto of 1991 promised to bring in this measure and it is comforting to know that at least there is one promise that they are keeping because we know they repudiated the 1986 Manifesto and called it the Richie Haynes Manifesto. I am glad to see that they believe they have a pledge to honour but I would warn them that the situation out there, according to them, has changed radically from January 1991. As far as I am concerned it is the same situation but they are saying it has changed drastically from January 1991.

I am sure, Sir, that the people in this Island would sympathise with the Government if it came to them and said: "Look we had intended to do this but because the situation is now so totally different we cannot." They would, Sir, more accept that sort of apology than if you promised them there would be no layoffs and ended up with over four thousand. I am sure that if they wanted to, they could easily go to the people of Barbados and say: "Look we would want to do it but we will bring it in when the situation demands it." So the timing of this Bill stinks. It is coming at a time when there is severe hardship in the economy where people are being laid off with one month's severance pay.

5.55 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: One obviously has to grant indulgences but surely a word like "stinks" is not befitting to persons who serve in this Chamber. Surely, the Honourable Member could use a word which is more appropriate to what this Chamber stands for.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Lewis. I just presume that the Senator is so limited in his vocabulary that he could find nothing better to use. So I sympathize with the Senator.

Aside.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am speaking, Senator Barker, and I have already spoken to Senator Barker to couch his language in more parliamentary words. But I suppose there must be certain limits. You may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, thank you for appreciating my problem. Sir, what I mean to say is that with this situation we cannot in good conscience accept this because the Minister might tell me how much money they expect to lose as a result of this measure. If he told me that, I would say: "Look, that could have kept. The money that you are giving away to people who may be in a better position that money could have been kept to employ a few more people." The situation cannot tolerate these sort of measures at this time.

While I am not fundamentally opposed to it, the timing is awful and Government should leave it off for the time being and let there be peace in the Island.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: Before I wind up, perhaps I would like to bring this to the attention of the Honourable Chamber. There are certain assumptions made in your own home that at one moment you think you are wealthy or something like it. But I think of those elderly people who may want to go and live with a relative and rent out their house and this is what we had in mind when we thought of this sort of relief. I am sure that Senator Barker who is always concerned about the poor in our midst would have recognised this especially those people who are older. This is a fact. The figure is demographic.

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

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

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR J. J. PAYNE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill without amendments and Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ORDER NO. 11 – A BILL TO AMEND THE SEVERANCE PAYMENTS ACT, CAP. 355A

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, the need for reorganisation of the Severance Payments and the Unemployment Benefit Schemes were highlighted by the Minister of Finance in a Budgetary Statement in April 1985. In August 1985, the Government accepted the Barbados Workers Union proposal that the Government should seek to obtain the services of an ILO expert to review the Schemes.

The review was carried against a background that the Severance Payments Scheme was insolvent at that time and that it would remain in that state unless there was a drastic reduction in redundancies or the cost to the Scheme of those redundancies. At that time almost 80 per cent of the persons receiving Unemployment Benefits also qualified for Severance Payments. These apparently generous benefits contributed significantly towards a negative attitude to the employer, since people would not hasten to go back to work when they can draw these benefits and they would tend to undermine the country's economic development effort. An expert was recruited, a Demetrius Pelikanos, who was involved with the Social Insurance Scheme in Cyprus came to Barbados, carried out a study, and presented reports in 1988. The reports were presented to Government and considered by the National Insurance Board which agreed to certain proposals. It did not accept the Pelikanos Report lock, stock and barrel, but agreed that both the Unemployment and Severance Payments Benefit Scheme should remain; that the prescribed time for claiming unemployment benefits should be reduced from six months to one week – this was subsequently adjusted by Cabinet for two weeks. That was implemented – that there should be a modification of the unemployment benefit from sixty per cent of average insurable earnings for the full 26 weeks to sixty per cent of average annual insurable earnings for the first ten weeks and forty per cent for the remaining 16 weeks. This represented a reduction of benefits of about 20.5 per cent, and it was agreed that contribution to the Severance Payments Fund payable by the employer alone should be increased from 0.25 per cent to one per cent of insurable earnings. This provision was implemented in April of 1991.

6.05 p.m.

The Board also agreed that an actuarial review of both schemes should be undertaken at an early date. It agreed that in assessing severance payments only wages up to the amount of insurable earnings should be taken into account and that severance payments should continue to be paid by the employer, and that the amount of rebate should remain at twenty-five per cent of the amount paid. It also agreed that suitable training or retraining should be provided for persons drawing unemployment benefits and that severance payments should be based on an average

insurable earnings at the rate of 2.5 weeks for each year of the first ten weeks of service, three weeks for each year of the next ten weeks of service and 3.5 weeks for each year of the remaining thirteen years of service.

The reports of the ILO and the recommendations of the Board were referred in March 1988. The representatives of employers and workers' organisations including the Barbados Workers' Union agree with the recommendations of the Board. The National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union recommended variations to the Board's agreed positions. The Barbados Employers' Confederation supported the Board's recommendations but with certain modifications including the one relating to the rebate to employers which according to them they would have preferred increased to fifty per cent from the present level of twenty-five per cent. The Confederation also proposed that payment out of severance fund for former employees of firms that have become bankrupt or insolvent should be limited to less than 100 per cent of entitlement as a means of restoring solvency to the Severance Fund and stabilising the rates of rebate contributions.

The Barbados Sugar Industry Limited and the Sugar Producers' Federation supported the recommendations of the National Insurance Board except that they considered in the light of proposed increase in contributions rebate to employers should be increased fifty per cent.

The Minister then responsible then held discussions with workers and employers' representatives in April of 1991 in order to be apprised of their current views and the proposed changes. Each group repeated its acceptance of the National Insurance Board's recommendations for rationalisation of the scheme.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Acting President, is that when an actuarial assessment of the Severance Payments Scheme was carried out, the actuary in 1988 indicated as follows:

"The analysis shows that the critical financial conditions of the Scheme requires the urgent enactment of amendments proposed by the Board. Severe cost over-runs of the last four years as aggravated by the liquidation of several industrial concerns have depleted the Fund with a minimum net deficit of \$3.6 million at December 1987."

He continued that actuarial costs estimated at 0.77 per cent and 0.55 per cent of insurable earnings will be present and the modified benefit provisions proposed by the Board respectively. Hence, an increase in the contribution was deemed to be necessary and contribution rate should be increased from 0.5 per cent to 1 per cent of insurable earnings plus the introduction of graduated scale of payment.

There were other representations made and these included simplification of the severance payments act in order to facilitate its operation and application. The Minister responsible accepted those recommendations. Cabinet agreed to the recommendations of the National Insurance Board that the legislation should be amended.

Mr. Acting President, there has been much debate and several discussions between parties on the amendments to this Severance Payments Fund and what is presented to us today represent the previously agreed position to a large extent. In order to ensure that it is implemented without too much delay the matter is brought before us at this juncture. Permit me to say that the claims already approved for payment from the Severance Payments Scheme amount to \$277,521, that the balance in the Fund is less than that amount being some \$267,844. At October 1991, there were claims totalling some \$7.5 million which have to be processed.

The Severance Payments Scheme is presently indebted to the Consolidated Fund in the sum of some \$10 million plus the interest which was due for repayment since 1989, but it has not been possible to make any payments. As a consequence, a moratorium has been granted on the repayment of principal and interest for a period of two years from April 1991. The tale, therefore, relating to the position of the Severance Payments Fund is a tale of woe, and in order to make some attempt to turn the situation around there has been some reduction in the benefits which up to the present time persons employed are entitled to.

The proposal in this bill is to reduce the four weeks' basic pay for each year of employment and to substitute therefor for each complete year of employment 2.5 weeks of basic pay for each year up to the first ten years, 3% for the second 10 years and 3.5% weeks basic pay for each year up to 33 years of service. This is 3 weeks basic pay for each such year by which the employment exceeds 10 years and does not exceed 20 years.

In addition, the definition of basic pay is now included in the bill so that the definition of basic pay accords with the definition of the National Insurance and Social Security Regulations, 1967. This bill therefore is a tidying up matter which seeks to place the Severance Payments Fund in a more amenable position in terms of the ability to finance it and to make payments to persons who become entitled.

I beg to move that the bill be now read a second time.
6.15 p.m.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, it was interesting to hear the Leader of the Senate say that in 1988 it was recommended that because the Scheme was

in so much trouble – he mentioned \$3.6 million deficit in 1987 – that in 1988 it was recommended that action be taken to put the Fund to some sort of solvency. He mentioned the word "urgent". This is November, 1991. I rest my case.

Sir, on December 5, 1987, January 5, 1988 and February 9 the National Insurance Board which includes the President of this Chamber who is the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, they met and examined the Pelikanos Report. They made certain recommendations. We are talking about the first quarter of 1988. The Fund was allowed to be in deficit from \$3.6 million in 1987 and today it is about \$30 million or more in deficit. Timely action was needed at that time to make sure that the Severance Payment Scheme was brought to a level of solvency but, in typical fashion, nothing was done.

Sir, I do not believe in coincidences. Why then is it brought at this time? We know that there is an old saying "Better late than never". The coincidence is striking that at a time where the manufacturing sector is about to lay off thousands, at a time where the furniture manufacturers are laying off people left, right and centre, you are now going to bring this Severance Payments Bill to deprive those thousands of people of what they should legally expect.

Now, it has been said – I do not know if I agree with it – that this Scheme is too liberal. I have always and will always be on the side of the workers because I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. Again, Sir, it is a matter of timing. I would not want to say what I said on the last Bill but the timing is remarkable that when the country is bleeding, you make the working class bleed some more.

Sir, I want to ask this question. I thought the severance payment was one of the matters that was under negotiation between the Coalition of Trade Unions and the Government. I have not heard that they have come to any conclusion. Probably when other Senators get up to speak they may be able to tell me if the matter has come to a successful conclusion.

Sir, I do not like us in this Chamber – I know you are going to tell me that it has happened under my Government too, but I still do not like it – to be getting into matters before they have been properly negotiated. I believe that we should try to reach some consensus with the Coalition. Then if you find that there is a big gap between the two, then Parliament can come in. But until negotiations have broken down... We have not been told that they have been broken down. We are told that they are going to meet again. We are told that the Coalition is responding to the proposals set by the Government. I have not heard that they have reached an agreement.

I do not see what the hurry is that we are pre-empting the outcome of that negotiation by introducing this Bill at this time. It shows that Government is negotiating in bad faith. They are now running to Parliament, because they have the numbers, and get the things to go through without giving the Unions a chance to bargain on the workers' behalf. It is unfortunate but again, this Government has been doing some unfortunate things in the ten months that I have been in here. I do not like them one minute but I suppose I will have to live with them until the time comes that the people of Barbados see better and change them. I really wish it was tomorrow, Sir.

Sir, this brings me to another matter relating to severance payments. It is with respect to those persons who are casual or temporary employees in the Public Service. It is said that the Severance Payments Act does not cover those persons. In 1972 we heard of the famous Cabinet decision that workers in the Government sector should not be at a disadvantageous position *vis-a-vis* workers in the private sector.

We heard the Prime Minister saying on Sunday night that while that was so, successive Governments did not make provision in the Estimates for such an occurrence. Now, if a private sector employer had done that, we would be down in their throats because if you have Severance Payments legislation we would expect that the companies would make provision so that if they have to sever a person, they would pay them what is due to them. For Government to come and say they did not pay workers because they did not make provision for them is sending the wrong signal.

I hope that Senator Cole would not do it in his business but he can easily say, he knows he should pay severance but he has not made any provisions for severance. If the private sector cannot do it Government should not do it and making an excuse like that when the Democratic Labour Party was in Government at the time and we were in Government for ten years and then they came back into Government. Who are you going to blame for not making provisions for the severance of those persons?

Sir, I am very confused on the matter of severance for public works. The Prime Minister said, not in so many words, but on Sunday night that they are not going to get severance.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Sir, on a point of order. The only purpose for the Prime Minister to introduce the matter was to state categorically that the Cabinet of Barbados has decided to honour the 1972 decision which was repeated in 1982 and that public officers will therefore be entitled to it just as if they had been in the private sector.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: If I had been wrong on that quotation, I apologise but the Honourable Senator mentioned 18 months from now. We have an old Barbadian saying that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. The private sector cannot do that. When payment is due they have to make the payment to the worker. I believe that Government should be setting a better example than that. I wish we go back to the position where it would not be a matter of negotiation.
6.25 p.m.

People should not have to march up and down Broad Street, including Saturday mornings, marching up and down to get Government to change its mind. People should not have to do that because the Cabinet decision was there that if you are a public worker you get the same severance on the same conditions as a worker in the private sector. The Prime Minister made me walk off my shoes to do what he should have been doing in the first place. I am thankful for the exercise but I consider it to be a matter of tremendous importance that we the citizens of this country have to demonstrate in order to get what is rightfully ours. I do not think they should have to wait 18 months to get what is legally and lawfully theirs.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You are repeating yourself. You just said that.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I rest by your decision. What I would say now is that the whole question of severance, especially as it related to public workers, came about because Government attempted to deviate from established norms when it came to severing public workers. The norms were last in, first out and it makes sense. The main reason is that when a person has a job for five years they have every right to expect that it is their job. The fact that they are casual should not come in. When a person has been employed for five years they have a right to believe that the job is theirs. What is going to happen now is that they are going to be in a position where they are going to make commitments in terms of housing and so on because they were in a job for that amount of time. Whereas a person who came in last year might not make that sort of commitment. He came in as a casual or temporary employee and within the first year or two he should not be making those long-term commitments. Therefore if you work the last in, first out the impact would not be as heavy because they probably would not have made the commitments that the ones who were working for 10, 20 years would have.

I know of cases, people called me and told me of a case where a person was working for 35 years in the Ministry of Agriculture as a casual employee and was sent home after 35 years with one month's pay.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: On a point of order. That is an absurdity. A person who works for 35

years would have been entitled to pension and all that was necessary was to complete the forms, get affidavits if they were necessary and if the person came to you or anybody you should counsel them thus that they are entitled to a pension and they really have no problem.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: But the person is about age 53, 54 and laid off. I do not know if they are entitled at that age.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: It is clear you do not know the pensions regulations.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Well educate me then. But Sir, if they are laid off they should be entitled to severance. To give them... Gratuity, whatever. Do people not get pension and gratuity yes or no?

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Do casual workers get gratuity?

Aside.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Anyhow it is still inhuman to send home a person at age 53, 54 after 35 years. It has to be wrong and all of your protestations are not going to make it right. It is still wrong.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair, Senator Barker. All around we see people with 20, 30 years in the public service being severed and being sent on the unemployment heap.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I am saying that if the Government had forgotten political considerations and stuck to the established principle of last in, first out we would not have been faced with a massive severance bill albeit that they may get the money in 18 months time. This massive severance bill is a result of the Government deviating from the norm and because a Minister may have put a person to work in NCC or some other place, they insist you cannot touch my man. You can sever another person who may have been there longer because you felt that he was put there by another Minister.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, on a point of order. You see this is a lot of the hearsay and stupidity that is going on in Barbados when people push panic buttons. The unions and the Ministry of the Civil Service both agreed that the arrangement would be last in first out. Where there was deviation from that it was in instances where it was certain that the persons work schedule was such that to make them redundant or whatever at the time made more sense than to put people who were contributing towards productivity.

If a person in the Ministry of Agriculture was doing it for 35 years they are obviously in a job where they could have gone home probably 10 years ago and this was an opportune occasion. I am only saying that. I am not making any representation about anybody in the Ministry of Agriculture because I do not even know. I do not even want to know who were the individuals. The fact is that we had to reduce by a certain number and that number was reduced. Who went? I am told more members of the Democratic Labour Party went than anybody else.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I would not know because I do not look at party affiliation. But the point I want to make, Sir, is this: if you are saying that you had last in, first out you would not be faced with a massive severance payments bill. That is all I am saying. So do not come to me with that.

Listen carefully you have to work under the old scheme for two years before you get severance. A lot of people were employed in the last two years. Do not tell me no, especially last year when the World Bank noted that there was election spending. If you were severing....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, we do not understand what your reference to election spending is. You will withdraw that remark. I do not understand what you could mean by such a reference. I am at a loss.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I am stating the fact that even the Prime Minister admitted that the World Bank was....

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: That has nothing to do with what I am saying. You will withdraw the remark with reference to election spending.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I withdraw the remark. But the fact remains that in the last year or two a lot of people were taken on to the public service roll. If last in first out were adhered to you could have got your 4 000 or how many that you sent home without having to incur a massive severance payments bill. Refute that. That is all I am saying.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I do not know where the massive severance payments bill comes from or what is the number of this severance payments bill. I made no such introduction and if Senator Barker is imputing this maybe he can tell us what this massive bill is.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, the Prime Minister indicated on Sunday night that there will be difficulty in paying for the severance payments. So that would lead me, in my ignorance, to infer that there is going

to be a big severance payments bill. Getting up is not going to help the situation.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, that is my duty. Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I am only trying to explain that if you do not make provision in your Estimates you cannot pay. That is the whole point that was made about the absence of provisions from 1972. So that even in 1991 there is no provision but my recollection also is that special contributions were to be made to a fund to enable payments to be made on the basis of four weeks as an interim measure. I do not know where the question of the massive bill comes from. The whole point of it is that when the whole cost of it is known only then will it be possible to indicate with any clarity whether it is possible to pay now or whether at the end of 18 months.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: If the Honourable Senator is saying he does not know if it is going to be a massive bill something is wrong with the Ministry of the Civil Service that they do not know who to send home and how many years they serve and all that. They must know what the size of the bill is going to be. They were sending home people all along. Probably the Parliamentary Secretary would know what the figure is going to be. Do not tell me that he does not know what the figure is going to be. Even although provision was not made for it up to yesterday in the Lower House a resolution was made for supplementary funds. You want to tell me you could not carry a Bill to the Lower House and get money to pay the severance? So because there is no provision there you want to say it can't be done? The same way you went for less important reasons you could have gone for that reason so don't give me that.

6.35 p.m.

The point I will stress is that Governments run into problems when they deviate from accepted norms and the country is paying because of the political patronage in the system and because Government refused to adhere to the last in first out system.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, I think that certain comments being made by the Honourable Speaker bear no relationship to the debate on what has transpired here.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: You may proceed, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Yes Sir, so we are now being called upon to change the Severance Payments Act, albeit three years late, but in the present circumstances I don't think that this is the time to bring this Bill. I know I said that before but this is hardly the time to be imposing further hardships, especially, Sir, when people who have

been working in firms for 10 or 15 years or whatever would have been expected, based on our provision of a certain level of severance. To tell them now when they get laid off and more layoffs are coming if the people in the manufacturing sector are to be believed, it seems that wherever the worker is turning in this country he is meeting a closed door and Government is not helping him one bit.

It seems as though they are cutting the severance and I saw an Order today cutting the National Insurance. I am concerned with, not only the severance cuts by virtue of two to three weeks but also cuts by virtue of the fact that the basic pay is now defined according to the National Insurance Regulations. And it is important that we recognise that not only is it cut in terms of from 4½ weeks to two weeks but the base upon which it is calculated is also cut. So it is a double-edged sword which cuts on the down swing and on the up swing.

Everywhere the poor worker turns he is meeting a Government that is uncaring and a Government that seems to cut off every avenue of escape because, Sir, in this time of difficulty the worker would be glad for a few thousand dollars so that he could use it probably to set up a little something and probably buy a little mini van and make himself independent. He is looking forward for this severance because he does not expect that in the short-term that he is going to find alternative employment, so a lot of them would be eager to get the money and probably Government will help them because the same recommendation that the National Insurance Board made, including provision for training, and I see a couple of the benefits, are you therefore implementing recommendation 8 of the Paper that the National Insurance Board sent to the Minister of Finance? Are you also going to implement that?

If you are implementing one, implement all. Don't implement one and the most important one, the one of training the man because we get in here and talk about the laziness of the Barbadian worker and all of that. Now is the opportunity for the poor worker to get a few dollars and with some additional training to go out there and make himself independent but you are not doing that. All you are doing is cutting, cutting. That is all you are doing.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker you are extremely repetitious. Have you any new thoughts to bring to bear on this debate?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, my hour is not up.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I am not concerned with that. The point is that you are being very repetitious and if you continue to be repetitious I shall have to ask you to take your seat.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President I just brought in a new point about training so I don't understand.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have heard that. I still repeat that you are being very repetitious. You may continue now.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I believe that I am not being handled properly.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: What exactly do you mean by that, Senator Barker?

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I don't want to be disrespectful but every time I get up to talk over there is interrupting me and I don't get any help from the Chair.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I have been very lenient with you, Senator Barker, extremely indulgent and I am asking you now to bring any new thoughts to the debate because you have been extremely repetitious. Will you proceed?

SENATOR A. MORRISON: On a point of clarification, Sir.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: You see what I mean?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Just one moment. There is only a point of order which I will entertain. Senator Morrison if it is a point of order yes, not otherwise. You may proceed Senator Barker. This is not a circus, Senator Morrison.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I was not making here a circus. I had just asked for a point of clarification.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: No. Senator Barker you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I would like Government, not only to improve the training availability, and this is something I spoke on before. Government has a lot of idle land. The biggest owner of idle land in this country is Government. Look at the Belle, look at River and Bawden, a lot of idle land Government has. Now you have sent home four or five thousand people. You are cutting everything you could. What Sir, about giving them access to the land to make themselves independent.

The land in the Belle, every time I pass there I have to remember the Minister of Agriculture. The land in the Belle is prime land that could be used by ...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker what has that to do with severance payments? I don't understand, Senator Barker.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: I was making the point, Sir, that now that a lot of people are being severed, I am just offering a suggestion of what can be done with them. You might rule that it is not properly a debate but I am just bringing a new thought. I am sure, Sir, that it is one that the Minister of Agriculture would be pleased to hear because I know he has the interest of the Barbadian at heart.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: If you have a private thought for him you may do that at another time and in another place.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I also thought that the whole Chamber would have appreciated the thought also.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Not within the debate. Please go ahead.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Also, Sir, these people who are being severed need special help from the Government. They need help in setting up and running businesses. They need help in training which is part of the recommendation, but above all they need money so I do not see why you should be cutting the severance at this time. Sir, I could not in all conscience, knowing the hardships that are being visited on the people put more on their shoulders than they are able to bear.

I believe, Sir, that in spite of the fact that the severance is in trouble the Report also spoke, I shall add, that there could be some marrying of both the severance and the unemployment benefit because the unemployment benefit fund is still pretty solid and it still has a lot of money. I say that but I don't know if any of their money is tied up in BCCI, but from the Central Bank Reports the unemployment fund is still very solvent.

I wonder, Sir, if in the short term, for the next year or so, we leave the severance payments where they are and find a way of linking the two schemes to provide the same sort of benefits for the worker. I think that bringing it in at this time is another imposition on the backs of the worker who alone has to bear the brunt of the assault by the IMF. 6.45 p.m.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: On a point of order, Sir. I think Senator Barker is making a suggestion when he speaks about leaving the Severance Payments at the present level because the Unemployment Scheme is very solvent. However, I would like Senator Barker to know that it would be breaking the law to link the two Schemes together. The Unemployment Fund is part of the National Insurance Fund and the Severance Payments Fund is not.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I have been told that we are the highest lawmaking body in the Island. If the law cannot be beneficial to the workers, so do not bring the law because the law is not written in stone. The law can be changed if it is thought to be in the interest of the worker. Any law can be changed because we in here and the Lower House can do that.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Sir, I hate to rise again but apparently Senator Barker is unaware that in principle severance is always funded by the employer but not so in respect to the National Insurance. Really severance has nothing to do with the National Insurance Department. It is just an imposition on the Department and the staff of the Department have to administer the funds but it is funded by the employer class.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sorry, I was not talking about National Insurance. I am talking about the Unemployment Benefit Scheme as opposed to the National Insurance Scheme.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Sir, again on a point of order. The Unemployment Scheme is an integral part of the National Insurance Scheme. The Severance Payments Scheme has nothing at all to do with the National Insurance Scheme. I hope Senator Barker understands that.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Barker, I said you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: What did you say before that, Sir?

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I said you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Sir, I was talking about the Unemployment Scheme helping in the short term. Now that I am on to that, it can work.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I thought that had been explained to you.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Anything can be done. That is all I am saying.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: I do not think the Honourable Senator understands.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Sir, again on a point of order. If the Government should condone the borrowing of funds from the Unemployment Fund for the

Severance Payments Fund, Government is in breach of the law. The law is very clear on that. You cannot go and tamper with National Insurance Funds to do what you feel.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, let him learn this. Do not interrupt him. Senator Barker, you may proceed.

SENATOR T. E. BARKER: Mr. Acting President, with those few words and many interruptions, I cannot support at this time any further hardship on the working people of this country. We on this side will not support this Bill and we will encourage other Members of the Senate to do likewise.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Straughn.

SENATOR Mrs. A. STRAUGHN: Mr. Acting President, I want to make a few comments on this Resolution. Just a little bit of research findings and taking cognizance of all the comments which were made here and in the newspapers, I think the findings will reveal that the real problem of the Severance Payments Scheme is found to be historical. It is extremely unfortunate, Mr. Acting President, according to my feeling and almost regrettable that this Resolution has come at a time when the programme of structural adjustment has almost reached a peak proportion.

But there are some harsh realities that we have got to look at and very seriously. I will mention only two. One is that these measures appear to be impacting severely on the most vulnerable section of our community and that ripple effect spreads and penetrates right throughout the country. Secondly, another harsh reality is that under any kind of circumstance scarcity and absence of funds and resources is a severe issue. I will caution however, Mr. Acting President, that we be careful that in these measures we are not placing plasters on a sore as a short-term measure.

I support a total reconstruction of the Severance Payments Fund. I support that this reconstruction should be addressed. There is no denying the fact that this small country, Barbados, has among the best infrastructures to be found anywhere. I submit, Mr. Acting President, that it behoves us and especially our leaders to be strict guardians of these.

Mr. Acting President, the strain under which our entire country is now wreaking is because of our structural adjustment programme. It is not only common but painful knowledge. I submit that all of us and particularly our leaders do everything in their power to see that this particular measure is not a cosmetic arrangement or purely an academic exercise.

6.55 p.m.

Even if it necessitates the recruitment of the best brains for consultation and advice, and especially from among our own Barbadian ranks, I feel that we should make almost a pledge, Mr. Acting President, to restructure and stabilise this programme. Not just to make ourselves comfortable to the extent that we become absolutely complacent, nor just comfortable, that we can compare or contrast ourselves as being among the most comfortable people in the world with these particular programmes in place, but a reconstruction that is strong enough and stable enough to withstand the test of any measure of economic constraints that are introduced at any time, and for any use.

Mr. Acting President, I admit this is a tall order, but I do support a proper reviewing, a proper restructuring and a proper stabilising of our severance payments programme. It must be seen and not just appear to be seen. It must be.

Mr. Acting President, I think that after 25 years of nationhood we should be proud of the fact that we can be reliable craftsmen of our fate.

SENATOR J. A. F. COLE: Mr. Acting President, I must say I was heartened to hear the flavour of Senator Straughn's remarks. I think what this bill purports to do is only a small part of what has to be done in the future. What I hope will be done will reflect not only the times to come but the new attitudes which will have to come along to make this mean anything. I think that some of Senator Straughn's remarks and some of Senator Barker's remarks are as timely as the timing of this bill. I do not think we are going to be able to walk away from this. As Senator Straughn said, much of it is historical and certainly with clause 2 here I think it is high time that we start to face reality and realise that we are not among the big boys many of whom do not even have the luxury of this sort of severance payments legislation. It is long overdue and I do not think we can put it off any longer.

Unfortunately, it will impact on some of the other very stressful situations which our citizenry will have to face. I just want to mention one other thing. I am going to stick to this bill and I am going to talk now primarily about how it will impact on the manufacturing sector. I mentioned it once before but I think it has to be said again because this has to be worked on.

Technology is changing at a phenomenal rate. I had a man in the United States of America, not long ago, looking at new typesetting equipment. He was there for two weeks and he phoned back to say, "We got the thing just as you instructed me, but next week a new bid is coming on for this for ten per cent more money. It has fifty per cent more capacity." This thing went on for three weeks, and I had to tell him to come home and we will have to buy because he was just there watching technology change before your face. In our categorisation of our workers'

job descriptions, we have to realise that our attitude to that has to be broadened as technology relinquishes some of its rigidity.

I will say I am sorry Senator Walkes is not here. I know that she is very concerned with the rights of the worker. Like Senator Williams, I consider myself a worker. I am there first and I am there last. I think about the thing all night long and I have access to much of the technology which few other people in the place have, so I am one of the workers. I think you have to try to make them realise that the world is changing and that you are not a worker operating a particular machine so that when a new machine comes in you can say I have been here 20 years and this is my job description and my workers' union categorisation. If you want me to go on this new machine you have to pay me out first and then I can go on it. This is happening. Never mind some people might say it depends on how you treat your workers. People are looking for money. These are hard times, particularly now. We are looking for ways. You don't have to get a special lawyer, any old lawyer. It takes him five minutes to say you have a good case. You should be able to get some money if you go on that machine. You can ask to be paid out.

In a technical operation, it is those people with that experience and those many years of exposure who are the right people to take the step because other people cannot take the step with the new technology. Right now, we have a big problem in Barbados in any technical concern.

I would just like us to remember that this Act is going to be a living thing. It is not going to be cast in stone and nailed on the wall for twenty years. I would like you to remember that when we are dealing with manufacturing that you are dealing with something which is a moving target. We have to be flexible. We have to cut out rigidity and I would like particularly the unions – I know they have educational programmes which tend to impress on their members this new state of mind – to do a little more. The employer himself has to do it. He can't do it alone because the employee will not listen to just his employer. He wants to hear what his workers' union can do. He wants to hear what his Government is going to do and he can put it all together and get a picture. I would like us to remember that in the manufacturing section we look at this aspect whereby companies are paying a lot of money out to their employees to take a logical step which they should not have to. This money should go to a fund in the companies to help keep the economy abreast of the new technology.

Apart from that, Sir, I would go along with this bill. I have no problems with it. Thank you.

SENATOR J. G. BELLAMY: Mr. Acting President, I also rise to support this bill, but like the speakers who have gone before, I believe it is unfortunate in its timing.

From the employers' side of the fence, ever since the Severance Payments Scheme was introduced, it has caused problems. There have been requests for review for many years and I would have preferred if it had been possible for this type of review to have been brought earlier than it has been. It is peculiarly unfortunate coming at this time with all of the other problems that we are facing. I am not going to repeat what the other people have said before me because I think they have put it eloquently.

My concern at this point in time, and I think it should be all of our concern, is the stark reality that the Fund is bankrupt and unless we do something, we are going to get ourselves deeper and deeper into an already deep hole. People like to talk about getting the money for things from Government, but Government has to get that money itself. Government doesn't make any money. I would not like to think that we have to face even more taxation or more levies or whatever with a view to maintaining a scheme that is blatantly unaffordable, unrealistic, and under the prevailing system, I believe I have heard it referred to as the highest in the world or certainly one of the highest in the world. I think that in a little island like Barbados, it is admirable that we thought we could do it, but I think that we went too far, too fast and we thought more of ourselves at the time.

I can speak from personal experience and tell you that during the time that the Severance Payments Act has been in force, it has caused a fall-off in productivity among our workers. We have talked during the course of the day today about work ethics and the need to improve it through training and other means, but I know for a fact, that there are workers who have sat down and calculated what their amount of severance would be and they become influenced by the fact that they may suddenly get \$20,000 to \$30,000, which seems to be a lot of money, and it causes them to come to work at that point in time and do as little as possible in the hope that their employers are going to get fed up with them and offer to pay them out.
7.05 p.m.

I do not think that is the sort of ethics that we want to encourage to continue in Barbados. We need much more to put our heads together and our noses to the grindstone. As the saying is, get on with the job and get the job done.

Even the reductions proposed here, according to some information that I very hastily checked out over the last couple of days when I realised that this would be coming before us today, still make the Scheme under this new proposal more generous than most in the Caribbean and than some of the developed countries in the world.

However, the recommendation has been arrived at, as the Leader of the Senate said in his introduction, through a tripartite agreement between the employers, the Government and the Unions. That is a system that I would like to see us developing much more fully at this time –

that we come together, we would have our differences but having concluded such a tripartite negotiation and arrived at a recommendation, I feel this is what we should support because our various representatives have been afforded the opportunity of sitting down, discussing the matter and coming up with this recommendation.

On that basis, Sir, I will resume my seat with those words.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON J. L. SPRINGER: Mr. Acting President, I find myself in a situation where my head is at war with my heart. I have a difficulty here. I think there is no doubt whatever that what the last Honourable Senator said is correct. It is generally held that the severance payments arrangements in this country have been, for the most part, more generous than most other countries. I think that not only the Unions but employers have been coming around to accepting that position and in our case more recently, the Coalition as well. We have seen in recent times a movement from an impasse between the Government's position and the Coalition's position, a movement from a position of uncertainty to one of an acceptance of responsibility by Government in the area of severance and unemployment benefits. I thought that was a useful move for all.

The fact that there is no money around, which I personally believe, for the settlement of the financial responsibilities of Government, I suggest is an indication that Government has been prepared to go as far as it can in accepting an arrangement without knowing where the money is going to come from. I think we will probably hear more about our responsibility in this regard later.

Out of all the discussion in these area, members of the Unions in this country were asked to go away and reflect on offers made, for example, the 6/40/16 arrangement formula, I call it, where people would be paid 60% of insurable earnings for the first 10 weeks of unemployment and then for the next 16 weeks 40%. That was the arrangement. They were also to reflect on the severance arrangement as well. Now, I am not satisfied that we have had a feedback yet from the Coalition quarters on these matters. Maybe I did not quite hear at the beginning what the introduction said about this. I did hear some mention of discussion with the Unions. It seem to me as though it goes back in history, that is, part of the historical arrival of this point. I am speaking more specifically of the recent discussions.

Since I believe that the Coalition partners are giving some thought to this matter, and had requested certain information from Government in order to help them to arrive at certain positions, and since I have no word myself that they have not reported back or there has been no further or recent discussions, because of my own personal involvement, I have no recourse than to abstain in this

matter. My head, I say, says to me that this is progress away from the more generous arrangement to the one that comes that closer to something that is manageable in spite of the absence of money. Until I am satisfied from my viewpoint that we know the most recent feelings of the Unions on this matter, I have to abstain in this regard.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE: Mr. Acting President, I too regret that this matter did not come to this Chamber at an earlier period. I share the concerns certainly of Senators Springer, Bellamy, Cole and Straughn as expressed.

I want to say, Mr. Acting President, that by December 19, 1985, the Severance Payment Fund was insolvent. The record will show that. The reason why the Fund was still able to make payments after December 1985 was because money was moved from another Fund to the Severance Payment Fund. I am told it was done in error and I accept the explanation. The fact is, as I said earlier, it is an infringement of the Act to move funds from the National Insurance Fund to the Severance Payment Fund. That happened in December, 1985.

By 1987, the Report of Pelikanos had demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the severance payments model which was in force was not viable. The economy could not support it. If the economy could not support that model of severance payment in 1987, Mr. Acting President, in its present condition today it is less able to support a model which previous Senators have referred to, and I agree with them, as one of the most liberal schemes I know of.

I think we have to recognise that when the Severance Payments Act was introduced in 1973, the country had little experience to go on in terms of a comparative experience. The country was acting against the background of substantial job losses because of those fires in Bridgetown at the time. I think we lost Forgarty, Cave Shepherd and some other places around Bridgetown. We had to rush to do something. The fact is that we have been long in reviewing the Scheme.

7.15 p.m.

But the downturn of the economy and the closure of very large businesses in Barbados in 1985 or thereabout, you would recall I think the Central Foundry and some very large establishments collapsed around that time and heightened the necessity to restructure that severance payments. The Severance Payments Scheme never recovered from those large collapses around 1985. The fact that the Severance Payments Scheme has been able to make payments has to do with the generosity of the Government lending the Severance Payments Scheme

some \$10 million and when the Scheme was unable to repay on time, as the Leader of the House indicated, the Government gave a moratorium on capital and interest repayments. Also too the Scheme was able to continue making some payments because in Barbados there are still some good corporate citizens. That has to be clearly understood. Because a Severance Payments Scheme is funded solely by the employer class. When we hear workers get up and say I want my severance, they fail to understand that workers do not contribute to severance and therefore when you start to make the argument, "Give me my severance," it is a non-argument. The employer can only pay to the extent that he is able to pay. What is the harsh reality in Barbados today? Several businesses have closed. They have not paid the workers a penny in severance. But the law permits these workers, who after a certain time have not received the severance from their employers, to make application to the National Insurance Board. Very often I receive letters. I do not know why the lawyers send the letters to me as Chairman. I do not know why they send them to my home. Very often they send them to my home. The wise thing to do is to send them to the Director of National Insurance. I do not know if they feel that they must find work for me to do. I do not need any more work. I have too much work to do already. The wise thing to do, my advice is to send them to the Director of National Insurance. That is the best place to send them.

But the fact of the matter is the Board then has the responsibility of paying these workers who are not paid by their employers and then resort to legal action to try to claim the money from these employers who claim that they cannot pay. The harsh reality is that in many cases the Board is going to involve in paying the legal cost but it will not recover any of that money because very often they are chasing the horse long after he has gotten out of the stable. There are several cases of that in Barbados. I think the Leader of the House mentioned – I am not sure – the outstanding claims. There are quite a couple millions in outstanding claims, approved claims to be paid and the department can only pay this money when the fund starts to accumulate some reserves.

I said earlier the country has been long in reviewing the Severance Payments Scheme. The introduction of the Unemployment Benefit Scheme in 1981 heightened the necessity to review these schemes. Because in a sense the Unemployment Benefit Scheme duplicated what the Severance Payments Scheme was intended to do. Because a worker was entitled to receive his 26 weeks unemployment benefit and then he was still entitled to full severance. So there was that element of duplication which had to be addressed. The Severance Payments Scheme and the Unemployment Benefit Scheme represent a substantial payroll cost to the employer. I am not speaking for the employer class. I am dealing with the facts. To the extent that they represent a substantial payroll cost it is a disincentive to the employer to choose a technology of

production which emphasizes employment of labour. This is not a point which we can take lightly.

Also too it is a major impediment to new investment in this country. Investors whether they are local but particularly the foreign ones they look very carefully at payroll cost before they decide which country they will locate in. When they recognize that in Barbados the Severance Payments Scheme is so liberal that if they decide to shift location they are substantial sums of money they have to pay out those employers will stay out of Barbados until we decide to do something about our Scheme. In Barbados today the country needs as many new productive jobs as it can generate, particularly in the private sector both our local private sector and foreign investors. We need them.

So to introduce any nebulous political arithmetic to suggest that we should keep the Severance Payments Scheme as it is to deny workers an opportunity of enjoying new job creation in the future... I think all the country has to understand that.

In the National Insurance Board – and I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the staff of the National Insurance Department they have worked very long and hard as well as the members of my Board who have given up their time, given up weekends to come and sit down and work through these different models and test them in order to arrive at the best possible advice we can give on these matters. I wish to pay tribute to them for the unselfish way in which they have gone about the task.

Mr. Acting President, we came to the view and the Government is of this view today that the two Schemes should be integrated and integrated in the interest of the worker. A benefit scheme is absolutely no benefit to a worker if at the time you make a claim there is no money to be had. That has to be clearly understood by all. So the notion that you are taking away somebody's money is an unfounded notion.

You are modifying a scheme to make it viable so that when the worker comes on the rainy day you know the reserves are there and you can pay the benefit in a timely fashion. At the same time you are removing some of the financial impediment on the employer class. So the modification of the Scheme is in the interest of the country. It is not a matter of selling out one class against the other class.

The National Insurance Department, over time, I would say has carried an excess burden having to deal with severance and have carried the burden well. I know the department has suffered from a certain level of public harassment. But the people are waiting for the severance, they will call and they will harass the staff.

The truth of the matter is that this management of the Severance Payments Scheme is an imposition upon the National Insurance Department. It has nothing to do with the responsibilities which are primarily attached to the National Insurance Scheme. We are happy to do it and I believe I can say the department has tried to do its best. I can also say, Mr. Acting President, that in spite of the Government cutbacks the Government has seen the wisdom in allowing adequate provisions to be made for the meeting of Severance Payments Tribunals so that the Tribunals can adjudicate on claims and we can cut down on those long queues which are bound to develop. I make this point because it is very important at this time when people are going to be laid off that we should avoid unnecessary build-up of frustration in the country.

7.25 p.m.

The Leader of the House spoke about the scale on which the new Bill is placed and there is a fundamental philosophy behind this. Mr. Acting President you will notice that the longer the worker is in a job the higher is the scaling of his remuneration and the underlying philosophy is that the longer the worker is in a job the more difficult, or put another way, the higher is his replacement cost. It is far more difficult to reabsorb somebody at age 50 into the work force than somebody who is age 20 or 25. That is the basic thinking and we have taken time to study the pattern of displacements in the labour force in Barbados and this is foremost in our thinking.

I believe, and the National Insurance Board is so persuaded, that there is a necessity for an on-going review of the Severance Payments Act and I notice the Leader of the House mentioned it. It is one of the most difficult pieces of legislation on the Statute Books, it therefore needs simplification. I am told some of the lawyers don't understand it and I have no doubt much attention is going to be focussed on the simplification of the different section of clauses of that Act.

I wish to say, about the severance overall, I believe that what is coming to the House today is in the long term interest of everybody in this country. I said earlier I would have been happy if it had come earlier because it is a bitter pill to take when many layoffs are taking place.

Senator Barker spoke, I believe, with great feeling on the unemployment benefit scheme. I believe he is misinformed with respect to that unemployment benefit scheme. The Senator spoke about the strength of the reserves of that scheme and the possibility for the scheme lending support to the Severance Payments Scheme. I pointed out earlier it is illegal to do that but I want, Mr. Acting President, to draw to the attention of this Chamber the fact that late in 1986 the reserves of the Unemployment Benefit Scheme stood at just over BDS.\$40 million. At the end of October 1991 the reserves had fallen to \$25 million.

I can also say to this Chamber that the number of unemployment claims at the end of October 1991 exceeded total claims for 1990 by at least three thousand dollars. I can also say that the rate of depletion of reserves is accelerating. When we bring those things together and we recognise that the earnings base is contracting because of accelerated layoffs which have taken place since September and the anticipated layoffs in the private sector we anticipate that the earnings base of the Scheme is going to contract somewhere in the region between 12 and 14 per cent. Therefore, if the Government had not taken action to modify the existing model of unemployment benefits given the agreements which they have reached with the Coalition the Fund would have been wiped out somewhere in the middle of 1992. When I say the Fund I mean the total reserves of the Fund.

I do not believe that the action, the scaling down, given the agreement which I understand the Government has struck with the Coalition with respect to the pay out, I do not believe that the scaling-down by itself is adequate to protect the reserves of the unemployment branch, but I have no doubt that the Government will monitor what is happening to this Unemployment Benefit Scheme because the country is heading towards a critical time in the life of the social security scheme.

I said earlier this afternoon the unemployment branch of the Scheme is an integral branch of the National Insurance Scheme. We had anticipated that by the year 2002 the inflows to the National Insurance Scheme would just be equal to the outflows, that is to benefits paid. Our latest checks suggest that we are likely to arrive at that point some time before 2002. It means then that the National Insurance Scheme itself, the major fund, will not be able to lend that support to any other scheme because that scheme will have to look for assistance from somewhere. The fact is that our population in Barbados, the old people are living longer, we have to recognise that and to the extent that they are living longer in one way or the other either at the contributory or non-contributory level they constitute a claim on the Scheme.

I believe that despite the fact that this Bill is coming a bit late it will relieve some of the pressure on the unemployment benefit scheme and is the first step to sort out the problems with the Severance Payments Scheme.

Mr. Acting President, I strongly support these measures. I am much obliged to you.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Acting President, the whole question of workers rights and the right of property that they have in their job, more commonly known as security of tenure, is a principle that I believe we have accepted in this country for some time now. Indeed one can

argue that after the growth of the Unions in the late thirties, in 1941 the Barbados Workers Union and there on, the whole principle that each worker had a right of property in their job was one that was held sacred and one which was observed by successive Governments in this country.

One of these rights, Sir, was the right to severance. The right to expect that at the time when you were laid off that you had a certain amount of funds that would come to you because you having spent time in employment and contributing thereby to the profitability of the employer that the employer had a debt to you in the sum of severance to be worked out by whatever mode was acceptable or the law at the time.

The whole question of unemployment benefit was an extension of workers rights to cushion the blow of the worker when he lost his job while seeking to find either alternative employment or to be retrained within the market place.

Sir, there can be no doubt in my mind that these measures and the rights of the workers must be preserved at all costs and indeed the social security scheme, Sir, is essential in a country such as ours that claims also to be a subscriber generally of the principles of democratic socialism.

In the circumstances, Sir, I have no doubt that the Severance Payments Scheme that existed before needed some modification, Sir, and I would not want to get in here and pretend that that was not the case, because it is a fact that the benefit of the four weeks for each year with a maximum of 33 years was extremely generous. Indeed, Sir, I believe there was a recognition on the part, as the Leader of the House said earlier, of the unions and on the part of the employers and on the part of the Board itself.

Having said that, however, Sir, it is a question just because something is good or we want to do something it is not always expedient in our lives to do it at the stage at which we would like to do it.

7.35 p.m.

Sometimes there are intervening events that will cause one to recondition or remake your decision to proceed on certain lines. Now it is a fact that this report has been in the Government's hands since 1988. It is also a fact that once again as we have seen over the past few years this Government waits until the last minute to act and usually when there is a crisis at hand.

Sir, I have difficulty in supporting these Amendments at this stage because it is in the context of taking away from workers who having an expectation, Sir, for many years and who have not been given a proper adjustment period, because I do not consider bringing a Bill on

November 27 which is going to apply from December 1st a proper adjustment period. They should have at least had a period of time perhaps, Sir, some three to six months where a public education programme would have been carried on, so that even each individual could make their own adjustment period who may be suffering from a lay-off.

Apart from that point, Sir, I have difficulty in supporting it because it is also in the context of those workers who prior to this lay-off would have faced increased expenses of living. As a result of those increased expenses of living, many of them have had in the last two or three months to go into their savings account. Therefore, whereas one would expect that a worker might have saved some money over the period of time and, therefore, that could supplement the payments of severance, that in the context of what has been taking place in Barbados for the three months in particular they would no longer have that expectation and ability to resort to their savings account. Their safety net has been eroded. But when you look at the safety net, Sir, that is supposed to be there for this worker who has been laid off after December 1, he realizes that not only has he eroded his savings but if he happens to own a house the mortgage has gone up and other expenses of living have gone up. These things, Sir, must be of serious concern to that person especially if they are middle-age or over. I take that, Sir, meaning anyone from 45 years upwards and the chances of finding employment, even if they are adequately trained in the present environment in Barbados, are extremely rare, Sir. So that those who are over the age of 45 years perhaps they are more than in a precarious position. As statistics tend to suggest, most of them have the responsibility for a family whether it is in the form of a marriage or in the form of common law marriage.

Sir, in all conscience, I cannot support at this stage a widening of holes in the safety net that until this day all Governments in Barbados had accepted as their bounding duty, Sir, to ensure that there was a legislative framework for a certain level of measures concerning the workers of this country and at a time when the worker can least afford to do it and at a time when Government does this in such a quick manner, Sir. There are only four or five days intervening between now and when this legislation is supposed to apply, that they did not even have the period of an adjustment and the benefit of a public information programme carried out by the media houses and by the Government Information Service to allow them to replan their business at this time.

Sir, it is interesting for us to come in here and be very blase and talk about a long-term 15 or 20 year interest, Sir. But the fact of the matter is that the short-term interest to be served on the part of this Bill will only benefit Government and big businesses in this country, Sir. I am not anti-business, Sir, but as regards to people's

existence, we are not like Jamaica or Guyana where those people because of reduced savings, Sir, that if things are so bad they can go and squat on somebody's land in the mountains. There is no pressure valve like that in Barbados. People can at least still exist and eke out a living, Sir, and at the same time they lower the Unemployment Benefits to the worker.

Sir, I am not saying that in principle there is not need for adjustment to these Schemes because I believe there is. But I have difficulty that at a time when people can least bear the burden, they seek to put it on their back. It is not even a case of a strong camel's back carrying a load of straw, but it is a load of bricks. Yet, Sir, we can come in here quite easily and talk about reducing the worker's benefits. We will complain bitterly about the interest rates also which we face because that is what affects us, or the others in the Other Place will continue to put up with nonsense for the sake of ensuring that they receive their pensions because that is what affects them. But this does not affect any of us in here directly, Sir, so we can afford to be glib. We can afford to talk in the overall interest of the country. The point is that this country is at the beginning of a serious crisis and we had better understand, Sir, that unless we take care of the welfare of the people of this country within the next two to three years, and I mean their welfare from their ability to eat, to be housed, and to be protected against all forms of invasions of legal rights of their privacy and violence. The total protection of the individual in this country must be paramount because, if not, we will find that we will not have economic problems caused because of problems in the economy or shortage of foreign exchange, but we will have serious economic problems caused by serious social trouble in this country and it will not be easy to correct, Sir.

7.45 p.m.

Sir, as a young person, I am distressed because I believe that the safety net which has to be there for the workers in this country, especially in times such as these, is right now full of gaping holes and that they will fall right through. The sad thing is that although we may not be directly affected, and that none of us in here have to go and draw severance or unemployment benefits, we will suffer from the indirect consequences of peoples' inability to do so, if that sort of trouble comes on this country.

On a broader point of the principle of it, I accept that there is need for reform of the Scheme. I wonder why Senator Alleyne is prepared to support this scheme *in toto* when he also said that he believes that there needs to be a merging of the two schemes which are presently separate and distinct now. One would have thought if there is any reform to be done now, having taken that position – and he has spoken this evening with great reference to himself as Chairman of the Board, and therefore I must speak of him in that same light – that one set of reforms would have been proper, at one time, rather than to see a piecemeal effort coming across.

Sir, it is a fact that there is a need for a permanent government actuary so that when there is a need for an assessment on the state of affairs of each various field, one does not have to go searching to hire a consultant to come in and do an actuarial study, and in the same way that when other government departments need the benefit of actuarial services that that does not have to be done. Perhaps it is time for Government to look at employing an actuary on a permanent level. Certain of the insurance companies in this country have already done so, and Government certainly has the work to fulfil the needs of a government actuary. There then, perhaps, will be a better review of these various funds, whether the Severance Payments Fund or the Unemployment Benefits Fund or the National Insurance Fund.

Sir, it is also a fact, Senator Alleyne made the point about the long-term interest being served in reforming the Severance Payments Act and gave the impression, that if the Scheme were reformed all of a sudden businesses would want to invest in Barbados because this was a major disincentive. If that is a fact reflective of Government's feeling, and Government is indeed interested in attracting these businesses, I would hope that it would not only be motivated in altering the Severance Payments Scheme which affects the workers of this country more so than anybody else – and the workers at the bottom, because all of us are workers – but that it will also address itself to the other major disincentives of foreign investment, those being things like an absence of confidence in the economy which is the very first premise upon which a businessman will make a decision as to whether to invest or not. When we have all quarters of this country from the various unions to the private sector, referring to that absence of confidence, a reform to the Severance Payments Scheme therefore at this stage cannot really remove any major disincentives to foreign investment when moreover we refrain to deal with the problem of absence of confidence in the leadership and the management of the affairs of this country. The absence of confidence ties back in perhaps with the element of bad faith...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Senator Mottley, what has that got to do with the Severance Payments Act? It is not a matter of confidence.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Sir, because Senator Alleyne said that the Severance Payments Fund as existed was a major disincentive to foreign investment, I am saying, Sir, that if that is a reason for bringing these amendments, it is no reason, because a bigger disincentive to foreign investment is the absence of confidence; and there has been no move on the part of this Government to rectify the problem of the absence and crisis of confidence in this country. So, we cannot take that as a valid reason for bringing these amendments to the Severance Pay-

ments Schemes. We cannot accept that, Sir, and it is another reason why I would have to reject them in this form, at this particular point in time.

I am also concerned, as Senator Springer said – and perhaps this is my major concern as well as having difficulty with accepting and supporting these measures here today – that at a time when the Coalition of Trade Unions has been given this proposal as well as the unemployment benefits proposal, the order of which was laid in this Honourable Senate earlier today to consider; and at a time when the Coalition's leaders made a statement that they are still considering it; and at a time when no decision on their part appears to have been made, that we find Government once again going ahead without reference to the fact that this is still awaiting a response on the part of the Coalition. That must be a lack of what the Latins would call *uberrima fides*, absence of the utmost faith. It must, therefore, be consonant with an accusation which was leveled by the head of the Coalition only three months ago against this same Government about the lack of good faith in their negotiating.

Therefore, Sir, I would not want to be party to approving any amendment to any legislation which can only serve to reinforce the bad faith which is being exhibited on the part of the Government in their negotiations with the Coalition, indeed, which can only lead to more serious problems in this country, and the social disruption as a result thereof. I think that we cannot bypass that fact. This is all in the context of a previous breaking-off of negotiations three months ago and in the context of the bypassing of the union in the issuance of the option forms and in the context of dealing with severance payments rights which is a right of the worker in the same way that it is a right of a worker to be a member of a trade union of his or her choice, and I must have great difficulty with this. As I said, we are told by Senator Alleyne that although this should have been implemented long ago it is nonsense to say it shouldn't be implemented now because Government is in less a position to pay the workers the severance that is due to them. I don't accept that. At a time when these same workers are catching themselves all around struggling to eke out an existence, at a time when this is happening and Government says that it does not have the money to pay them, we still see \$65,000 a month being paid in salaries at the St. Joseph Hospital. We still see money being paid on...

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: This is nothing to do with this debate, Senator Mottley. You will refrain from dragging in things which have absolutely nothing to do with it.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am making the point that the Government has resources which it is spending badly, which it should use, and I would have thought it would have had as one of its priorities the

welfare of the workers of this country and, therefore, if that was one of its priorities, it would be prepared to prioritise its spending to ensure that the welfare of those workers, especially the ones being laid off, was met with properly, justly, and fairly, Sir. Also at a time, Sir, when we are likely to see even more layoffs. In fact, the layoffs in the private sector are perhaps only now about to come with us. Therefore, these are the people who are going to be affected by this amendment which is coming in on December 1st because as Senator Clarke said earlier, the manufacturers have until December 31st and then the concessions go.

SENATOR THE HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE: On a point of order, I did not say that. I said that at this point in time the concessions will remain in effect through the 31st. The negotiations are still going on. I also said that there will be a mission from the World Bank and discussions thereby, but I did not say they will terminate.

SENATOR Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am obliged to the Minister of Trade, and I hope he will use his good offices to ensure that the manufacturers do not suffer from a removal of these concessions. Unfortunately, he has left me still with the impression that it is open-ended as to what will happen with the negotiations still continuing. Sir, I must worry therefore that if it does happen and thousands of workers are laid off, as we are told will be the result of the removal of concessions remaining, it will be thousands of workers who will be carrying home less, and it is these thousands of workers whom I would have thought Government, as a caring Government as this Government always says it is but shows no evidence of, that they would have prioritised the welfare of those people in the spending of their resources. As I said, it is easy for us to be glib but let us face the reality in a year or 18 months' time or even in six months' time when people have no savings to resort to.

7.55 p.m.

Sir, it is with those words that I wish to register my disapproval and lack of support for this particular amendment to this Bill at this particular time. I believe that there is no time. It is rushed. There is no proper thinking and no sensitivity as to the effect it will have on the workers in this country and those of us in here can remain detached because it does not affect us. Perhaps our vision needs to be a little broader and our hearts need to be wider at this stage.

There can be no doubt in my mind that the only short-term interest that can be served by this Bill at this particular time given the overall current economic situation and the overall situation of the workers themselves, is to serve the interest of big business and the interest of Government. I have the greatest difficulty with supporting this when Government sought to implement two meas-

ures on the workers of this country, that being the four weeks only for the severance of public workers and the measure to ask workers to contribute to their own severance, and which wisdom Government now accepts is wrong. I hope that some ray of light would be shed on the part of Government to let them know that they are asking for a recipe of social disaster at this time.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Acting President, if nothing had come before us the Government would have been wrong. Something comes before and the Government for some people is still wrong. The last comment was made about Government's attempt to impose a four week's severance on its employees. If this is not passed this evening that is all those same employees would get because that is precisely what the law is. That is why there is urgency to put this in place to supersede that in order that the Government employees may be able to get other benefits.

Over and above that any unemployment benefits for which they would have been entitled they are still going to be entitled to notwithstanding the other measure that is being put in place. It in no way undermines the stance the Coalition would have taken on behalf of the employees. I make that comment because some people have difficulty, they claim, with the fact that they have not heard from the Coalition. These measures were put before the Coalition more than two weeks ago. The Coalition has not rejected them. Indeed, the Coalition gave classic acceptance to both of these and only indicated that they wanted to go and clear it with their members. The fact is that whatever had happened the Government would be wrong.

I have absolutely no doubt that the present Minister of Finance will lead this country out of the difficulties which we are presently facing. I have every confidence that the Cabinet of Barbados supports the Prime Minister in these measures. Indeed, these measures result and the apparent change imposition results from the position which the Cabinet recognised was in the interest of the workers of this country. To suggest that Government is not a caring Government is to state something that is altogether untrue. I did not intend to say anything in winding up after the presentation made by Senator Alleyne which I thought covered all the questions. Even the ones that came after were covered by his presentation but there are two area which I need to mention.

There was some comment about Government having the most idle lands in the country. Absolute untruth, if ever there was one. The persons who made that comment know, that is not true because the Government has substantially

less land than the majority of persons in the private sector. If anything the Government has been trying in the last two to three years to try to bring any land which it had which was not cultivated at the time to get it back into cultivation.

The agency of Government which has this responsibility has the same problems as the private sector people and it functions as if it were a private sector agency. It has to go to the bank to get money. In the present circumstances it has great difficulty in getting money from the banking system. That is another of the negative things being said about Government.

Let me also say that those of us who keep crying wolf about social unrest are the very persons who ought to be saying in this community that the time has come when all of us leaders in this country have to recognise that the success and forward thrust of the Government is dependent upon all of us. It does not depend upon the Government alone. The present Prime Minister alone did not lead the country into his situation. There is no need for me to go over and recite that. That is an established and well-known fact to everybody in politics in Barbados today. But the problem is that some persons have not yet got over the January 1991 decisions by the people in this country and they will seize every opportunity that presents itself to reinvent the wheel and take us back to January of 1991. The Cabinet of this country and the Democratic Labour Party will not be turned aside by all the bleatings and rantings which will take place.

On the question of allocation of Government lands which an Honourable Senator on the other side suggested should be done, this has been put in train for more than two months. We have been working on the allocation of lands for persons who, unfortunately, are no longer employed in some areas of Government. In addition, we are also considering the allocation of lands to unemployed persons dealing with lands which are presently under the direction of the Agricultural Development Corporation or the Ministry of Housing and Lands. The lands are not presently idle. The lands are presently under crops. We are quite prepared to put a programme in place which will assist these would-be farmers in growing crops which can reach the export markets. Your suggestion, although it has some wisdom in it, is nothing new. We are several steps ahead of you in that regard.

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

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to, the Senate dividing as follows:-

AYES: SENATORS THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, HON. Dr. C. D. CLARKE, A. MORRISON,

Mrs. M. BARKER-WELCH, Dr. F. W. ALLEYNE, Mrs. V. C. FRASER, J. J. PAYNE, Mrs. A. STRAUGHN, Mrs. M. WALCOTT, J. G. BELLAMY AND J. A. F. COLE - 11.

NOES: SENATORS Miss M. A. MOTTLEY and T. E. BARKER - 2.

ABSTENTION: SENATOR THE REV. CANON J. L. SPRINGER - 1.
8.05 p.m.

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT: Thank you. Therefore the "Ayes" have it. The Bill has been read a second time.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. J. PAYNE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment and Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I beg to move, Mr. Acting President, that this sitting do now adjourn *sine die*.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT adjourned the sitting accordingly at 8.12 p.m.
8.12 p.m.

CONTENTS

MESSAGES FROM HER EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. ACTING PRESIDENT 393

1. Absence overseas of Her Excellency from office for medical reasons from August 6, 1991 to September 13, 1991.
2. Absence overseas of Her Excellency from office from October 30, 1991 to November 4, 1991 on an official visit to the United Kingdom.
3. Announcement by Her Excellency of the re-appointment of Sir Frank Milton Blackman, KA, KCVO, OBE, JP to the office of Ombudsman.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 394

1. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1991.
2. Letter of Intent under the proposed adjustment programme between Barbados and the International Monetary Fund.
3. Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1990-91.
4. The Civil Establishment (General Amendment) Order, 1991.
5. Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority for the year 1990.
6. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the Financial Year 1988-89.
7. National Insurance and Social Security (Collection of Contributions) (Amendment) Regulations, 1991.
8. National Insurance and Social Security (Benefit) (Amendment) Regulations, 1991.
9. National Insurance and Social Security (Benefit) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations, 1991.
10. Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending 31st December, 1990.

11. Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for the year 1990.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 394

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

SENATOR A. MORRISON 394

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 394

Appointment of Senator J. J. Payne to act as Deputy President.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 394

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS 395

1. A Bill to amend the Exchange Control Act, Cap. 71.
2. A Bill to amend the Land Tax Act, Cap. 78A.
3. A Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, Cap. 355A.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND TO CONSTRUCT A CAR PARK AND PLAYING AREA FOR THE ST. MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE CITY OF BRIDGETOWN.....395

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 395.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF A NOTIFICATION RE ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BALLS, CHRIST CHURCH 395

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 395.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BOVELL'S GAP, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER FOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT 395

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 395; Senator T. E. Barker, 396; Senator A. Morrison, 397; Senator Mrs. A. Straughn, 397.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SALE TO GEORGE HOLDER UNDER THE CROWN LANDS (VESTING AND DISPOSAL) ACT, CAP. 225 OF LANDS AT ROCK HALL, ST. ANDREW TO BE CONVERTED AND USED AS A RESIDENCE 397

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 397; Senator Miss M. A. Mottley, 397, 398; Senator J. J. Payne, 399, 400, 401, 402.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SEAVIEW, ST. JAMES FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT 402

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 402.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH TO PROVIDE AN ACCESS TO CROWN LANDS USED FOR THE RESITING OF HOUSES 403

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 403.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF BARBADOS OF REPAYMENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LOANS MADE TO THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR FINANCING INVESTMENT PROJECTS 403

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 403, 410; Senator C. O. Williams, 403; Senator Dr. E. A. Simmons, 404; Senator Miss M. A. Mottley, 404, 406, 407; Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 407; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 408, 409, 410.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1991 411

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 411, 421; Senator T. E. Barker, 412, 413, 414, 415; Senator Mrs. M. Walcott, 415; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 416, 417; Senator C. O. Williams,

418; Senator Dr. E. A. Simmons, 419; Senator Rev. Canon J. L. Springer, 419; Senator A. Morrison, 420.

A BILL TO AMEND THE EXCHANGE CONTROL ACT, CAP. 71 422

Senator the Hon. C. D. Clarke, 422, 423, 425, 438; Senator T. E. Barker, 422, 423, 425, 426; Mr. Acting President, 426; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431; Senator Miss M. A. Mottley, 433, 435, 436, 437, 438; Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser, 431, 432.

LAND TAX ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1991

Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D. Clarke, 439, 441; Senator T. E. Barker, 440, 441.

A BILL TO AMEND THE SEVERANCE PAYMENTS ACT, CAP. 355A 441

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 441, 445, 456; Senator T. E. Barker, 442, 444, 445, 446, 447; Senator Dr. F. W. Alleyne, 450; Senator Mrs. A. Straughn, 448; Senator J. A. F. Cole, 448; Senator J. G. Bellamy, 449; Senator Rev. Canon J. L. Springer, 450; Senator Miss M. A. Mottley, 452, 454, 455.

SUSPENSION 411

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 411.

ADJOURNMENT 457.

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 457.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ALLEYNE, Senator Dr. F. W.
BARKER, Senator T. E.
BARKER-WELCH, Senator Mrs. M.
BELLAMY, Senator J. G.
CLARKE, Senator the Hon. Dr. C. D.
COLE, Senator J. A. F.
FRASER, Senator Mrs. V. C.
JORDAN, His Honour Senator M. DeL.
LEWIS, Senator the Hon. L. V. H.
MORRISON, Senator A.
MOTTLEY, Senator Miss M. A.
PAYNE, Senator J. J.
SIMMONS, Senator Dr. E. A.
SPRINGER, Senator Rev. Canon J. L.
STRAUGHN, Senator Mrs. A.
WALCOTT, Senator Mrs. M.
WILLIAMS, Senator C. O.