
THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

THE SENATE

Wednesday 17th September, 1980.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings, on Wednesday the 17th September, 1980, at 2.50 p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir ARNOTT CATO, M.B., Ch.B., LL.D., (President); His Honour Senator the Rev. G. ANDREW HATCH, M.A., (Deputy President); Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, B.A., LL.B., (Minister of Information) (Leader of the Senate); Senator O'BRIEN TROTMAN, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office); Senator Sir M. E. COX; Senator H. F. G. ROCHEFORD, B.A.; Senator R. L. FIELD; Senator AARON TRUSS; Senator H. R. LINTON, LL.B.; Senator K. E. HINDS; Senator Miss O. A. LYNCH, B.A., Dip. Ed.; Senator C. I. E. DEANE; Senator K. R. HEWITT, B.Com., C.A.; Senator Mrs. E. M. LYNCH, B.A.; Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM; Senator the Hon. D. G. BLACKMAN, (Minister of Labour and Community Services) and Senator R. E. BRATHWAITE.

Prayers were read by Senator the Rev. A. Hatch.

ABSENT

Senator J. D. S. MACKENZIE; Senator Miss M. I. StC. BLACKMAN; Senator D. H. G. HUNTE and Senator J. CONNELL.

EXCUSE FOR ABSENCE

An excuse was offered for the absence of Senator MACKENZIE.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to lay the following:—

The Annual Report of the Sanitation Service Authority for the period April 1979 to March 1980.

The Chairman's Report, the Auditors' Report and the Financial Statements of the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation for the year ended June, 1979.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

SENATOR THE REV. G. A. HATCH: Does the Minister agree that there is a need

- (a) to promote and encourage orderly economic development by controlling the time frame within which the development takes place,
- (b) to exercise greater control over the sale of Barbados' property to foreigners,
- (c) to prevent speculative property deals by foreigners,
- (d) to ensure that land is available to present and future generations of citizens?

If the answer to (a), (b), (c) or (d) is in the affirmative, will the Minister state:

- (1) area of land sold to foreigners in the last ten years,
- (2) number of lots sold,
- (3) total value of property passing out of Barbadian ownership?

If the answer to (a), (b), (c) or (d) is in the negative, will the Minister please say why?

In either case, will the Minister provide answers to the questions 1, 2 and 3?

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS OR PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, two of the Bills of which I will give notice must be passed in accordance with the provisions of section 49 of the Constitution which deals with alterations to the Constitution in that they affect in one instance Chapter 2 and in the other Chapter 3 which are entrenched by section 49 and therefore require a two-thirds majority for their passage through Parliament, although they do not constitute amendments to the Constitution.

Entrenchment is the means by which matters which the Constitution makers deem to be of fundamental importance are protected either from alteration by way of constitutional amendment or modification by way of ordinary legislation unless the formula laid down within the Constitution is followed.

Because the law on these matters must be clear legislation which is of general benefit to the community and which does not in any way seek to amend the Constitution, will from time to time, be caught by the Constitution's restrictive provisions. This is not a problem peculiar to Barbados as is apparent from the 1962 Trinidad and Tobago Constitution which carried a provision to enable passage of legislation which was in apparent conflict with the human rights provisions of the Constitution, so long as a prescribed majority was obtained.

The makers of the Barbados Constitution preferred to treat such legislation under the general umbrella of alterations to the Constitution and therefore at section 49 subsection 5(b), there appears the following —

“references to altering this Constitution or any particular provision thereof include references —

(i) to repealing it, with or without re-enactment thereof or the making of different provisions in lieu thereof;

(ii) to modifying it (whether by omitting, amending or overriding any of its provisions or inserting additional provisions in it or otherwise); and

(iii) to suspending its operation for any period or terminating any such suspension.”

Furthermore, to ensure that there cannot be any implied repeal of any provision of the Constitution, section 49 subsection 6 states —

“No Act of Parliament shall be construed as altering this Constitution unless it is stated in the Act that it is an Act for that purpose.”

Accordingly, when a few weeks ago it was desired to pass legislation to make it easier for expatriates who had served in this country as public officers to receive their pensions, it became necessary to pass the legislation in accordance with the provisions for altering the Constitution since pensions are protected under sections 103 and 104 which are entrenched by section 49. The Act for that purpose — The Expatriates Pensions Act, 1980 — Clearly states that it was an Act to alter the Constitution even though all will agree that it did not derogate from anybody's rights.

In the same way it is now desired to legislate “to enable membership of the Commonwealth to be more easily ascertained”. Since section 3 subsection 2 dealing with citizenship makes specific reference to the Commonwealth and is similarly entrenched by section 49, the Bill for this purpose must evidence the same intention and must be passed with the same majority as the Expatriates Pensions Act, 1980.

The same is the case with the Bill to provide a right for tenants of lands in certain tenancies to purchase the freehold in those lands since section 16 of the Constitution deals with protection of private property and is entrenched by section 49. Unless therefore the requirements of section 49 are complied with the Bill for this purpose cannot become law although it may be generally agreed that its purpose is highly desirable.

It is our intention therefore to schedule a sitting of the Senate for Wednesday, 1st October at 10.00 in the morning to give consideration to these two Bills and any other matters which may be on the Order Paper for that day. And I am giving Honourable Senators early notice of this meeting because as is stated at section 49 subsection 2 a Bill for an Act of Parliament under this section that alters section 16 or section 2 of the Constitution “shall not be passed in either House unless at the final vote thereon in the House it is supported by the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members of the House.”

Mr. PRESIDENT: I will ask the Clerk to have the Minister's Statement printed and circulated as a matter of urgency.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Bill to amend the Constitution of Barbados so as to enable membership of the Commonwealth to be more easily ascertained and to provide for the continued operation of the law of Barbados in relation to certain Commonwealth countries.

The Tenancies Freehold Purchase Bill, 1980.

The Tenancies Development Bill, 1980.

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the financial year ended 31st March, 1980.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act.

A Bill to repeal the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act.

A Bill to amend the Hotel and Restaurants (Sales Tax) Act.

A Bill to amend the Housing Act.

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Tudor Street and Sobers Lane for the provision of a Youth Centre.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded in the Minutes that these Bills have been read a first time.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, before the first Order of the Day is called, may I please take the opportunity to inform the Honourable Senate that although all the items are standing in my name, I shall be dealing only with Items 7 and 8, the Perjury Act and the Evidence Act. Senator O'Brien Trotman will be dealing with Orders Nos. 1 through 6 and Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman with Orders Nos. 9 through 11.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND TO HOMEX CONSTRUCTION LIMITED

The First Order of the Day was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at Prescod Boulevard, Fontabelle, St. Michael to Homex Construction Limited.

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, there is a stretch of land between Fontabelle and the Prescod Boulevard. That land has several business places on it on the Fontabelle side. It has been decided, Sir, that the land should be leased to the business houses on the Fontabelle side of the land. Those business houses with which we will deal this afternoon are Homex Construction, the Nation Limited and H. B. Niblock, so that

although in fact there are three Resolutions dealing with three separate companies, it is in fact one spot of land with which we are dealing.

The Crown Solicitor has carried out negotiations with the companies, they have agreed on the leases which are now before us this afternoon, and it seems in the best interest of everybody that these properties be leased to these business houses. The other result would be in fact that the Parks and Beaches Department or MCW would have a continuous problem of keeping the Prescod Boulevard in good condition.

What we are doing is allowing the businesses to expand and at the same time allowing them to keep it clean for the people of Barbados. I beg to move that the Resolution No. 1 do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD TO THE NATION LIMITED

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: As I said earlier, Mr. President, indeed it is only one set of business to three companies, but I do not propose to do three introductions. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The maps which have been passed around will show the three companies involved. The other companies which are not mentioned in this Resolution this afternoon have in fact already leased the land.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT PRESCOD BOULEVARD TO H. B. NIBLOCK COMPANY LIMITED

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: I am now going to follow the advice next door and say ditto, Sir, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHEAPSIDE, ST. MICHAEL FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, Items Nos. 4 and 6 are tied together in the same way as the first three Resolutions were tied together. In this case we are dealing with one continuous stretch of land and I do not know why for administrative purposes they had to have two Resolutions, but be that as it may, the

Resolutions have to deal with the acquisition of, in the first place, 25 pieces of land, and I think I have that map in circulation, and the other Item, No. 6, has nine pieces of land. I am trying to find that map for the general information of the Senate, but the land is required, Sir, to continue the roadworks which most of us would have seen being carried on in the Fontabelle/Cheapside area. With the coming in of the sewerage scheme I believe that the opportunity was taken to clear up and "re-road" — if that is a good term, Sir — the Cheapside/Fontabelle area.

What they hope to do is to convert the dangerous little roads of Fontabelle and Cheapside into the kinds of road which would carry the traffic because of the new Post Office and other developments in Cheapside, and it is therefore necessary to acquire these lands for the purpose of road expansion.

In nearly all cases I believe that the owners and Government have come to agreement, I think there are only one or two cases where they are still negotiating, but nevertheless it is necessary in these cases for the record for the compulsory acquisition to be processed.

I do not think that there is much more that I can say on that, Sir.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in this Resolution.....Senator Hatch.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: From time to time, Sir, public spirited persons and institutions in the country make offers of road frontage to the country for the well-being of all the citizens. For example, to my own, certain knowledge, the Ursuline Convent has made an offer of land on Collymore Rock to the country which will obviously benefit everyone, in terms of faster traffic flow and also the well-being of pedestrians. This was some years ago and has not yet been taken up.

One is very well aware that it takes time to do major road improvements, but I believe that it is important when individuals, or Bodies make such gestures and in this instance, they were not asking to be paid for it, but, of course, that their wall be built back, that these offers be treated extremely carefully. My suggestion would be that they should come to the attention of the Hon. Minister responsible and not just be handled in a cavalier fashion, if ever they have been so handled and I am not suggesting that.

In this particular Resolution, reference is made to property surrounding St. Mary's Church. Nearly fifteen years ago — I am hoping to see the Plan as it comes around — but nearly fifteen years ago, that part of St.

Mary's Church yard which faces on to Cheapside and the Lower Green was offered to the country and it is not necessarily dependent on the Cheapside Road because it could well have been widened and have improved the flow of traffic long before now. But, these are, no, Sir, this one, page four, Schedule 20. My preliminary remarks are only to spin out my speech a little bit, but the substantive thing which I want to say is that St. Mary's Church does not own any property.

All the property of the Anglican Church in Barbados, is vested in Anglican Diocesan Trustees, so I hope that the statement here, "the property of St. Mary's Church" does not invalidate this Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not know whether the Hon. Minister wishes to reply to the point raised by the Deputy President. Senator Hewitt.

SENATOR K. R. HEWITT: By extension, Mr. President, we may look at the 18th and 19th Schedules which refer to the property of Rick's Shopping Plaza. One would doubt very much that that is a legal entity. I mean, it may be Rick's Shopping Plaza Ltd., or they may be the owners themselves, but hardly, Rick's Shopping Plaza.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not want to anticipate the Hon. Minister, but all these Resolutions and descriptions are always worded to include the phrase "or however else it may abut and bound". I am wondering whether it is meant legally to cover just the sort of questions which the hon. members have raised.

What is up to the hon. Minister?

SENATOR O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. President, you made the point which I was advised that I should make, that is, that for the purpose of the Resolution, the land is described in such a way, that there is no doubt as to where we are talking about, but at the same time, what will be most important, will be what actually happens at the level of acquisition when the Crown Solicitor's Office and the real owners of the land get together on the question of acquisition. So that, for our purpose, as I understand it, there is no real legal problem.

The question that the Honourable Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Honourable Senate and agreed to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think that in view of what the Hon. Minister said earlier, that it would be useful to take Order No. 6 before Order No. 5.

Order No. 6 was called — to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of

land at Cheapside/Fontabelle, St. Michael, for road improvement.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Trotman.

SENATOR O'B TROTMAN: Mr. President, Sir, I took the opportunity earlier today to circulate the Plan on the nine pieces of land involved and it is somewhere in circulation.

In fact, as I said earlier, this Resolution is really an extension of the earlier one and there is no need for further debate.

I beg to move Sir, that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is proposed that the Senate concur in this Resolution..... Senator Hatch.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: Sir, the Plan may be somewhere in circulation, but I cannot see it and it is not coming to this quarter.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Order No. 5 was called – to move the passing of the Resolution to amend Resolution No. 26/1979 for the acquisition of property at Cheapside, St. Michael.

SENATOR O'B. TROTMAN: When Resolution No. 13 was passed last year, Sir, we said then, that the intention was that that land should be used for the new Post Office.

In fact, that is not correct and the purpose of the land acquisition should have been for security of the Rates and Taxes building which is the property being acquired.

I have therefore taken an early opportunity to pass the corrected drawing around so that this afternoon we can be clear as to what country we are talking about. The Resolution as passed described the land correctly but apparently there was some error as to what the person writing the Addendum thought it was to be used for.

I believe that that happened because it came at the time when we were acquiring land for the new Post Office and the officer thought that we were acquiring all the land for the new Post Office so we got into misleading ourselves. I apologise for that mistake, Sir. Now that we have it correctly, Sir, I hope that the Senate would forget our earlier error.

I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

EVIDENCE (PROCEEDINGS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS) ACT, 1980

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this matter is very straightforward. There is already legislation for taking evidence in Barbados for use outside of Barbados under the Foreign Tribunals Evidence Act, 1856, the Evidence by Commission Act, 1859, and the Evidence by Commission Act, 1885 by virtue of the application of these United Kingdom Acts to Barbados.

This evening the legislation which we are presenting will – if passed – amend these Acts, and we will move within the framework laid down by the 1977 Winnipeg Meeting of Law Ministers. The development from that meeting is the Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil and commercial matters – the Evidence Convention, – which was signed at the Hague on the 18th March, 1970. Barbados proposes to accede to that Convention as soon as possible.

This Convention, provides for the taking of evidence or the performing of other judicial acts abroad by means of Letters of Request or by the use of diplomats and consuls and commissioners.

Sir, as we accede to that Convention, we are taking the opportunity to give effect to it and at the same time, therefore, to repatriate the Laws of the United Kingdom primarily that have been made to apply to Barbados and so this constitutes the legislation over the whole of this area. The Bill therefore seeks to replace the United Kingdom legislation and its application to Barbados and to give effect to the Evidence Convention by providing a unified set of Rules applicable to requests originating from foreign countries as well as Commonwealth countries for assistance in obtaining evidence for use in those countries.

The principle features of the Bill are as follows:—

- (a) Power is conferred on the High Court to entertain applications made under the Convention and to make an order for obtaining evidence in Barbados.
- (b) Recognition is given and provision is made to preserve any privilege to a witness under the laws of Barbados so that the legal position of a witness is in anyway not eroded.
- (c) Orders of the Court are not to bind the Crown or its servants as a matter of policy.

- (d) The application of the Laws of the United Kingdom Parliament to Barbados is discontinued.

Those, Sir, are the special features of this Legislation.

I will close, Sir, as I began. There is at present legislation covering the area but it would be far tidier since we intend to accede to the Evidence Convention to have our law in conformity with the Evidence Convention and secondly, it is always a good thing to bring together the law and put it in one place so that the subject may more easily ascertain where the law is.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, the Senate resolved itself into Committee to study the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE PERJURY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

The Eighth Order of the Day was called — to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Perjury Act.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, again this matter is very straightforward. You will remember, Sir, that we passed the Evidence Proceedings in Other Jurisdictions Bill just a moment ago and this Bill is its companion in that it gives support to that Bill by creating by way of an amendment to the Perjury Act Cap. 142 a new offence in respect of a false statement made not on oath. For this evidence the penalty is imprisonment for two years, a fine or both. If the offence, Sir, is to be reliable, then the conditions have to exist where there can be reasonable belief in the truth of the evidence, and for this reason where the testimony may not be on oath an offence is created where the statement is false in a material particular and the person making the statement knows it or the person making the statement does not believe in the truth of the statement he is mak-

ing. So that all of the evidence there, Sir, exists to justify it being made an offence under the Perjury Act.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator Reverend A. HATCH in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator HINDS, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE JUDICIAL SALE OF LAND (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1980

The Ninth Order of the Day was called — to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Judicial Sale of Land Act.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, the introduction of this Bill applies *mutatis mutandis* to the next item on the Order Paper, Item 10. When this Honourable Senate passed the Property Act, 1979, it was aware that one of the stated objectives of that Act was to simplify the method of conveying land. In consequence of this all existing statutes under which or by which land was conveyed became candidates for amendment in order to bring them into alignment with the Property Act.

This Bill before us seeks to amend the Judicial Sale of Land Act, Cap. 227 in order to achieve this objective and at the same time the opportunity was taken to amend this Act in order to effect changes appropriate since the enactment of the Legal Profession Act, Cap. 370A which fused the two branches of the profession, the Barbados National Bank Act, 1978 which *inter alia* gave the new bank, the National Bank, responsibility for matters which were previously exercised by the Agricultural Credit Bank. At the same time the Profession, Trade and Business Act, 1978 was enacted and it influences section 3 of the legislation before us to which I will refer when I get to that section.

Over and above this, it seeks to extirpate from the Statute Book the use of archaic language which confuses and obfuscates the meaning of legislation.

I shall deal in my introductory, Mr. President, with those sections which I consider to exemplify the points that I have made in my brief opening remarks. Section 3, for example, seeks to repeal sections 6 and 7 of the original Act. Sections 6 and 7 deal with the functions of appraisal. It may be important to point out that this legislation, the Judicial Sale of Land, Cap. 227 deals with the selling of land in execution of a High Court Order and it sets out the procedures that are to be followed in such circumstances. The relevant sections 6 and 7 identified certain persons who could be appraisers. Section 6, for example — I beg your pardon, I think I am a bit previous, Mr. President, because I am not seeing very well today.

We are talking about a repeal of section 3 of the existing Act rather than sections 6 and 7. The qualification for appraisers under that legislation required that persons be either owners or managers of plantations of not less than 100 acres, and that such persons not be exempted from serving on juries, or that dwelling houses, shops or stores should be appraised by persons as are rated as householders. The property qualifications for the exercise of fundamental rights, constitutional rights by people of Barbados have long been abolished in other areas, particularly with the exercise of the franchise, the exercise of the right to vote, and it is no longer appropriate in the last two decades of the 20th century where we have persons who specialise in real estate and others who by reason of their avocation know a great deal about land for us to presume that only managers and owners of plantations could appreciate the value of land. I am quite sure that my good friend, Senator Deane, would agree that persons of that category no longer enjoy a monopoly of wisdom in this particular area.

Section 3 of this Bill before us proposes a simple emendation to the text of the original Act and it merely seeks to substitute the words "attorney-at-law" or "attorneys-at-law", the plural form, for "solicitor" or "solicitors" where these words appear. Such amendments become consequential upon the enactment of the Legal Profession Act, Cap. 370A.

I really do not believe that it is necessary to tire the Senate, Mr. President, with amendments of that kind where names are substituted for others without altering the substance of the meaning of the provision, such as where the Barbados National Bank is substituted for the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank. It suffices only to indicate that in the matter relating to the simplification of conveying, as the Property Act, 1979 was designed to achieve, that section 8 of this Bill before us seeks to

do this not by changing the substantive meaning of section 16 of the original Act, but by rearranging the sections in language that is at one more clear and more felicitous.

That being the case, Mr. 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. D. G. Blackman, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch, in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 11 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman, the passing of the Bill in Committee was reported to the Senate and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Next Order.

Order No. 10 was called — To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Court Process Act.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Blackman.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, as indicated in my introduction on the last item, in principle, the Amendment of this Bill, the Court Process Act, Cap. 11A follows the same reasons, mainly for the Amendments to the previous Bill. I therefore think it unnecessary to elaborate any further on that and I beg to move that it be read a second time.

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

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Blackman.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator the Rev. A. Hatch, in the Chair.

On the motion of Senator K. Hinds, the Bill was taken as read.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman, the passing of the Bill in Committee was reported to the Senate and Mr. President resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. D. G. Blackman, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BARBADOS WATER AUTHORITY ACT, 1980

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, when in the year 380 B.C., if my memory serves me correctly, Thales, the pre-socratic Philosopher made this profound declaration that "It is all water", the subject of water became a matter of supreme importance. When Thales said "it is all water", he simply was trying to underscore his belief that the basic reality of matter was liquid.

Thales was one of the earlier primitive physicists who provided brilliant insights into the works that over the years produced such noted geniuses as Einstein and while from our vantage point 2,000 years down the line we may think it facetious for anyone to declare that it is all water, nevertheless, there were good reasons for holding this particular principle.

Thales observed that men were perpetuously salivating as long as they were normal men. As long as they were not ill, there was a constant flow of saliva that could be found in the mouths of men. He observed that the circulation of blood, another liquid was vital to maintaining life. When men exhausted themselves, fire did not come from their veins, but water. Liquid came from their veins. They perspired and in the morning when Thales awoke and looked at the leaves he saw dew there and when Thales observed that the rain fell, that plants grew, and people ate whatever products they were in agriculture and the cause of this was rain, which led him to conclude that "it", meaning dew's existence is reducible to water, and while we might not go as far as Thales went and say that it is all water we nevertheless recognise that water is an essential and indispensable ingredient in our bodies.

We know that if perchance we ever became dehydrated in the extreme that we would be no more. We know that water is necessary for the development of our agriculture. We know that pure drinking water is an important feature in the health of any community and Barbados happily is one of the few places in the World where our drinking water cannot be used as a substitute or as a laxative.

Mr. President, the establishment of a Water Authority as is envisaged by this Bill before us is predicated upon the recognition that our water resources need to be controlled and managed in a much more satisfactory way than has been in the past. An enormous amount of development has been taking place in Barbados in the last 30 years and we are only now beginning dimly to perceive the impact that such development is having on our environment and our water is such a precious asset that it would be suicidal for any responsible Government to continue to create an atmosphere where blind and random development could take place without any regard for our water supply.

This legislation follows upon an exhaustive study which was undertaken jointly by the Inter-American Development Bank, a group of Consultants from Canada, and representatives of the Barbados Government. A comprehensive survey, I believe it was the first of its kind ever undertaken with respect to the water resources of our country was carried out and out of this came the specific proposal for the establishment of a Water Authority which became mandatory of this Government as a condition of getting the needed financial assistance from the Inter-American Development Bank for the construction of a Sewerage System which gave an undertaking to create an autonomous body for the management of our water resources including sewage, which is nothing more than the disposal of waste water and given the increasing pollution of the sea, the effluence that can be seen floating among swimmers, swimmers having to dodge from all kinds of obnoxious substances in the sea, given this particular problem the question of the management of used or misused water is a matter of extreme urgency. This is why it is proposed in this legislation to establish this autonomous body which would deal with the question of the utilization of water for the purposes of irrigation, the preservation of our water resources and the replenishment of our water resources. Every facet of water will fall within the purview of this Authority.

This legislation here sets out the powers of the Water Authority which is, in the last analysis, an instrument of public policy and the word "autonomous" should not beguile us into thinking that the Water Authority will be a law unto itself.

Like any Statutory Body, the Water Authority will work within the framework of ministerial direction, because this is the only circumstance in which we can expect that the supremacy of Parliament in determining water policy will be maintained; so "autonomous" must not be interpreted as meaning the establishment of a body run by men and women who would in effect be the alpha and omega of all things liquid.

The term "authority" is really a synonym for a board or corporation that we all well know. The rules as

set out in this body for governing its functions follow closely those rules that exist in various statutory corporations in Barbados. I talk about the ministerial power of oversight and ultimate parliamentary supremacy in the Authority's activities. There are vested in the projected authority powers to hire staff and to provide for their emoluments subject to ministerial approval, and the development of a proper pension scheme. There are rules with respect to secondment, there are financial safeguards provided in the Act which require the Authority to keep proper accounts, to have them audited, and have these audited accounts laid before parliament. There is power vested in the authority to raise money and power to keep and use revenues. These things are nothing novel. They are powers that have been conferred by legislation upon many statutory bodies in this country.

One point that may be of some interest to you, Mr. President, is the fact that all of us in Barbados are concerned with having potable water, we are concerned with having pure drinking water. This is of extreme importance and in the past the quality control of our water supply in Barbados was the exclusive responsibility of the Ministry of Health. This legislation provides that shared responsibility of quality control of our drinking water supply and it was thought that it was necessary to do this to ensure that the authority might be in a position to do its work effectively. The Act accordingly provides the mechanism for coordination between the Water Authority and the Ministry of Health.

I believe, Mr. President, that this is a Bill that all right thinking Barbadians would support. It is a step in the right direction to plan our water supply to ensure that we bequeath to posterity water resources that are not bacteriologically or chemically contaminated and a water supply that is adequate. I believe this is an extremely important step and I commend support of this measure to fellow Senators.

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

SENATOR H. F. G. ROCHEFORD: Mr. President, I should like to say that for many years the people of Barbados have taken their water supply for granted as the Hon. Minister has said, and it is good to see that we are getting concerned about our water supply especially with the increase in population and the development that has been taking place.

There are two observations I should like to make. One is that while people all over Barbados must be concerned that improper disposal of sewage might cause a breakdown in health in the whole population I think that where we have been noticing our water rates increasing at alarming rates because of the operation of the sewage scheme, we need to look to see where people who live in

areas which are not benefitting from the sewage scheme are being asked to carry a large part of the burden of the sewage operation where it is benefitting and providing for the services for a certain part of the country. That is one of the points I should like to make.

The other one is that in the light of the possible diminution of our potable water supply as the Minister has said, we have been looking at the resources that we have available, but I think the time has come when we should be looking at the possible use of solar energy in the possibility of desalination of water to supplement any diminution in the water supply, and I should like to think that this Water Authority that is now being set up should be looking towards some of these new areas to supplement what water resources we do have.

The other comment is that the Minister did not indicate under which Ministry now we are going to have the whole thing, whether it is still going to be the Ministry of Communications and Works or whether it is going to come under the Ministry of Health completely.

SENATOR K. HEWITT: Mr. President, after listening to Senator Blackman, I do not think we would need any one to emphasise the importance of liquid or water. I want just to take the opportunity to make a few comments, one of which will flow somewhat from a point referred to by Senator Rocheford, and this is the point with regard to the escalating cost of water. This subject has been the topic on various platforms and so on, namely, the prime reason given for the increase in the water rates over the past few years has been that it was one of the conditions included in the agreement between the Government and the IADB.

Perhaps I should digress one second, Sir, and say two things. One is that I am a member of an Advisory Committee set up to predate the Board of Directors of this Authority, and No. 2, I had some involvement in one of the studies surrounding the Water Authority. If that constitutes an interest, I so declare it, I don't know.

As I was saying, Sir, one of the reasons given for the escalating costs of the increase in water rates is the fact that one of the conditions of the loan from IADB was that after a certain period of time, I think that time was three years, after the establishment of the project, which would be the sewerage project, and after that time the revenue generated from the Authority should be such as would cover the operating expenses of the said Authority. Consequently, as I said, in the past few years we have witnessed a general persistent increase in rates.

Now, I see no fault in the increase in itself, but I think that it is worthy of comment to state that one should be very wary in agreeing to certain conditions which in fact may have an effect or which may in fact

disturb certain things as we knew them to be. I will try to explain that. For argument's sake, I think we have grown accustomed in Barbados that Government should subsidise certain areas of activity; education and health come to mind immediately, and the distribution of water also would come very much to mind. The thinking here is then that there are certain services pretty fundamental to life that should be available to all and sundry irrespective of their financial position. The supply of water obviously falls into that category, and I think we have to be very wary where we agree that rates should be increased to a point which may obviously cause great hardships to a certain sector of the community.

If Government in their wisdom determine that the subsidy should be less or more, fair enough. If they come to a conclusion concerning water rates mainly because of a condition in a loan agreement, I think that we have to be wary about that. I am more or less repeating myself. The point is close to something which prevailed recently, a few months ago when we had the Light and Power asking for increased rates. The main argument given was not so much that the rates might have been needed for the operation and so forth, but the main argument which seems to come out was that the rates were needed because the World Bank stipulated that if such and such did not happen then the loan may not be forthcoming, and it is just the type of influence that may prevail from outside which may cause certain changes in our patterns of living which I am trying to make a point on.

I am aware that any borrower must repay, and obviously it is in the interest of the lender and of the borrower that there are certain conditions which should be met and which should exist in the repayment of that loan, but as we were discussing some time last week, we have to be very careful that in the search or quest for progress we are not damaging a certain type of way of life that we are accustomed to.

Another point, Sir, I would just like to make, and this has to do with the co-ordination between the various utilities, especially those who in carrying out their function need to dig up the roads pretty often. We had an experience in Well Gap, in the Cave Hill area, recently where for a very long time the road was really a mess, so that when the rain fell it was very uncomfortable for pedestrians, and also drivers of cars, because they had to be very careful that they did not splash up pedestrians. Much to my delight some months ago as I turned into Well Gap I found myself driving on nylon, as the Barbadians call it, it was all Barber Greened and so on, but not more than a week, two weeks at the most after that the digging started again, and this happened to be digging being done to put in natural gas. Obviously the people in the area would welcome natural gas, but the point I am making is that a little more co-ordination, the digging for natural gas could have preceded the Barber Greening,

and I am sure there are many more examples of that.

It is not only inconvenient but obviously a waste of time, effort, money, etc. when these things are not co-ordinated.

Turning to the Bill itself, Mr. President, obviously we cannot disagree with Senator Blackman when he says that ministerial direction must prevail and that Parliament indirectly must have its supremacy, but there are certain areas in the Act which suggest to me that quite a bit, if not everything, is really left to the ministerial direction, and I am wondering really whether that is in the interest of the smooth running of the Authority. This point has been raised already and I could more or less anticipate the reaction by Senator Blackman, but I will be specific.

For example, and in this particular one I am wondering if it is not a misprint really, in section 19(3) it says:

"The power conferred on the Board under subsection (2) may only be exercised with the approval of the Minister who must stipulate, etc. etc. ..."

Before I make this as a point, I am wondering if by chance the word "may" was not meant instead of "must." It seems a bit odd to me that in all cases a Minister would want to stipulate the exact amount and all the conditions of the loan.

One other example of this was Section 26 which says that:

"The Minister may, after consultation" *et cetera* "give to the Board directions of a general or specific nature relating to the policy".

Well, perhaps now, Sir, I have to take back my comment on that because I think that the operative word here is 'policy'. At first, I was more, or less objecting to the specific nature of the direction, but perhaps the operative word here is 'policy' and not necessarily each individual item.

Section 10, "Power to employ". Generally speaking, I would not think that one can quarrel with a policy which stipulates that certain senior people, or people at a salary of "X" dollars, whatever that "X" dollars may be should not be appointed without prior approval. The problem here is, and I mean speaking generally now and not only specifically to this Bill, but the problem arises where, in an effort to keep not necessarily a party, but a close relation with salaries in the Public Service, various Statutory Corporations find it extremely difficult to attract specific personnel with specific expertise.

Some of the Statutory Corporations have a freer hand in the selection of their personnel. I think that I am correct in saying that Central Bank would be one of these, would be one of the few, perhaps, where there is no stipulation for the Governor, or whatever to refer (*Asides*).....where there is no stipulation for reference, with regard to hire personnel and it may be that that is one of the reasons why Central Bank has been able to hire, or get people of a particular calibre and why some of the Statutory Corporations find it difficult because of salary constraints to attract the correct people of the particular position.

This Section here is one which is not peculiar to the Water Authority, but runs through quite a few of the corporations and I think that I would use it to make the point that one has to be pretty careful how one ties certain salaries to the Public Service because in that respect, you would find that you would fail to attract the right type of expertise.

The final point Sir, would be just in passing and probably to say the obvious which would be that obviously, the mere transfer of the functions of the now Waterworks Department to the new Authority, obviously, in itself, would not solve the various problems which may pertain. It is going to take quite some doing by the new Authority to set up the structure and to lay down the guidelines and rules *et cetera* to attract and maintain the type of personnel which would be needed to manage and control an Authority of this nature.

SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH: Sir, I make no pretensions to the erudition of the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill, nor claim to similar longevity of memory as the Hon. Minister and I was grateful to learn of the maxim of the Greek, Thales, "it is all water". It is obviously a useful one which many of us would be able to avail ourselves of in the future. The Hon. Minister and Thales were undoubtedly on a serious note because in very recent years, Emperor Selassie of Ethiopia, at least the final turning point of his rule was the disastrous drought in the western part of Ethiopia and misappropriation of funds on an economic scale which took place and I think that it is fair to say that this was the turning point in his loss of his throne and presently, in the Carimasia region of East Africa, there is an enormous drought situation causing the loss of lives of large numbers of people. I think that only in the press this week, there was an instance too of a drought situation in Israel having a very serious effect on the economy of the country. So, with all of these pointing in the direction of the truth of the maxim that, "it is all water," we have to ask some questions about the Government's Development Plan.

For example, in the Springhall Development, because not a mere idle and uninformed enquiry, but the enquiry of a Consultant in this sphere, as to the delivery of water for the Springhall Scheme which one

understands involves irrigation systems, an enquiry on the delivery of water for these irrigation systems received the answer, from somebody who is supposed to know that it was Government's business to deliver water and therefore, the implication was that it was an unnecessary question to query the cost of delivery of water for irrigation in Springhall.

I agree with the Hon. Minister that it may very well be a question of water, whether the Springhall Scheme fails, or succeeds and with due respect, I am aware that people in this Honourable Chamber were able to speak on this matter far more professionally than I. But, the upshot of the question and the ridiculous and irresponsible answer that it is the Government's business to deliver the water for irrigation, the upshot is that one is not sure and would like to be informed on the point, as to whether, in the irrigation scheme for the Springhall Development, an estimate of the cost of delivering water to the site has been made because obviously, the question of the Consultant concerned was whether an appropriate approach to the delivery of water was going to be made in terms of wells, or fan-mills and maybe as Senator Rocheford indicates, the use of solar energy for desalination, or whether the Government indeed, has to deliver water and as presently provided, as one understands, by the use either of electricity, or diesel for the pumping of water.

It must be absolutely manifest that the irrigation scheme at Spring Hall can only be cost effective if the delivery of water to it is appropriate. With this in mind it seems that there is an absence in the country of an Authority used in the way in which the Minister introducing the Bill describes it, of an Authority which is responsible to ensure that there is an energy unit in every development scheme in the country.

I made some reference to the Spring Hall Scheme but there are a great many other developmental schemes coming on stream and we would like to be assured that an energy audit has been mounted so that we can be sure that the project will be energy conscious. It may well be, as Senator Hewitt says, in the absence of any such Authority and I think there is a sad lack of such an Authority, that the new Water Authority would have itself to ask when it hears of developmental schemes whether the costing of the delivery of water to that project has been estimated and calculated for and that it should not just depend on the Government delivering it because, for example, those of us who go to the Caribbean Development Bank will notice on the lower side, which the staff proudly tells you is a large chattel house, which apparently has been designed to be a conscious response to our climate for which, of course, the chattel house was extremely appropriately designed, and if I may digress, in this Chamber itself, and you, Sir, who sat on the Legislative Council — I could hardly believe

the size of the Council which was less than this required a building as large as this or as lofty as this but those who planned it took cognizance of the fact of the building before air-conditioning, and designed the Chamber to make people as comfortable as possible given our climatic conditions and the jalousie shades on the above side and the Gallery on the below side indicated their awareness of the climatic conditions and within the constraints of their time designed an exceedingly appropriately good Chamber.

The President of the Caribbean Development Bank has been over-heard to say that the day may come when the Caribbean Bank's staff has to move out of the building, when the cost of air-conditioning may become prohibitive and with this in mind, a building has recently been erected on the lower side which is as different as chalk from cheese and if my memory serves me right, the CDB has not been there a decade yet which raises the question as to whether our Architects and those responsible of saying "go" to construction projects of that magnitude in the country are making any estimate of the energy costs there-in.

When I read the Advertisement in the newspaper for the new Central Bank Building, I was very interested to learn that my school boy contemporary, who is now the Governor, has more flexibility than other public authorities. One would like to be assured that the Architect who are presently designing the Central Bank and seeking Tenders have designed a building which is more energy conscious than the Caribbean Development Bank which they also designed or else we will be left with a monument of somebody out of which he and others may have to move when it costs too much money to air-condition it, if it is not designed with utmost primary concern of it being energy conscious.

One passes along the Prescod Boulevard regularly and one is not uninformed that it must have been many years in the planning for the Port Authority. One understands that it has to be conceptualised and land made available and designs thought out and finances sought out locally, externally and construction estimates being required and thereafter the process of construction.

I have not examined it in any detail but the nearest, most cursory observation leads one to deduce that it is entirely energy conscious and unsympathetic and unvernacular and unsuited. Even though one concedes that the process I have outlined may all have been five years ago but 1974 is now six years ago and anyone before 1976 might well have forecasted how energy costs would rise so planners and Government only have a moral right to stay in power if they are people who are able to see further than others and to plan for the future.

I would also like to be assured that the Hall of Justice, and I think the country needs to be assured that the designs will also be energy conscious. Thus the up-shot of what I am saying is that there seems to be the need in the country of an Authority which will pay attention to every Governmental Development Project and even those of the non-Governmental sector, the cost of supplying energy which also falls upon the country directly and indirectly that all our major developmental projects are energy conscious and every possible renewable sources of energy are insisted upon where there are available and they are already available in various sectors and I do believe that there is such an overlap in this concern of the appropriate renewable sources of energy and appropriate design and the integration of both of these with the whole environment that we need a Cabinet post. We need a post at the level of Cabinet, a post which has the responsibility of seeing that the energy needs of every developmental project in the future receive primary consideration because I think it is not too much to forecast that the future development of Barbados will depend on the availability of energy at a cost which the community can afford.

SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I listened with great interest to some of the speeches made. I can agree with most that has been said, but it is necessary for me to respond to points which each speaker made. In the case of Senator Rocheford, he gave voice to a popular myth in Barbados that because a sewage system is established in Bridgetown that people who live in St. Lucy do not benefit from the sewage system. I would have thought, Mr. President, that the rationale for putting down a sewage system involving the proper disposal of waste in a particular area would be beneficial to the entire community, especially a community that is as small as Barbados.

So far as I know, the currents in Barbados flow and eddy in such a way that waste matter that is in Bridgetown today is in St. Lucy next week and I think that it is absolutely necessary for me to refute the mythological position that a sewage system in one part of Barbados necessarily does not affect the whole of Barbados. It is a serious error.

The second point that Senator Rocheford made is with respect to the ministerial home of the Water Authority. The Water Authority will operate under the Ministry of Communications and Works. Mr. President, if one juxtaposes the speeches made by Senators Hewitt and Hatch, one would see pellucidly clear in fact that there is a dilemma for the Government. Senator Hewitt raised a question which concerns developing countries and on which controversies have raged in international fora for the last decade about the conditions upon which financial assistance should be

given by multi-lateral financial institutions to developing countries, multi-lateral institutions like the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank etc. They have a word for it which they call "conditionality". The whole question of conditionality refers to the terms under which loans for any financial assistance should be made by those institutions to developing countries such as Barbados, and the position as adumbrated by Senator Hewitt is one that finds much sympathy among third World Countries because there is a consensus that rates ought to be concessionary where infrastructural development such as the establishment of a sewage system takes place. The multi-lateral institutional side of the argument was put by Senator Hatch even although he had no intention of acting as their advocate or their proxy, a role which I do not think he would relish. The fact is that when people are spending money, especially that belongs to somebody else, it must be carefully and meticulously spent.

In many of the developing countries there has been a history of squandermania within the public domain. People tend to feel that if it is the Government's money they can have a bacchanal and spend it as they like. We are normally tight-fisted with our own money, but when it comes to the Government's money, the public purse, there is a general belief unfortunately prevalent in Barbados that it can be spent with wild abandon, and that is precisely why the person to whom Senator Hatch referred was emboldened to say that the Government is delivering the water and therefore we do not care how much it cost. Questions of cost are considered to be irrelevant and nobody's business as long as the money is public money.

A Government such as the present when embarking upon a programme to safeguard the quality and quantity of the water resources of this country faces this dilemma in its starkest form because the provision of adequate drinking water to the people of Barbados contains a substantial social service component, and we will readily agree with Senator Hewitt that it would be wrong to operate the Water Authority as a profit-making enterprise. I do not believe that this kind of philosophy is involved in the assumptions that led to the establishment of such an Authority. Indeed the precise nature of the agreement entered into between the Barbados Government and the IADB is that up to October 1981 water rates would be increased to a point to cover costs. What this means in fact is that the repayment of the loan from IADB will have to come out of other projected sectors within the economy; so a listener to Senator Hewitt's speech must not assume that he made allusions to a situation that does not exist, namely, that the increase in water rate is designed to generate a service to pay back the loan that the Government got from the IADB. Senator Hewitt shrugs and disclaims making the statement. I do not believe, Mr. President I accused him of such, so that a person who was not listening carefully might have gone

away with the impression that he was saying this, clothed in ambiguity as some of his statements were; so it is necessary for me to be very explicit about this.

The water rates are designed to cover costs and as such pay a proper attention to the issue of cost effectiveness that was so eloquently and responsibly stressed by Senator Hatch.

We recognise very plainly that in any development programme we must consider questions of cost. I believe that if these issues are put in a clear way to the people of Barbados they will understand them. All around us in this Caribbean area, Mr. President, we can see bankrupt political regimes, not only bankrupt politically but financially and falling into a state of disintegration, which means that we can no longer expect as responsible citizens in this country to have improved services and still subscribe to a philosophy of freeness, the freeness mentality is not consistent with our condition of independence.

Before responding to Senator Hatch's question about energy, I will go on to make another point arising out of Senator Hewitt's speech. My good friend, Senator Hewitt, Mr. President, talked about misgivings when perusing this Bill before the Senate, misgivings rooted in what he thought was too much power conferred on Ministers. In an Aside which I believe offended your ears, and for which I apologise, Mr. President, I asked him to be specific, and vainly did he try. He smuggled the word "interference" and then quickly retracted it knowing that it would evoke a devastating response from me. Nevertheless, Mr. President, this word "interference" characterising relations between Ministers and Statutory Bodies has been bandied about in such a totally cavalier and irresponsible way that I feel constrained to respond to it.

There is, I have noted, Mr. President, a debating tactic in this august Chamber where people hint at certain things, seduce the unwary listener into believing that a particular point is made and then backtrack and cover up with a number of sentences that are escape hatches. That is why it is necessary for me to make things very explicit. No Minister who is ultimately responsible for explaining to Parliament or the public what goes on in a Statutory Corporation can by any stretch of imagination be guilty of interfering. You cannot interfere in something for which you are responsible, it is a most iniquitous and malicious concept that has come out of the minds of certain perverted bureaucrats. You cannot interfere in anything for which you have ultimate legal and moral responsibility, so whenever this word is teasingly presented to us I must take umbrage and be very very explicit about the position.

I agree with my good friend, Senator Hewitt, when he talked about the problem in trying to link the emolu-

ments of officers of the Statutory Corporations too closely to those of the Establishment. I believe the doctrine of relativity which permeates these actions, Mr. President, is one that can be carried to an extreme. In most Statutory Corporations there are people performing functions that are basically dissimilar to persons who work in the general Service and yet they find themselves constantly being compared. When Aristotle said "*nihil ex nihil*", out of nothing comes nothing, this was the first step in an argument in which he says "like begets like", moving on down in his argumentation to involve only to make comparisons between like and like. The doctrine of relativity therefore falls seriously down when we begin to compare two unlikes, and I find myself in agreement with Senator Hewitt in this respect, and on that note of harmony I will leave Senator Hewitt alone.

In so far as Senator Hatch is concerned, he moved a little outside of the domain of my expertise when he raised questions relating to energy. I cannot give any answer to the questions he raised at this particular time, except this one, and it is that the Government of Barbados is not blind to the importance of planning within the field of energy. Senator Hatch said that from 1974 it was possible to predict the course of developments involving escalating prices in oil as we have experienced up to the present time. I do not think that many administrators and policy makers would agree with Senator Hatch. The one country that was most critically involved in increases in the price of oil from a revenue point of view, that is the United States of America, in 1974 through a spokesman, Henry Kissinger, at the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations held in New York in that very year, agreed to proposals which he believed or made proposals which were unanimously adopted by the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly which they believed would stabilise the price of oil for the next decade.

So even countries intimately involved in the politics of oil from the investment side, imperialist countries like the United States of America, did not foresee the outburst of nationalism and the peculiar Middle Eastern politics which would have led to this situation. I do not believe that the Government of Barbados on that account can be held as less far sighted than other Governments involved in the politics of oil. The Government of Barbados has been slower than countries like the United States of America in planning for the new changed conditions on the oil market, and there is every reason why there would be an advance on Barbados, because planning for energy requires the kind of technical expertise that is not readily available to the Government of Barbados.

The Government of Barbados recognising the necessity to do serious energy planning pushed hard in September 1978 when the Barbados Government representatives paid an official visit to Nigeria, and one of the

terms of the agreement now being implemented was that Nigeria would train a fairly substantial number of Barbadian nationals in petroleum technology over a wide range of technical matters.

In dealing with planning for oil, it is necessary for us to have as a pre-condition to satisfactory planning, a Body of technically trained individuals who can advise the Government of the perspective of nationals living in Barbados and working for Barbados. Most of the time, the advice which is bestowed upon the Government of Barbados comes from external sources where persons are interested in the energy question of Barbados, rather than a speculative point of view. We need to have these people but, over and above this, within the area of Agriculture and within the Ministry of Industrial Development there are Committees which operate jointly and are, at present, doing work with respect to the use of bagasse as a source of energy. There are other officers doing work on wind power and solar power, but these are highly technical areas in which we do not have adequate manpower yet, we are working with what we have and it is not a particularly fair criticism to imply that the Government of Barbados is not sensitive to this problem and is doing nothing about it.

If I were aware that such a question would have been posed, I would have come here with information from the appropriate Ministry which I could read out chapter and verse, and I will talk to the Hon. Ministers concerned and have them, Mr. President, send the Hon. Senator a copy of the work that is being done in the plans for energy development in Barbados. Research work which is involved in planning any energy regime in Barbados must be, by its nature slow. All research work is slow, tedious and painful, especially where you have a situation where you do not have an adequate number of trained people within the area. That is precisely why, for the last five years, the Government of Barbados has co-sponsored Resolutions which would have the impact of making an International Energy Authority available to all developing countries like Barbados. It has been painfully slow at coming at an international level, but the thing is that within a year or eighteen months, there would be an International Energy Authority which would give the requisite advice to small, developing countries like Barbados, without adequate expertise.

That, Mr. President, is all I respond to. If I have been silent on any questions raised, or any statement made, I think that it is because I am in agreement with them.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN, the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, SENATOR THE REV. A. HATCH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Senator Hinds, you will be glad to note that this Bill is in parts. Senator Hinds.

SENATOR K. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause One be taken as read and the remainder of the Bill be taken in parts.

The question that Clause One be taken separately and the Bill be taken in parts and the whole Bill be taken as read, was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Parts One to Eight inclusive, were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN, the Senate was resumed and the passing of the Bill was reported.

On the separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. D. G. BLACKMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that Senator Wickham's Private Motion which was promised to be debated today, will be deferred for another Sitting, when there will be more time for a general debate, than appears to be now.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn until today week, the 24th September, 1980 at 2.30 p.m.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly. 5.32 p.m.