

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981-86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, October 31, 1984.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, October 31, 1984, at 11.05 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E. (Deputy President);

Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate);

Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman, (Minister of Health);

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office);

Senator StC. E. Howell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and Planning);

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary of the Prime Minister);

Senator H. R. Linton;

Senator Mrs. E. M. Lynch, G.C.M.;

Senator D. A. C. Simmons;

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece;

Senator E. E. Greaves;

Senator Mrs. G. G. Reader, M.B.E.;

Senator C. D. Seale;

Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M. and

Senator C. Jemmott, B.S.S., J.P.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MRS. INDIRA GANDHI

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, early this morning we all woke up to

the news of the most brutal assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, late Prime Minister of India. Mrs. Gandhi has been an outstanding Third World leader who has had an outstanding career in her 67 years, being remembered along with the late Golda Meir as the first women to achieve prominence on the international scene. While she bore the name associated with Mohandas Gandhi, a great apostle of non-violence, she was in fact a member of the family of the first Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru; in fact, daughter.

It is not for me to make an extensive speech, even though the record of the lady is one of which any people would be justly proud. It is my humble duty this morning to ask that this Chamber put on record its grief at the passing of the Prime Minister of India, put on record its sense of loss to the world because of the passing of so outstanding a lady, and put on record its abhorrence of brutality, of force generally, as a way of settling disputes.

I think it is only appropriate that we recognise that even though there have been, as in most countries, occasions when force has had to be used, India has in fact tried to live up to the ideals of Mahatma Mohandas Gandhi, and tried generally to resolve problems by finding peaceful solutions, and by urging the world to find peaceful solutions to problems. This has not always made Mrs. Gandhi a very popular figure, since this direction was a direction pursued during most of the time that she was Prime Minister — she has in fact been Prime Minister for close to 20 years — and indeed it would be unreasonable at a time like this not to note that India has been foremost among countries in seeking peaceful solutions to problems. If on nothing else, Mrs. Gandhi would deserve a special place in history.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will at the appropriate time be asked to put our condolences on record, but it is my function this morning to ask that we honour in silence the memory of Indira Gandhi.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, as is the custom on occasions like these, I should certainly like to associate the Opposition Democratic Labour Party with the sentiments which have been expressed by Senator Barrow on the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, the late Prime Minister of India. In doing so, I would certainly like to express our profound shock at the violent way in which her life was taken. It is of tremendous concern to the Democratic Labour Party, as I believe it would be the concern of all right thinking people throughout the world, that violence is not the way to express disagreement or dissatisfaction with a particular point of view or particular positions which are taken by people, and when this kind of violence leads to assassination, it is something which we ought to abhor and certainly speak out against.

11.15 a.m.

Mrs. Gandhi's death comes rather quickly on the attempted assassination of the Prime Minister of Britain, and it seems as if we are moving into an extremely violent stage of development in the world. I believe that we ought, as nations and as people who are concerned with human life, to try and ensure as much as we can that occurrences such as these do not happen again. It means that those of us who are involved in the political life of our respective countries, in a way, have ourselves exposed to that kind of death. I hope that we would see an end to this way of solving whatever difficulties and dissatisfactions we may have with a particular point of view.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable Senators, in associating myself with the remarks of the Leader of the Senate and Senator Greaves on the assassination of an outstanding woman of her time, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, may I invite the Senate to stand for one minute in silence.

The Senate stood for one minute in silence.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable Senators, I have a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General which I will read to you.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.

16th October, 1984.

Dear Mr. Deputy President,

I am aware that you have been informed that I will be away from the island during the period 24th October

to 10th November, 1984, on vacation, and that Senator The Hon. Sir Arnott Cato, KCMG, has been designated by Her Majesty the Queen, under section 29(1)(a) of the Constitution, to perform the functions of the office of Governor-General during the period of my absence.

As the Senate is not expected to meet before 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 it meets, provided that this occurs before my return on 10th November?

I have the honour to be,
Yours faithfully,
HUGH SPRINGER

Governor-General.

His Honour,
The Deputy President,
The Honourable the Senate.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I have the honour to lay the following:

The Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1982.

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 4 months ended 31st July 1984.

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for five months ended 31st August 1984.

The Customs (Transit Goods) Regulations, 1984.

The Annual Report of the National Assistance Board for the period 1st April 1983 to 31st March 1984.

The Annual Report and Statements of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the years 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Employment Injury Claims and Payments) Regulations 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Benefit) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Employment Injury Benefit) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Non-Contributory Old Age Pensions) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Collection of Contributions) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Claims and Payments) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security (Self-Employed Persons) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The Severance Payments (Fund Contribution) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Community College for the year 1982-1983.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for the year 1983.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1984.

Recommendation No. 169 concerning Employment Policy adopted at the 70th Session of the International Labour Conference held in Geneva on 26th June, 1984.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Barbados National Bank for the year 1983.

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

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I do not rise at this stage to formally move a motion, but to indicate that if I discover in the course of the debate that members have no objection to our proceeding with these Bills which are down for first reading this morning, but which we are in a position to proceed with, we on this side would be prepared to do so, and at the same time be prepared to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2) to facilitate this. These are the Airport Charges, the Miscellaneous Controls Order, the Customs and the security guards and private investigators Bills.

If, Sir, in the course of doing the land Resolutions, which are Orders 5 to 9, which we intend to take first, we have any indication that members object to our proceeding with the Orders 1 to 4, we will not proceed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I wish to give notice of the two items which were dealt with in the Other Place yesterday:

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's St. Peter, for the construction of the Speightstown By-pass Road (Phase 3) and for housing re-location.

A Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap. 91.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that these items have been read a first time.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: As you are aware, Sir, Senator Hall has gone to Australia as the Manager of the West Indies Cricket Team. In speaking to him before he left, I indicated to him that he ought to seek leave of the Senate. I was talking to the Clerk just now and it does not seem that there is anything on record, no written indication about leave.

Senator Hall did say to me, if my memory serves me correctly, that he spoke to the President and indicated to him that he would be away for a period of five months. But in the absence of anything on record, I would formally like to request that he be granted leave of absence for the period of time that he will be performing this important duty on behalf of all of us in the Caribbean.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: This, of course, is a very ticklish matter. I do not believe any of us would wish to deny Senator Hall leave, but I do not know if it could be done in that way. What I wish at this stage is to ask that the matter be dealt with later in the day, after we have had the benefit of advice from the Clerk as to what is the correct procedure on the point.

11.25 a.m.

If I had not been taken by surprise on the point, I would have sought advice from the Clerk earlier. But I would suggest that we do it that way, so that if it should become necessary for Senator Hall to make the request himself, he is given time to do so.

We on this side certainly are not going to object. It does tend to speed up things and improve the quality of the debate.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CHECKER HALL, ST. LUCY

Order No. 5 was called - To approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Checker Hall, St. Lucy, for the resiting of houses affected by the construction of the Arawak Cement Plant.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, in introducing this Resolution, in which I know Senator Greaves has a special interest, just let me say that my little quip just now was the kind of quip I would have made in front of Senator Hall and he would not have gotten annoyed; so there is no reason why Senator Greaves should get annoyed by it.

The Resolution which is before us concerns the acquisition of land at Checker Hall, St. Lucy, and the history to it is as follows. In August 1982, Government acquired a property at Checker Hall consisting of 4.73 hectares, some 11 acres, with a building on it, for the purpose of resiting those residents of Checker Hall who would be dislocated as the result of the construction of the cement plant.

That building standing on the lands that I have just referred to, which is presently being used as the Project Office for the cement plant, is Checker Hall House. I believe it is to revert to Government at the end of this month, and in relation to that, on Monday of last week the officials of my Ministry and of the National Cultural Foundation accompanied the MP for the area, Mr. Roy Brathwaite, and myself on a visit to that property to see what would be the most appropriate form of development for community recreational purposes, because while the house stands on about three acres, the other eight acres now represent lands that will no longer be put into housing.

We went down and had a look at it - the National Sports Council was also represented in that delegation - to see whether between the Ministries of Culture and Sport there could be the further development of the joint approach which we have been working on to bring facilities to a community, allowing money to be better spent and to go further than if at one point the Ministry of Culture did its own thing in respect to a community centre and in another place the Ministry of Sport did its own thing in respect to a pavilion or changing rooms for a playing field.

I have also taken the matter a step further in that I have spoken to the Chairman of the Arawak Cement Plant, with a view to seeing if there is any in which they can make a contribution so that there can be a three-pronged approach to tackling the problem of

providing adequate facilities for the Checker Hall Community.

In the early stages of the cement plant project, it was envisaged that there were four houses to be relocated. One house-owner, however, requested and was subsequently paid compensation for his property, and, therefore, no longer has to be resited. The action to resite the other residents on the land was halted since the Project Manager of the Cement Plant Project informed the Ministry of Housing and Lands that this particular area of land was not suitable for the purpose because of its close proximity to the cement plant. It is envisaged that, with the further expansion of the plant in the near future, the necessity to uproot and resite the residents a second time may arise again. This is why the Ministry of Housing and Lands was forced to seek an alternative area of land to resite the residents. If we use the land on which Checker Hall House stands for the purposes which I outlined, community recreational purposes, those lands can be effectively used in this way and also serve as a buffer between the community and the plant. If we use them for housing, any further encroachment by the plant will obviously not produce the same beneficial result.

Two parcels of land have been located. These contain a total of 3.855 hectares, and are also situated in the Checker Hall area. These were identified in proceedings where the compulsory acquisition has been instituted with the implementation of the provisions of Section 3 and Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228. One parcel was owned by the Estate of J. Alonzo Phillips, deceased, and comprises 1.933 hectares; the other parcel, containing 1.922 hectares, is owned by Joseph F. C. O'Neale. The plans represent the two lots which we are talking about.

Although there are only three houses now to be resited, it was considered that it would be prudent for Government to acquire both areas of land to take care of any further resiting that may become necessary when the plant becomes fully operational. It is not at present anticipated that further resiting will become necessary, but in the development of things, it would be unwise not to make this provision. Cognizance was also taken of the fact that part of the said land may have to be utilized in connection with the construction of the proposed Northern Access Road.

The Resolution, therefore, is to seek the approval of Parliament for the compulsory acquisition of the two areas of land to facilitate the resiting of houses affected by the cement plant.

I move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

11.35 a.m.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, as Senator Barrow anticipated, I certainly want to make a contribution to this debate. I have, naturally, an interest in it, as the former representative for the parish, and hopefully as the representative for the parish when next there is an election in Barbados, and of course as a person who is interested in the parish of St. Lucy from the point of view of the kind of developments which take place there.

It is very interesting to note that when Senator Barrow introduced the Resolution to acquire these two areas of land, he spent a considerable time in telling us why the area of land which was acquired in 1982 could not have been used for housing development, the purpose for which, as I understand it, it was acquired at that time. I well recall that debate. On the occasion, I indicated that the area of Checker Hall was a compact area, it was kind of centrally located in the lower part of St. Lucy, and that the Government should take the opportunity to utilise some of this land for the development of a community centre and for the development of playing facilities for the people in that part of St. Lucy.

You may not recall, Sir, but I certainly vividly recall the reaction of the Government to that suggestion, and that reaction was represented by the views which were then expressed by Senator O'Brien Trotman when he said that the Government was giving very serious consideration to using the building as a stop-over for tourists. I hope you remember those words. That is in the records of the Senate. When I was suggesting that the area should be used for the very purpose for which the Government has now come around to seeing that it should be used for, I was told, for practical purposes, that I was talking nonsense, and that the Government was considering using it as a stopover for tourists when they go up north.

I am very happy to see that, even although it has taken more than two years for some kind of sense to be driven into the heads of the decision makers on that side, at least the words which I have spoken on that occasion, and certainly the representation which I made before and which I continued to make have not fallen to the ground, and that we are now seeing some movement in this particular direction. I think that it is a useful idea — not because the idea came from me. It will be beneficial to the people of the particular area and will certainly add some variety to the lives of the people who live in that area of St. Lucy, as indeed hopefully it will be for the benefit of all the residents of the parish.

I can see that this can make a meaningful and useful contribution to the development of sporting activities in the area, and I hope that when the time comes for the laying out of the area of land, there will be a properly laid out area which would allow the youngsters to play all of the games in the various competitions at all

levels which are organised in Barbados. I hope that there will not be just cricket or football, but hard courts on which basketball, netball and tennis can be played. Relative to the utilisation of the building, or using part of the property for community purposes through the Ministry of Culture, again I hope that the facilities would be developed that would enable the various groups which are functioning in the area to have a central place from which they can operate.

I move to the crux of the matter, which has to do with the acquisition of land to resite the residents who are affected by the construction of the Arawak Cement Plant, a lot of interesting things happening around this particular matter. On the 28th February this year, the persons whose lands were acquired by the cement plant received a notice from Arawak Cement Company demanding and requiring that they quit and deliver possession of their land and premises on the 31st of March, 1984.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President. Do I understand Senator Greaves to be saying the people whose lands were acquired by the Arawak Cement Plant? It happens to be important. If so, then I think he is erroneous.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The persons whose lands were acquired for the purpose of the construction and use by the Arawak Cement Plant, whether they were acquired by the Arawak Cement Plant, by the Government or whoever. The lands were taken away by the Government - I do not think the people have been compensated yet - that is another matter we will deal with - and the notice indicated that "In the case of refusal or neglect on your part to comply with this notice, an action of ejectment will be commenced against you without further notice."

11.45 a.m.

I have spoken on this in here already. I indicated then that it was very shabby treatment for people whose lands had been acquired and who had not been compensated, but who were then being told that they had to get off the land and find somewhere to live because the cement plant required their land. The people concerned were very upset, and they seemed to have no where to turn to. They could not get any responses from any person. Nobody could tell them what was going on.

I was approached about this particular matter by the persons who were affected and I made representation on their behalf. I wrote to the Prime Minister, drawing his attention to a number of problems which affected these people in the following letter, written on 3rd April, 1984:

"Dear Prime Minister,

"I feel constrained to write you directly and urgently at this time regarding the anguished plight of those Checker Hall residents who are affected by the establishment of the Arawak Cement Plant.

"As you know the householders and property owners are currently under immediate threat of expulsion from their properties by virtue of quit notices dated February 28th, 1984, which they received from the Cement Company.

"You must know, as I do, that ever since the receipt of these notices these persons have been experiencing severe mental and emotional strain and that the fear of being evicted without the assurance of being resited in locations suitable to their special circumstances has meant for them many sleepless nights.

"I would draw to your attention that these persons obtain their income mainly or altogether from these lands which they have owned and occupied for many years. Stock and poultry rearing, the growing of vegetables and sugar cane cultivation constitute their means of survival. In this way they are distinguishable from urban dwellers whose main source of income would normally derive from wage earning. Therefore for them to be suddenly deprived of their land as now appears to be the case, can only result in irreparable harm not only to their means of survival but also to their mental health and morale.

"I recognise that financial compensation is guaranteed to them by the laws of this country, but in view of what I have stated above, you will surely appreciate that mere normal financial compensation relating to property acquisitions cannot possibly, at least in moral terms, be considered adequate in these circumstances.

"I would strongly urge, Sir, that the greatest consideration be given to including in any settlement adequate arrangements for resiting these persons to locations which would permit them to continue to earn their livelihoods in a manner to which they are accustomed and for which they are prepared.

"I would further urge that immediate steps be taken to remove from them the immediate threat of ejection and to halt the disruption to their livelihood which is currently taking place, until mutually satisfactory arrangements can be made taking the above consideration into account.

"I have no doubt that you share my concern as expressed above. Indeed it is with this in mind that I, on behalf of the affected residents, ask you personally to intervene as it seems quite likely that without this a reasonable and satisfactory settlement will not be immediately forthcoming.

"I am sure that you will treat this with the urgency the situation demands.

I remain,

Yours respectfully,
E. EVELYN GREAVES
Senator."

This matter came to national attention when, apparently, in response to my efforts — because the people were just left there hanging in mid-air not knowing what to do — a meeting was hurriedly arranged for the Minister of Housing, the Member of Parliament for St. Andrew, to visit the site. At least, the representative for the constituency told the residents that the Minister would be coming to meet with them on the Monday. The people stood home and waited for the Minister until 5 o'clock in the evening of that Monday. The Minister did not turn up, and when the Minister was asked by the Press about why he disappointed the residents of Checker Hall in that manner, he indicated very clearly that he had made no arrangements to visit the site or to visit the people on the date that they were told by Mr. Roy Brathwaite, the representative for St. Lucy, that the Minister would have been coming. I do not have to deal with that aspect of it here, that is a matter which will be dealt with elsewhere. Then, I think it was the following week that a real meeting was hurriedly arranged, and the Minister visited the residents and indicated to them that the Government would be acquiring some land to resite them.

I am glad to see that resiting is taking place, because I think that the people concerned have been very disturbed by the way in which they were being treated. Now, I believe that Senator Barrow owes it to the Senate to give some indication of the kind of development which is going to take place on the areas of land which are being acquired. He did say that there are only three houses to be resited and that provision will be made for other resiting that may possibly arise out of the further expansion of the Arawak Cement Plant, but what is of interest to me, and certainly of interest to the people in the area, would be to know the kind of development which is planned.

11.55 a.m.

Are we going to have a full scale housing development area where roads are going to be put in, where there will be a sites and services development combined with the construction of houses or apartments? I believe that this is a golden opportunity for the Government to really bring a meaningful housing development to the constituency of St. Lucy with a variety of offers, with areas where people can purchase land to put houses and some where they can rent some house spots. It is a very serious matter in the country, particularly in St. Lucy, that people cannot find areas to rent on which to put houses, because the Government has made it almost impossible for people to rent lands now. Also, will there be provision for the construction of apartment housing, as you find in some other developments, or single units? I want to hear Senator Barrow on this, and I want to get some indication of how many house spots the Government will be having in this particular area.

It seems to me as if the Government is proceeding on this acquisition without any plan, without any idea as to what is going to be done. I passed through there as recently as yesterday and already there are blocks which have been put there, and I am told that one of the residents has already selected an area of land for his house. I want to find out the basis on which the land is being allocated. It is not just a matter of your acquiring an area of land and that is the end of the matter. I would like to think that this thing is properly planned and organised.

There are about three houses on part of the land which is to be acquired, right on the corner. One of the residents indicated to me that he has already been told that his house has to be moved back from the road because it is too near to the road. If this is the case, will the Government assist him and the others in moving their houses back, as they have done in some of the other areas, for example, in Mount Friendship, where the former Minister of Housing is the parliamentary representative. What we are asking for is equity of treatment for the residents who are going to be affected by this particular acquisition.

There is another fundamental concern, which I think is symptomatic of the kind of arrogant behaviour for which this Government is noted. Government has decided to acquire this land, but the land is still being cultivated by a gentleman who has a five-year lease from the owners of the land. At present he has a cane crop on the land. One would have thought that a sensitive Government, a Government which is humane, would have done at least what any decent person would have done in those circumstances, and would have gone to the person who had the lease and said that they were going to acquire this land, because I know that the name of the person is within the knowledge of the representative of the parish. That was not done. The Minister went on the land and

informed the world that it was an area that the Government intended acquiring. Since that decision was taken, surveyors have gone down and have planted iron stakes at least on the property, they have destroyed part of the man's cane crop — and not a word has been said to him about this.

This is how Governments seem to want to treat people who are not able to defend themselves. This is a very bad and inhuman approach. It was not beyond the Government to know who was cultivating the land and be able to go and indicate to him what they planned to do, that they were going to acquire this area of land. To this day this has not been done. I know the argument will be advanced that he was not the owner and that is no concern of yours. That may very well be so, but surely they ought to be a little more humanity in this matter. This means that the man, in order to protect his rights and certainly his investment in that area of land, has got to go to the expense of obtaining a lawyer to represent his interest in this particular matter.

I do not think it is right that a citizen should be forced into this unhappy position, and it is all because of the arrogance of the Government. I have every reason to believe that that particular attitude was a spiteful decision on the part of the Government to treat this particular gentleman in the way they treated him. I hope that an amicable settlement can be worked out.

Finally, I hope that the Government will move speedily to compensate those persons who own this area of land and not keep them waiting for two or three years, as has been done in some other cases where acquisitions have been made. This Government has a very poor record on compensating owners of properties which have been acquired. I hope it will not be repeated in this particular acquisition.
12.05 p.m.

I certainly want to support this Resolution. We, of course, do not agree on too many things, but this is one item on which I can agree, because, generally speaking, it is in keeping with some ideas which I have expressed. My regret, however, is that it is not a larger area of land. I had suggested to the Government a way in which they could even have done better, but, again, the ideas which I expressed on that occasion were rejected. I know that, sooner or later, we will see that coming to fruition — it is sooner rather than later — because I am sure that when the Democratic Labour Party wins the Government the next time around, in 1985 or 1986, we will certainly be able to move in that direction to achieve what I have indicated.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I have not sat down for a long time

and heard such foolishness, and heard a man trap himself with it.

Senator Greaves read from his letter written to the Prime Minister on April 3, 1984, which concerned the plight of persons affected by the acquisition. He went on to talk about what should be done for these persons, and said that, arising from that letter, Government then chose alternative plots of land. The files give the lie to that.

We have on file a note dated 20 March 1984:

"Following a site visit at which an area of land was pointed out by Mr. Roy Brathwaite....."

That is the MP for the area:

".....I spoke with the Chief Surveyor. He has identified the parcel of land required for resiting purposes and has promised to forward a description of the boundaries shortly, in order that a Section 3 notice may be prepared early."

There is no doubt who made the representation, who identified the land, and who got Government to take the decision to which this Resolution relates as to how the people should be relocated and where. I do not like people coming in here and misleading the Senate.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order. I do not think that anywhere in the Records, or in what I said just now, there is any indication that I said that I recommended this area of land. You can check my speech. I did say that, as a result of representations which I made, the Government moved in this direction. I did not say that I identified this area of land.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, the statement I am interested in is the statement he has just repeated, that as a result of his representation made on April 3, 1984, the Government adopted this course of action, evidenced by the files to have been adopted before March 21, 1984. In other words, he produces the chicken before the egg. They say that is quite reasonable, but I have never seen the boy produced before the baby.

I have never seen anything like it. It is a wrong set of claims, that the Government is arrogant and the Government is inhumane. The evidence of all this is supported by his having had to make representations in April for Government to do something which, in March, they had already decided to do.

On the same March 20, to show you the speed with which this was handled, once the MP, Mr. Roy Brathwaite had made the representation, long before the former MP, present Senator and future Senator ever got into the act, the Memorandum from the Chief Surveyor to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Lands, said:

"I refer to our conversation. The two parcels of land involved viz.:

- (a) Owner; Estate of J. Alonza Phillips, deceased C/o Sir Neville Osbourne, "Green Acres", Britton's Hill, St. Michael. Area: 4 acres, 3 roods, 26 perches or 1.9 hectares approximately. Description: Abutting and bounding on lands of Fitz Allman Gibson and lands of Joseph F. C. O'Neal on a public road leading to the St. Lucy's Church, on a public road leading to Maycock's.
- (b) Owner: Joseph F. C. O'Neal, Eden, Medford Road, White Hall, St. Michael.

Do we need more? Long before the Senator was activated to make any representation we find that the action has been taken. His is consistent with the attitude of a man who hears about something and rushes in to get himself associated with it before the public becomes aware of what has been done. It is typical of those who wish to mislead and fool the public.

The Senator went on with the accusations about arrogance and inhumanity. As I was about to leave my seat, I sought to warm him by raising a point of order on a statement which was not correct, and which he then took the opportunity to correct. He was saying that persons received quit notices in respect of the land which had been acquired by the cement plant on 28 February 1984. The fact of the matter is that the Government acquired the land for the purpose of the cement plant and — this is very important — because Government had every intention of transferring that land to the cement plant — Government was quite intent on letting them have vacant possession of the land. At the time when — I am not calling any names — Senator Greaves' friend — he supports him politically — had the quit notices issued, Government was in no position to give vacant possession nor was the cement plant in any position to issue quit notices, because it was not their property.

What he should do, is to stop his friend creating mischief and making the Labour Party and the Labour Party's supporters carry the burden for the damage that the Dems do down in St. Lucy. Senator Greaves has the gall to come in here and accuse somebody of inhumanity. His friend, who sent out the notices, is the person who is to be accused of being inhumane and arrogant. He is one of the most arrogant people in this world. I do not need to call any name. Once I mention a man who is very arrogant, everybody knows who I mean. Arrogance is his first, second and third name.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Do you mean Broome Webster?)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: He now comes in here and affects to be disturbed, perturbed, upset and all sorts of things by the way in which these people were treated. But Senator Greaves had one or two people down in there stirring the pot, and there was one big make-believe thing that went on down there. There was absolutely nothing, when you got to the bottom of it, that could not have been handled by responsible people approaching the matter and telling the people, saying: "You can ignore the cement plant and these notices, because the cement plant does not have any legal authority to put you off your land." That would be the end of that. But they got down there and made a whole lot of political capital out of it, and now Senator Greaves comes in here, eight months later, to try to do the same thing. I think we can move our public conduct to a little above that level.

12.15 p.m.

Senator Greaves told us about somebody who has a five-year lease on one of these pieces of land. He said that a humane Government would have told the person who has the lease that we are going to acquire the land. If I remember enough about the Law of Real Property, if somebody is in apparent occupation of land, that is taken to be noticed that the person has an interest, and in all such circumstances, I know that the Government does go and speak to the person in occupation. If Senator Greaves wants to tell me that some particular public officer did not go on this occasion to do it, he may be telling the truth, but I do not believe it. I do not see any reason that should have departed from what I understand to be the normal practice, and far be it from me ever to tolerate the suggestion that the fact that it was not done means that the Government was motivated towards this man by spite. Senator Greaves knows much better than to suggest that in here, or outside on the platforms where such an irresponsible and reckless statement is usually tolerated. Those of us who have a respect for truth usually wish to check our facts before we make accusations. That is how we know who we are dealing with.

He said that the Minister went down and informed the world that he was acquiring land. He said that the surveyors went down and planted iron stakes. Does he want the surveyors to plant grass? By planting the iron stakes the surveyors destroyed the cane crop — a ludicrous and farcical suggestion! Not a word, he said, has been said about this, this is a bad and inhumane approach, and he said that, as a result of this, the man has had to go to a lawyer to protect his interest. I hope that he went to a good lawyer and not to some that I know the Senator will be associated with.

The fact that if the man has an interest and the Government is buying the land, the man is entitled to compensation for any lost that he may suffer, because if he has a lease, he has a property in that land. He is

entitled to compensation for his property and nobody can take that entitlement away, because Section 16 of the Constitution guarantees to a man the enjoyment of his property. What foolishness are we hearing? Anybody in that position, I humbly submit, would go to a lawyer to ensure that his interests are properly protected. It has nothing to do with the garbage that we were being told this morning.

At this stage, he said that the action was motivated by spite. The surveyors are going to leave Bridgetown, go to St. Lucy and put down iron stakes, and destroy somebody's crop out of spite for the person! Perhaps Senator Greaves knows of some private dispute between the particular surveyor and the person who has the lease! That is the only conclusion I can come to.

He made his point, as usual, that Government should move speedily to compensate. We all agree that Government should move speedily to compensate. But where I cannot admit his statement, is where this Government has a bad record in this respect. He is much more correct, much more accurately informed, and much more truthfully spoken, if he says that Governments have not had a good record in this respect. The facts are there in respect of the Government prior to 1976, when the party he has the honour to represent, or the burden or representing, was the Government of the day. His whole speech was to get into the Record a position which, quite frankly, had it been blessed with honest representation, would have been a good position. But it had the basic failing of not being blessed with that.

He wants to know that there will be equality of treatment for the people of Checker Hall, and he wants to know what the Government's plans are in respect of this resiting. The fact of the matter — and this is a matter of record, and it can be evidenced by a visit to Sion Hill, St. James, or Clapham Park, Christ Church — is that in resiting, this Government tries to keep people within the community of which they already formed a part. It was not this Government that decided to move Emmerton people from under Miss Billie Miller and take the people to Clapham Park. We would have found a way of keeping city people in the City.

There is a second and very important point about this. While if people had an agricultural way of life on their quarter acre of land, we have tried to ensure that this be continued, and Sion Hill is a case in point.

We have never accepted that the quality of housing ought to be restricted to the same quality of housing which the occupant enjoyed at the time of being moved. If you remember when the residents of Clapham Park were moved the policy position of the Democratic Labour Party was that those who had water-borne toilet systems would enjoy them, and those who had an inferior quality of life would also enjoy what they had previously.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: That is a lie!)

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, please do not interrupt, and please watch your language.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: The truth or lie of that statement is to be established by the fact that it originates in the breast of the then Minister who was responsible for moving the Clapham Park people. If the Senator wishes to say that the Minister thought so, but the rest of the party did not think so, then he will have to show me what that party has ever done to suggest that they thought any differently from the Minister of the day.

We have a proud record, and it is there for all to see. When we move people, we give them an improved situation. We do not move anybody without, at the very least, a waterborne toilet system, and we do not move a house and resite it knowing that the house is not really capable of being transported and being re-erected. Go right through any of the developments of this sort for which this Government has been responsible and we will find that we do not need to ask what Government's policy is or what Government will do at Checker Hall, St. Lucy. The record is there. It speaks for itself, and never before in this country has any Government ever had such an enlightened approach to the improvement of the quality of life as this Government has.
12.25 p.m.

When Senator Greaves wants those questions answered, he would be well advised to take a drive around, go and talk to some of the people who live in such neighbourhoods. He can get the answer from them. He ought to be prepared to ask and get the answers directly from those people who are themselves enjoying what we have been able to provide.

Having heard my description of what happened the other Monday morning, the Senator then made a plea for some facilities. He was speaking from the position of being the supporter of a Government, a Member of Parliament, representative of a political party. That party, when in Government for 15 years, was known neither for providing community centres nor playing fields. Their record of providing for the youth is an appalling and disgraceful record. It is the most hypocritical thing in this world for any member of that party to show his face in public proclaiming what you ought to do for the youth, because they did nothing for the youth. The young and the old can use the community centres. It is the young who tend to use the playing field and hard court amenities.

The idea of putting down multi-purpose courts, trying to provide for those who play netball, volleyball and road tennis in addition to the people who play cricket, football and hockey, is ours. When we provide facilities,

we provide facilities bearing in mind that these are the variety of things which the youth must have. If you go to Boscobelle.....

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Why did you not do it at Mile and a Quarter?)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Why did we not do it at Mile and a Quarter? Why did you not do it anywhere? If you go to Boscobelle, you will see the complex. There is not only a big field for cricket, and football, there is a well laid out large community centre, which a large community like that deserves. There is a multi-purpose hard court, and there will be other facilities added in time. So as far as is possible, they are provided with adequate facilities for that aspect of the development which we are reminded of when we think of the Latin writer Juvenal when he talks about *mens sana in corpore sano*, which, being translated for Senator Greaves, is a healthy mind in a healthy body.

If he wants to know what else, we are providing facilities in Black Bess and Diamond Corner, and we are going to refurbish the facility at Speightstown. That is for the Senator, in case he wants to make any points which might have a bearing on up-coming events. All of these decisions have been taken already, they do not need to be taken now.

I did say that that building was going to be given back over to the Ministry of Housing by the end of this month, we expect, and I did say that we are looking for a way to jointly provide the community facilities. I should clarify that no decision has been taken as to the use of the house, because we have not put a proposal upon that, which I will explain.

If the Ministry of Housing will agree, we will certainly consider its use as a community centre rather than building another community centre, but we have to bear in mind that it is an old plantation house currently in good condition. The method of construction, therefore, is such as is to be found in many houses of that age, and it will be an expensive proposition to maintain. That is what one can reasonably expect. We will have to decide whether it would be wiser to provide another unit on which maintenance would not be expected to be so high, or if the Ministry of Housing agrees and says it does not have another purpose for the house, if it says it is not to be used for the purpose to which Senator Greaves referred when earlier he spoke, then perhaps we can look at that. I want to make it clear that nothing in what I said ought to be regarded as being at variance with what Senator Trotman said on an earlier occasion, for the simple reason that I was talking about the eight acres of land and not just about the house standing within the three acres. There is a total of 11 acres down there.

I am quite prepared to consider its use as a community centre, but it is for the Ministry of Housing, as the manager of Government property, to determine first of all whether any plans which they had for it will still be proceeded with, or whether they can yield it for that purpose. In any event, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Sport working together will, in the very near future, be providing the community complex for the people of Checker Hall. That has been decided. We are now finalising the details.

What I have put to the Chairman of the Cement Company is that it would be good if his company saw its way to assist us in the provision of the community complex. If the company can see its way, I have every hope that they will also associate themselves with the project. All of that would be to the benefit of the people of Checker Hall.

Mr. Deputy President, I have been lengthy because I heard a lengthy speech which, when analysed, consisted of slurs and charges against the Government, and of assertions which, in my candid opinion, were less than factual. The speech itself was an attempt to read into the Record of this House a responsibility and credit for things for which Senator Greaves deserved absolutely no credit. That picture, I hope, will no longer remain after due consideration is given to the facts I have revealed existing right here on an open file, which anybody can see. There is no secrecy on the point.

We have nothing to be ashamed of either in our record of resiting persons when that becomes necessary, or in our record of providing facilities for the community. We have consistently when we have had to resite people, approached it not with arrogance, but with humility and humanity, because we care. That will continue to be our approach in resiting people.
12.35 p.m.

We will have to do resite in some instances for the industrial access road. We will do it in the same caring, careful, humble way that we have done it so far. The few acolytes of people like Senator Greaves, who want to seize opportunities like that to ferment unrest whenever we resite people, will have to continue to work and discredit themselves, because, ultimately, the people will not be fooled. Ultimately, they will know that we have approached the matter in their interest and in the best manner possible.

I think that that will take care of the comments which Senator Greaves made and put the matter back in its perspective.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FONTABELLE AND EXMOUTH, ST. MICHAEL, FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Fontabelle and Exmouth, St. Michael, for Road Improvement.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, this Resolution is also a very simple and straightforward matter. It has to do with land at Exmouth, Fontabelle, and arises out of the Spring Garden road works.

It was necessary, in order to construct the Spring Garden Road, for Government to acquire several parcels of land. The project was completed over a year ago, and the majority of people whose lands have been acquired have been duly compensated. However, it was recently discovered that during the course of the construction of the road Government had also utilised three areas of land for which the owners were never compensated. These lands are 454 square metres belonging to Esso Standard Oil (S.A.) Limited, 125 square metres of land belonging to Frank B. Armstrong and 23.5 square metres belonging to the Estate of Violet Williams.

They were originally earmarked for acquisition, but were inadvertently omitted from the list of the other parcels of land which were acquired for the Spring Garden Road Project. The opportunity is now being taken by Government to regularize its use of these lands by the form of an acquisition and by the form of compensation to the said owners of the land.

I move, Sir, that this Resolution be now concurred in.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT TURNERS HALL, ST. ANDREW, FOR VARIOUS PURPOSES

Order No. 7 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Turners Hall, St. Andrew, for recreation and park development, highway improvement, housing, agricultural and petroleum development.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, there are places where this Resolution will become contentious. I have a feeling that this is not one of the places where it becomes contentious.

Within the Turners Hall Plantation you will find Turners Hall Woods, which happens to be important

cultural stock. Turners Hall Plantation, therefore, is not just like any other plantation, but it is one of several which owes considerable sums of money to the Barbados National Bank, and it is one of two which the Government has so far taken a decision to compulsorily acquire. The other one is Belle View Estates (1979) Ltd. which is the Belle, which lies, of course, in the area from which most of us have to rely on for our water.

Proceedings have already been instituted, in accordance with the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, for the acquisition of this property. The plantation is owned by a company known as Barbados Estates Ltd. It contains a total of 226.649 hectares (560 acres, 10 perches), of which approximately 115.33 hectares are arable. In other words, half of it is arable. The remaining lands comprise natural woodland, tenantry, rab land, gully and pasture. The natural woodland, obviously, is what I referred to earlier as an important part of our heritage.

According to information recently received, the indebtedness of the plantation to the Barbados National Bank Agricultural Division at the end of August was \$1, 212,268.70 comprising of principal of over \$903,000 and interest of over \$309,000. As with the case of the Belle View Estates, it was considered that compulsory acquisition of this property was the best course of action for Government to take to recover its monies to circumvent the tedious procedures of foreclosure and auction. The National Insurance Scheme is also owed \$44,106.95, and the Severance Payment Fund, paid by workers, is of the order of \$76,344. In any event, the estate now clearly owes a lot more than it is worth.

The proposal is that Turners Hall Plantation be used for the purpose of recreation and park development, highway improvement, housing, agricultural development and petroleum development. Apparently, the Minister responsible for Energy thinks he can get something out of it. It is a traditional area for gas. Consideration will also be given to subdividing a portion of the plantation into large units for sale, and already the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation has commenced work at Turners Hall Plantation. It is in the process of salvaging approx. 33.18 hectares or 82 acres of sugar cane for harvesting in 1985. I move that the Senate do now concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The Resolution, as has been stated, seeks to acquire this area of land for recreation and park development, highway improvement, housing, agricultural and petroleum development. I am particularly interested in the aspect dealing with recreational and park development. I wonder whether this fits in, if it does fit in at all, with the proposal from the Government to declare from Archers Bay in St. Lucy to Ragged Point in St. Philip for the development of a national park. I think that Turners Hall is a little in from the coast, and I am really wondering whether this fits in

with the overall development, and indeed, if in the light of this particular acquisition and the facts that the Government will have a fairly large area to develop park facilities, the Government will be proceeding with that particular plan or proposal which they have for developing such a long expanse of Barbados land a national park. 12.45 p.m.

I believe that where we see areas for development and where it is possible, quite naturally we ought to proceed in that particular direction. In our national plans we have to pay some serious attention to providing an opportunity for recreation and the development of parks around our country, because people have time on their hands and they need places where they can go and relax.

As Senator Barrow has said, this estate is in the same kind of situation as Belle View Estates which were acquired some time ago, and on which we had an opportunity to express our view. I indicated then how I felt about that particular estate and the way it was able to utilise funds supposedly for agricultural purposes, but all the funds could not possibly be used for agricultural purposes.

We now have a situation where a company, and this is unfortunate with a number of companies in Barbados, does not seem to think that they have an obligation to pay their contributions to National Insurance, which are necessary in ensuring that the welfare of workers is properly protected. It is not only this company; there are a number of companies in Barbados which seem to find themselves in that particular position. I hope, however, that these matters will be settled and that the workers who are going to be affected by the closure of the estate would get their severance pay, as provided for under the legislation.

Agricultural development is something which we cannot overlook, and it is good to see that the Agricultural Development Corporation will be using some of the land for this particular purpose. I have always said that they must of necessity be a greater interest and commitment shown by the ADC to agricultural development and diversification in this country.

As far as housing development is concerned, I know that area of land, I think it is in the Scotland area, and from what I recall, it is a very hilly and rocky part of the country. I am not sure really what kind of successful housing development can take place in that particular area. I certainly hope that in any development consideration will be given to ensuring that the houses will not be destroyed by any movement of land which seems to be natural for that particular area. Having said that, we still need a considerable amount of effort in building up our housing stock, and any attempt which is made to add to this is certainly a step in the right direction. I hope it will be for the credit and lasting benefit of the country.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I support the Resolution, and I am pleased to see that the Government will do something with Turners Hall Woods. It is a good tourist attraction, and, properly developed, it will be an asset to Barbados.

Is the company presently owing now a Barbadian company? If so, is it a public company? Who are the shareholders? I would like to know who owns the place. I notice that Senator Greaves was a little upset that they had not paid any NIS, so I just wondered who are these shareholders who are not paying NIS payments.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, the question asked by Senator Seale is like throwing a red rag before a bull, because I think if a little research is done — and I believe the Leader of the Senate will respond to that — it may be found that there may be some people in the Opposition who would know who owns the company.

I want to speak on the Resolution, particularly as it relates to petroleum development in the area, and I take this opportunity because when one sees a Resolution which seeks acquisition for petroleum development, it might be a bit misleading not only to the people in the Chamber but to the public. In the first place, there is not really any serious need for the Government to acquire land for petroleum development, because all mineral rights in the country are vested in the Crown. It is only the surface rights which may be owned by the people, who are indeed owners of record, but all mineral rights are vested in the Crown, hence the Government, through its mining agencies, can get involved in any extraction activity without recourse to acquisition.

I want to stress this, because in this country there is some argument being advanced about the Government buying oil in the ground. Again I saw it in the *Nation* on Monday and in the *Advocate* on Tuesday this week. They both carried the same statement which was made by the shadow spokesman for Finance in a speech made in Independence Square last Sunday night. I am sure it does not take a genius to know the statement was a handout and not an off-the-cuff speech, because it was quoted verbatim in both sections of the daily Press.
12.55 p.m.

I have to deal with these things and I believe I have the scope within this Resolution, since we are talking about petroleum development, to answer some of the statements that were made at the time by the Opposition spokesman, because when one reads about what he says, his outbursts could truly be characterised as unguided missiles. But they present a danger in this country, and this is why these statements must always be answered, because it is very easy for people to make statements and get away with them. People should be asked

sometimes to bring proof for the statements. I will reply to some of the things that were said, and I will touch on Turners Hall and its petroleum development during the course of setting the record straight.

The goodly gentleman stated that the Barbados Government borrowed \$24 million to purchase the assets of MOBIL, and purchased oil in the ground. This is where the point made about acquisition of land comes in. I have to point out time and time again that oil in the ground is of no use to anybody unless we have the wherewithal to produce it, and there is nobody in the world who I know will buy oil in the ground.

The Government of Barbados purchased the producing wells, a capital investment, of MOBIL Exploration Barbados Ltd. in 1982 for US\$6 million. Any company extracting oil from the ground can claim oil depletion allowance, which is the same thing as depreciation on a building. So you are not purchasing oil in the ground when you are buying producing wells. We bought reserves from wells that were drilled at an expense to MOBIL. That point has to be made time and time again.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition with this argument and it surprised me that a man with his legal knowledge would make this point. It is purely a malicious point. We have had support on this. If one were to read the international business magazines, one would see that for instance, when TEXACO purchased Getty oil, they purchased producing wells. When the Trinidad Government signed an agreement with TEXACO International for \$423 million to purchase the assets of TEXACO in Trinidad, included in those assets were land-based producing wells. I think that it is about time somebody got the shadow spokesman to understand that it is about time he stopped fooling people in this country with this nonsense.

Another unguided missile was that the Barbados Government borrowed \$35 million to get the operations of BNOC going. I believe that people should be called upon to account for these statements, and there should be some way that people should be penalized for misleading the people in this country when they make these statements. The truth of the matter is that Barbados National Oil Company has operations which are highly successful, and regarded so internationally. The Barbados National Oil Company has assistance on a soft loan basis from two agencies: the Venezuelan Investment Fund, which has provided something like US\$5.5 million at two per cent, to be repayed over eighteen years; and from the Canadian International Development Agency, from which it has a \$6 million line of credit, which is provided for forty years, with no interest. The CAN\$6 million and the US\$5.5 million amounts to about Bds\$19 million at soft rates. I do not see where the \$35 million come from. These things get in the Press — there is nobody who

seems to be able to challenge them – but it is clearly a serious misrepresentation of what this country is all about.

I notice that the gentleman only got involved in talking about oil and energy after he was able to get a copy of the Regional Energy Action Plan which was produced after hard work by CARICOM Governments in June last year in Trinidad. He was quoting extensively from that, without acknowledgement of the authorship of the document, and therefore purporting that this information was straight from him. Indeed, I remember that he did pass a copy of the document to a feature writer at the *Nation* newspaper, who sought to defend his position last year. That feature writer knows who he is, and I am sure he did not understand the document either. Dr. Haynes used a lot of the quotations like “tore refine” without understanding their meaning. I was able to find out that he got a copy of the CARICOM document, which was restricted, and he used it to advance his own interest.

In respect of Turner's Hall, we have had one well in Turner's Hall, well No. 19, which has been producing since 1939/40. Over two and a half billion cubic feet of natural gas has come from that one well since the 1940s. It is still producing. The technicians tell me that this is a phenomenon related to what is called a fault plane, and I told them that it is the only term I am interested in learning in anything about the technical aspects of petroleum. There is a fault plane production, because the feeling is that the leakage of the gas is something like 60 000 cubic feet to 70 000 cubic feet of natural gas per day which comes from a reservoir somewhere lower down. That supports the point made by Senator Barrow that more work may be done in the area in the interest of petroleum development.

Some work was done only this year where one well that was drilled by PetroCanada International has been tested – it seems as though it is a very good producer also – at some 1.7 million cubic feet per day. Further work is being done on the reservoir to determine the size of the reservoir. If we are going to find significant natural reserves in that area, we are going to find major uses for it, and PetroCanada has offered, as part of a package to the Government – and this arises out of a trip that I just made to Canada – to do a gas utilization study which would look at the possibilities of providing services to the north of the island, indeed as far as the cement plant. It will also involve other activity in the Turners Hall area, because if the recommendations of the study are that we try to pump natural gas to the north, it would mean the laying of pipes and other facilities in some parts of Turners Hall. So that is what is happening down there.

There were many wells drilled in the Forties by the British Union Oil Company in that area without any

success. But PetroCanada's geologists, in collaboration with Barbadian geologists, who I must say have done a very good job for this country – they have had training since 1976 in a programme of training that this Government, as a policy, instituted, and which is now bearing fruit – feel that more work should be done in the area. In addition to the Rock Hall well, there are six or seven wells that they have on test to look at the results to see if they can produce commercially.

The whole business of acquisition and surface rights must be looked at within the terms of royalty payments. The shadow spokesman made an outlandish statement about the Government having to tax the people of Barbados to support this losing proposition called the BNOC. He said many things that are so misleading. Last year when he got the purloined document he said that we should close the topping plant at Mobil, negotiate the purchase of oil products from Trinidad through the CMCF, and minimize the inevitable losses incurred in the production of our crude by entering into a further agreement with Trinidad and Tobago. He was frothing at his mouth all over the place.
1.05 p.m.

One should note that the Barbados Oil Company does not use tax dollars in its production of crude, which redounds to the everlasting benefit of this country. Rather than use tax dollars, the Barbados National Oil Company – I have a copy of the financial statement which will be laid in Parliament very soon – in fiscal year 1983–84 paid \$3.1 million in royalties into the Government's coffers from its operation. This year it has projected that for fiscal year 1984–85, it will pay \$4.5 million into the Government's coffers. One million dollars will go to the owners of properties on whose land they are drilling for oil. Even Hopefield is benefiting.

The company and the oil industry are making significant contributions to the economic life. Over 450 jobs are involved in the oil industry. These are direct jobs, and has nothing to do with the indirect jobs which come through the acquisitions and clearing of sites for drilling where the private companies are involved. There is a lot of money involved in the operation. I believe that sales this year, based on the budgetary projections for the oil company, will reach some \$36 million. Yet, we have to be fed with nonsense about a losing proposition concocted by somebody who does not understand one iota about international petroleum.

We are fed now with CNN News, thanks to the work of the Minister of Information and Culture. Every morning you can know what is going on in the world. People criticized it, but I am very glad, because Barbadians can appreciate what is happening in this world. For the last five days, we have been fed with a diet of OPEC Ministers Meeting in Geneva to try to resolve the problem

relating to the maintenance of the high price of oil at \$29 a barrel. Their strategy is to make sure that oil prices stay high, at \$29 a barrel. Yet we can still hear this unguided missile talking about the Government should take advantage of the low prices prevailing. If they know of low oil prices anywhere in the world, they should let the people of Barbados know, and let us send and buy some.

People are paying \$29 a barrel for oil, and there was no rush by the OPEC countries at their meeting to reduce the price of oil. The objective was very clear, to maintain a high price for oil. But you can hear the night air filled with nonsense at the People Assemblies. A man reads some figures, reads a document, passes it around, and all of a sudden he is an authority on petroleum! We who have been working in this field for years, and studying and reading, and have the support of technical people cannot even understand sometimes.

We hear about a policy to make sure that we stabilize at low oil prices. This is what the gentleman said:

"The Government has taxed the community \$6 million to avoid losses to the company whilst, unlike most other countries, we continue to pay high energy costs as reflected in the cost of water, electricity, and so on."

There is a case to be made for repetition, and if people repeat this often enough, I suppose people will accept it. But we also have to repeat constantly that Barbados has some of the lowest energy prices in the Caribbean. But this gentleman, who has no responsibility to anybody, only his own ambitions to destroy his "co-horse", gets up talking about the highest prices unlike any other countries.

We hear about an energy policy from them. In 1981, in the Democratic Labour Party's manifesto — they are so concerned about energy now — there is one line making reference to energy. All of a sudden, since June 1983, they have a policy of energy, because they were able to copy the CARICOM document which was hammered out at a meeting of the regional Ministers responsible for Energy, one which was headed by Senator Clyde Griffith.

At that meeting when we sought to push for the Regional Energy Action Plan, we said that, because of its expertise, because it was better placed than any other country in the Caribbean, if we decide to close refineries in the Caribbean, Trinidad had the capacity to satisfy the needs of the CARICOM region, which is true. One country objected to closing its refinery if Trinidad could have handled the whole situation; it said that it has a refinery and could not close it. Do you know why

that country could not close its refinery? Because it was a refinery that was built at the cost of \$30 million on the advice of the people in the Democratic Labour Party. The DLP want to close our refinery but they were advising the people to build another refinery in the Caribbean, for \$30 million, that has run for three months with one batch of crude.

We fought for and supported, and will continue to support, the Regional Energy Plan. One of the reasons why the plan has not been implemented stems from the fact that Trinidad has had a significant problem in how it is going to deal with its own situation regarding the TEXACO and TRINTOC refineries. That is why we in the Caribbean have not been able to move to meet some of the conditions in the Regional Energy Action Plan. We did not hear anything like that. We keep hearing from people who do not know that we should sell our crude to Trinidad for total refining. I doubt if there are ten people in Barbados who understands what total refining is all about. Let us say that the Trinidadians woke up one day and sent us the crude they have for total refining. Over 50 per cent of that crude would result in fuel oil, which Trinidad does not need, and we still would not be able to use our crude to satisfy the demands of gasoline and other like products in this country. But we hear this idiotic suggestion that we should totally refine the crude. We even tried to sell two batches of crude to Trinidad within the last six to eight weeks, and because of the delay in getting a response, we had to sell to Curacao — 45 000 barrels.

1.15 p.m.

We have tried very hard to get oil reformat, which Barbados purchases from Trinidad — over \$22 million worth a year — for our gasoline, put under the CMCF. The Trinidadians at the time when the CMCF was functioning said no. That is one of the things that caused us to have problems with the CMCF. They were selling oil to Guyana under the CMCF but we could not get oil purchased under the CMCF. Yet still we hear this joker talking all the time about buying it through the CMCF, as though it is a one way street.

I could go on and on, but I will have another opportunity to give a more detailed response to the nonsense. I just thought that I should bring some points to bear, because some of the statements made were too blaring, too dishonest and too misleading to the people of this country for us to continue letting these things pass. We cannot allow somebody to speak with authority on a subject that he has clearly no understanding about, and indeed use people in the Press to get those points of view across, because it can be very misleading and damaging.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, like Senator Greaves, of course, I too deplore

the business of companies not paying the National Insurance contributions. The companies are, as I believe in respect of monies that they collect from their employees, agents of the National Insurance Scheme, and I believe that is the only thing that gives these workers some protection. Not to pay is a most deplorable act, and is certainly to be condemned in the strongest terms when companies collect money from workers and then do not pay these monies over to the National Insurance Board, as indeed they are legally bound to do.

If the owners of Turners Hall Plantation do not find any favour with Senator Greaves, I must say I am in full agreement with him — they do not find any favour with me either. Turners Hall Plantation is owned by Barbados Estates Limited. The shareholders and directors are listed as follows:

Estate of Rowan Henry — he used to be a lawyer in Antigua, who studied with and was a very close friend of two other persons whose names appear in the following order —	30%
Mr. Bruce E. Procope, Queen's Counsel of Trinidad and Tobago	30%
Mr. E. W. Barrow, I presume Queen's Counsel of Barbados	30%
Mr. Gittens Clyde Turney (Mr. G. C. Turney). It may not be the same	10%

The attorney for the plantation is Mr. E. LeRoy Ward, whose name always turns up as attorney whenever Democratic Labour Party members have interest in property. He is a former member of this Senate.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senators, I propose to suspend this sitting until 2 o'clock. The Senate stands suspended.
1.22 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, earlier in the day I gave notice of an intention to move the suspension of Standing Order 45(2).

The items we would wish to proceed with are to be managed by Senator Griffith and they are, 1, 2, and 3 on the Order Paper. We will not proceed with item No. 4 which is the Private Investigators and Security Guards Bill, today. The other three money Bills are the items we would wish to proceed with.

I accordingly move that Standing Order 45(2) be suspended.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WELLINGTON & BECKWITH STREETS, BRIDGETOWN, FOR RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Order No. 8 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wellington and Beckwith Streets, Bridgetown, for recreational facilities.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I have some photographs of the property to be affected by this Resolution and, with your permission, Sir, I will pass them around.

Government has instituted proceedings for the compulsory acquisition of a small parcel of land of 259.1 square meters, that is less than 3 000 square feet, at the corner of Beckwith and Wellington Streets in the City of Bridgetown for the provision of recreational facilities. The relevant notice as required by the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, has already been published in the *Official Gazette* and the daily Press.

Prior to the commencement of negotiations by Government for the acquisition of the land, there was a derelict wall structure situated thereon; that is the subject of the photographs which are being circulated. Part of this structure collapsed and the remaining part was observed to pose a great threat to the safety of pedestrians, motorists and neighbours. It was also being used as a garbage dump. The structure has since been demolished and the site cleared.

The parliamentary representative for the City of Bridgetown, the Hon. Billie Miller, Minister of Education, drew to Government's attention that the residents of this very densely populated area, in the district known as the Nelson Street area or the Main, had indicated their desire to have a hard court constructed on the land in question, and it was considered that such a facility would go a long way in providing employment for idle hands and would help to divert some young people's attention away from the hurried and sociable activities which are common in the area. While it was agreed that these proposals would improve the amenities of the area and provide some

leisure time activity in the area devoided of such facilities, it was felt that the site was better suited to passive rather than active leisure activities, in view of its small size and location at the junction of two busy roads.

A small urban park seemed more suitable to the area. Government accordingly decided that the land should be acquired, and that steps should be taken to have seats provided on the site and the area landscaped. The area will be fenced off in order to create a feeling of safety and in order to separate the park from the roads.

This, though a very small item, Mr. Deputy President, is an extremely important Resolution for people who think in terms generally of the environment. Cities, I believe we can all agree, tend generally not to be the most beautiful part of any country in that there is always density of building and very little in terms of recreational amenities. Some cities have been lucky in that their development has taken place either in a sufficiently fortunate way as to leave fairly large open spaces for recreation, or that they have developed so recently that there has been time for planners to provide for adequate recreational areas.

In Bridgetown, we do have a situation of, I presume, what one can use the term intensity. If you look around Bridgetown, everything is cheek by a jowl and there is very little by way of space for recreation. Therefore, any little bit of space that can be gotten for this area to make life for those who actually live in the City, or whose business brings them into the City frequently, perhaps on a daily basis, more pleasant for them and provide some opportunity for the ordinary amenities which people in the country can normally look forward to, is, in my view, welcome. I, therefore, very warmly commend this Resolution to the Senate for its approval.

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

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. Deputy President, this is one Resolution which I will support. I would like Government to also take a look at the open window to the sea between the Welfare Department and the Child Care Board which, at the moment, is covered with potholes, broken bottles and broken pavements. It would be a great help to the workers at both of those institutions if they could park their cars there peacefully at the ends. There are trees there already with some benches under them so that people could sit and look down over the jetty on Bay Street. It could be a very beautiful area, but it does need some attention. At the moment, it has garbage all over it.

I hope that this same thing will not happen to the Beckwith Street enterprise. I think we have to train our

people to keep their garbage and not throw it on to other people's property and on to public amenities like this.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Deputy President, I want to assure Senator Reader that the area which she mentioned is receiving active attention from the National Conservation Commission. Only three days ago, we had a report on that particular area. Our draughtsman was on holiday, but he is ready to give us some ideas on remedying the problem. We are aware of the problem and we are having active discussions with the Ministry of Transport and Works, through the Chief Technical Director, and you can rest assured that the area will receive the attention it deserves under the National Conservation Commission.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I support the Resolution. I congratulate the Government and the decision to uplift the standard of Nelson Street by having a park there.

In the very first speech I made in this Senate, I called for the Baxter's Street Mall, and while we have got it on occasions, it is still not yet a permanent feature. Now that the Minister has his National Cultural Foundation, I think that he would see a lot of merit in having a lot of cultural road shows in Baxter's Road, and I also believe that Nelson Street needs a little upliftment, too. That could also become a mall at night. I realise that Nelson Street conjures up other things, but still I think we need to let tourists to our island see how our own people enjoy themselves. We, that is the Barbados Development Bank, are doing wonders for the fishing industry in Barbados by granting good loans. We have a lot of fish being landed here; we can get tourists to consume it if we have the Baxters Road Mall every night, and we would save a lot of foreign exchange and create a lot of activity for fishermen. There is nothing like a Baxters Road piece of fish, fried fish down there is class, and I would like to think that we could encourage this.

2.20 p.m.

I know that the National Cultural Foundation has been taking some licks on the St. Barnabas Roundabout slave idea. I am wondering if it is not a better idea to take the \$100 000 and develop Baxters Road, clean up the sidewalks of Baxters Road for all the people there, because that would create employment. I do not know if we will create any employment with the slaves. I want to see some employment and foreign exchange generation, so I would appeal to the Minister to use his good offices to direct his funds into Bridgetown.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, even in 1984, 150 years since emancipation and 148 years since the actual end of slavery, Senator Seale still wants more employment by way of slavery.

(SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I did not say so.)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I am glad he does not want to. I am going to deal with that point last, because it is a point which I believe has to be addressed rather seriously.

To deal with the earlier points raised, Senator Reader's point drew a very prompt response from the Deputy Chairman of the National Conservation Commission, almost as if he had something to hide; and all the time that he was so sensitive on the matter, the Minister responsible for the Environment, whose office is a stone's throw away from the same area that Senator Reader is complaining about, was keeping very quiet. I think he was waiting until his new Permanent Secretary arrived before he got around to dealing with it. So a lot of people have plans for ensuring that Senator Reader's point gets dealt with. It looks as though that area is going to attract the attention of the Department of the Environment, the National Conservation Commission and the Ministry of Transport and Works, and if with that team we cannot get it done pretty quickly, I think we will be in serious trouble.

The point is very seriously taken, because when we provide all of these areas, it is necessary that we keep them up so that those for whose use they are intended can really use them. We are very thankful that Senator Reader has raised the point, but I am also very thankful that other people are sufficiently sensitive to it to respond in the way they have.

As to Senator Seale's point, the idea of a mall in Nelson Street seems to attract some amusement, and the idea of the mall in Baxters Road of course, as he said, has been tried on occasion. But the focus on the National Cultural Foundation is not quite correct, because what happened is that, as part of the Crop Over Festival, the Ministry of Culture had made a mall in Baxters Road as part of the festival. That was done for as long as those who did business in Baxters Road wished to have it done and was prepared to put their bit of the organisation in. When they no longer were prepared to do that, then you would have been forcing on us the responsibility to go against what wishes could be recognised, the wishes of the people who operate and live in the area. We are not in that business.

As to whether Baxters Road should be a mall permanently, again Government is not going to do it unless there is a clear recognition by the people who live and function in that area that this is what they want. Government is not going to take any position without first understanding how the people in Baxters Road feel about it. I think Senator Seale is in a sense misdirecting his fire, because I think it would be better to try to persuade the people of Baxters Road that a 24-hour mall really is something in their best interest. I am extremely doubtful that if they wanted it Government would say

no, but I can also tell you if they did not want it, or indicate strongly that they want it, we are not going to force it on them.

Senator Seale seems to see some apparent conflict between having the Baxters Road Mall and having a statue at the St. Barnabas Roundabout. I was not aware that the St. Barnabas Roundabout statue was really a source for the dissent which seems to be coming from certain quarters. I have paid a lot of attention to it, and I got the feeling that what people seemed to be saying was that to dedicate NIFCA to four years of celebration on the single theme of slavery was too much, and that is why there was an explanation given by the Foundation to the effect that the theme for NIFCA for the Eighties is not slavery. The theme of NIFCA for the Eighties is "Nationhood."

There are many sub-themes running through NIFCA, as there are many sub-themes running through the Eighties, in the same way that in 1834 an Act of the British Parliament was passed for the abolition of slavery, in the same way in 1838 the apprenticeship, which had been intended to last for six years, came to an end and therefore all slaves became free, and in that same way in 1937 there was one of the great watersheds of West Indian political history, the riots of 1937. We are aware that from 1935 to 1938, from Jamaica in the north to Guyana in the south, there were riots throughout the area which had the effect of transforming the social, economic and political life of the entire Caribbean, and that is a great watershed period of West Indian history. It is the period in which we find the birth of modern Trade Union Movement, in which we find the birth of modern West Indian political party system, and indeed the takeoff point for the West Indies as we know it today, with the number of independent countries all looking after their own interests. That appears as one of the sub-themes in NIFCA in the Eighties; it will be the sub-theme for the year 1987, the fiftieth anniversary of the 1937 riots. 2.30 p.m.

Similarly, in the year 1639 this Parliament was established. We happen to be the second oldest Parliament in the Commonwealth as a result of the three hundred and fifty years of existence which we will be celebrating in 1989, in which year we will host the conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and which year we will mark in many different ways.

The National Cultural Foundation employs a researcher I can tell you, for example that the 1880s are a significant period. They have already formed the subject of Dr. Bruce Hamilton's book on Barbados and the confederation crisis. Out of the 1880s we may find particularly significant events to mark in the year 1985 or 1986. In other words, what these sub-themes in NIFCA represent is an awareness by the National Cultural Foundation that in order for people to understand and

take pride in themselves as they are, they must understand their own story.

We cannot be ashamed of who we are, if we are a people who expect to make any progress. We must understand that if we have had the experience of slavery, slavery was a brutalizing and demeaning experience for black and white. There is no example of brutality that did not touch both sides. And we must also understand that what we are today comes out of that melting pot. There are experiences shared by all Barbadians at every level, and they inform our past and commit us to a certain path of future development.

We are not in a position, if we are going to establish a National Cultural Foundation, to look at it and say, "You are to do what some people regard as acceptable and the rest you are not to do." I cannot, while I am Minister of Culture, turn my back on my past. I will not close my mind to facts.

There are Barbadians black and white. There are themes, some noble, some ignoble, which inform our history and account for our being. We, in erecting a statue in celebration of emancipation, are recognizing that fact. When we erect a statue to Sir Grantley Adams, which is also a work already commissioned, we are testifying to the work of perhaps the most outstanding Barbadian of all time, and certainly the most outstanding Barbadian to date. When we erect a statue to Sir Frank Worrell, a work already commissioned, we are saying something about the way in which we see our sportsmen and we are saying that we understand his significance to our country and to our people for the outstanding contribution he made in the field of sport.

There are others. Can we truly see a Barbados which is going to commemorate themes, events and people by way of a programme of statues that will not have a statue of Sir Herbert Greaves, a great former Attorney-General and Chief Justice of this country, whose ideas brought salvation to the sugar industry in the early 20th Century, when sugar has been so fundamental to the social and economic development of this country?

The theme underlined by statues of what we commemorate and why we commemorate it is not a laughing matter. I should like to believe that we are a sufficiently mature people, a sufficiently forward-looking people, that we would be talking about what in the society is worth commemorating, because I want my two little children to grow up in a society where they can look and see things and identify with them and understand why they are there and why they are like they are. I believe that those whose claims to children would be rather more than two, or even twenty-two, share that desire.

Laughter.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT DASH VALLEY, ST. GEORGE, FOR VARIOUS PURPOSES

Order No. 9 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Dash Valley, St. George, for Sports and Community recreational facilities, Housing Development and the provision of sites and services for housing purposes.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this is the last item that I will be handling today before handing over to Senator Griffith.

The Government acquired this land in 1981. It is a parcel of land at Dash Valley, St. George containing 18 207 square metres, I believe that is about four and a half acres, from Kingsland Estates Limited for the purpose of providing recreational facilities. Since then, the National Sports Council has developed the area into a playing field. Arising out of the representation made by Kingsland Estates Limited that the remainder of the field would be rendered useless for agriculture because of the playing field and the resulting destruction of crops, it was decided that Government should acquire the remaining portion of the land, which measures some 25 879.5 square metres, for further development. That is at least another six acres.

Sir, I hope nobody in this Honourable Senate objects to my moving from the standard metric to what must be more comfortable. The reason is that although I can talk metric, I do not think metric. So when I go along, I can understand what it is like if it is six acres. I tend to do that, I hope nobody will think me rude or that I am talking down to anybody, because I would first have to start talking down to myself.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Barrow, I am sure nobody thinks so, providing that you make the transfer accurately.

Laughter.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, I cannot undertake that. All I can undertake is to be honest with my transfers. The accuracy, I think, will have to be incidental.

It was decided that the additional land should be acquired for multi-purpose development, including additional sports and community recreational facilities, that is an additional playing field and community centre cum

pavilion, with an area to be used either for housing development or alternatively to provide sites and services for housing purposes. It is expected that the proposed multi-purpose development will cater to persons not only in the Dash Valley area but also to those at St. Barnabas, Mapp Hill, Mount Friendship, Lower Burney's, Haggatt Hall and possibly Hanson in South District. It is therefore envisaged that maximum use will be made of any recreational and community facilities provided, and that their use would be further advanced because of the location of the site near a major highway. The land runs from the east of the St. Barnabas Roundabout. There is a Service Station on Mapp Hill, Mr. Trotman's Service Station, and the land is across from that.

2.40 p.m.

Senators would have heard me refer to the fact earlier, in dealing with another Resolution, that we in the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Sport have decided to approach a lot of these things jointly. Instead of the Ministry of Sport, through the National Sports Council, merely putting changing rooms or a pavilion, wherever possible we are now thinking together so that if it is appropriate for a community centre, as this particular area is, then we can go in jointly, which will have the effect of giving the community a larger plant, which is more appropriate if it is a large community, or, in the event the community does not need a larger plant, it may give us a little saving here and there which will then allow us to carry services to more communities.

A number of facilities have come into service with that joint co-operative arrangement. I mentioned Boscobelle earlier, and there is Sion Hill. We are looking at Bush Hall, where we visited a week ago. Two mornings ago we were to go and look at Eden Lodge and we will go and look at Eden Lodge next week. We also a week ago went and looked at Parish Land in Christ Church. Wherever we can put the plant in as a joint enterprise, it ensures that the youth of Barbados will get facilities at a much faster rate, because we will create savings and we will also be able to look at the thing conceptually as a whole.

This Resolution, therefore, is one which I present as though it were my own. It originates in the Ministry of Housing, which is Government's landlord, and the land will be vested in the National Sports Council ultimately. When we put in plant, then the community centre becomes the plant that is operated by the National Cultural Foundation.

Mr. Deputy President, I move that this Resolution be now concurred in.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am very pleased that this joint Resolution, as it were, between the Ministries of Culture and Sport has come before the

House, and I am extremely delighted to hear the Honourable Leader of the Senate articulate that in the future — in fact, starting with Boscobelle, as far as possible where the communities themselves lend themselves to the type of development, the two Ministries will be harmonizing with a view to putting down a joint project.

I do not claim much by way of personal credit, but in the by-election in 1976 in St. Philip North, I conceptualized then, and wrote in the manifesto for the General Election of 1976, among other things, that part of the manifesto which deals precisely with the laying down of recreational facilities. What was conceptualized January and February 1976, was that we would have a multi-purpose building which would double as a pavilion on one side and a community hall on the other side. I have, therefore, been disappointed that, for the most part since 1976, even though we have been meeting part of the need in putting down pavilions, and more recently at Wildey, changing facilities, I think we grew away from the concept and the only building that I can think of in the last eight years, that meets the conceptualization in the manifesto of 1976, is in fact, the building at Belfield.

I think that if the designers could have had a look at what was done at Belfield, they might have been able to do a similar design at Boscobelle, but what we have at Boscobelle is a community centre on one side of the field and a pavilion on the other side of the field. I think that the one that meets all of the demands best is the one at Belfield. I really would urge members that whenever they have a spare minute and they are in the Black Rock-Belfield area to visit the Belfield Pavilion and see. Mind you, it costs a lot of money. It costs about \$250 000 to put up the pavilion community centre, auxiliary services and children's park.

I have not had much of an opportunity to deal specifically with the work of the National Sports Council. I am going to take this opportunity, largely from memory and with some hurriedly put together notes, to give a breakdown of the work of the National Sports Council, since it was established in 1978, in terms of a recitation of projects. It amazes me that even though things are tight economically in Barbados, the National Sports Council has been one Government agency that has been performing, especially having regard to the paltry sums that we are doled out by the Ministry of Finance from year to year. Last year we got \$400 000; this year it is a lot better, \$870 000.

I do not believe that there is any statutory board in Barbados that has functioned as well as the National Sports Council.

(SENATOR C. D. SEALE: The BDB.)

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: The BDB. But that has money, it is a bank. I am not talking about banks.

Let us just look at some of the things that have been done since 1977, when the Council was created. Playing fields: Boscobelle St Peter; Durhams, St. Lucy; Connell Town, St. Lucy – I will deal with the ex-member for St. Lucy later on – Sion Hill, St. James; Bridgefield, St. Thomas; Content, St. Thomas will be finished in two weeks time; Parkinson, St. Michael; Haggatt Hall, St. Michael; Dash Valley – part of the subject of this Resolution; Gibbons, Christ Church; Orange Hill, St. James; there is one off the Spring Garden Road we have not named it; – Applegrove, Christ Church; Wotton, Christ Church; Holy Innocent's, St. Thomas; and even the people in St. Philip North, who are not represented by a labourite, at Bayleys they now have a massive playing field, and is going to be a pretty one too when it is finished. The whole works are going up there, for me or not for me, Sir. Monday morning at 8 o'clock work started at Indian Ground in St. Peter. That is 17 playing fields.
2.50 p.m.

The pavilions: Wotton; Dover; Chapel; Farmers in St. Thomas; Warleigh, St. Peter; Shorey Village, St. Andrew; Montgomery; Sion Hill; Blenheim; Murphy Pasture; Belfield; Salters, otherwise known as Richie Haynes; Wildey – 14.

Hard courts: Deacons, St. Michael; Holy Innocents, St. Thomas; Belfield again; Lammings, St. Joseph; the Ivy, St. Michael; Pleasant Hall, Christ Church; Boscobelle; Sion Hill; Parkinson; Princess Royal Avenue; Grazettes. Those are about eleven hard courts.

I think that that programme of work bears testimony to all the platitudes that I may have mentioned at the beginning of my address. It is clear that the Sports Council has not been standing still, and in the rest of this year there are still a number of other projects to be completed. Perhaps the most significant of all the projects still to be completed in this financial year would be the hard courts at Combermere School. I say significant because here again we have an area which has been deprived of sporting infrastructure, and the plan is, together with the efforts of the Parent/Teacher Association of Combermere School, to put down hard courts at the school for use by the children of the school and the residents of the Bush Hall area. Near to that area a playing field will be constructed at Waterford, and as soon as the rains finish we will start work on that.

In all of this the one unsavoury feature has been the amount of vandalism we have had to put up with particularly at the pavilions, which has resulted in an unnecessary amount of money having to be spent each year in terms of recurrent remedial maintenance.

In the next few months attempts will be made to upgrade all the playing fields, those which are still a little bumpy and need filling in. We have just reorganised our staff structure. Mr. Othneil "Hitler" Downes, formerly a coach, has been made Supervisor of Grounds. We now have two, and we have divided the island into zones so that the two Supervisors will have responsibility for a particular number of grounds and pavilions, and we hope that the reporting of the grounds which need to be refurbished or rehabilitated from time to time will become more efficient than in the past.

Great weight is placed on the Sports Council by the particular schools and clubs for the use of equipment, and I trust that some of these words will get back to the Minister of Finance before I meet him with the Estimates, because in order to service these playing fields, the clubs and schools, we are going to need some additional heavy equipment, especially cutting equipment. We have had a problem with the equipment – it will work properly for two or three weeks, then it will break down – and we have to wait until the agents send to England and get parts for it, and it is very unsatisfactory. We are going to need some heavy capital investment from Government in the area of heavy equipment.

I have not mentioned the National Stadium. The stadium is, I believe, 12 years old. Again, the problem that seems to afflict most Government property is that it has been allowed to languish free from any constant remedial maintenance. It is constructed largely of steel, and the result has been that over the years there has been corrosion of the steel, and much of the steel structure is positively unsafe.

If there had been routine maintenance on a planned programme every year, I believe the kind of expense that we are now faced with could have been certainly minimised. Nevertheless, it is a place of public resort and we have to just try and find the money and refurbish it. So between now and April Phase One of the repairs to the structure of the stadium will start. We have earmarked \$150 000, and I believe I will find probably another \$50 000 to \$75 000 this year to do the worst aspects of the stadium as Phase One. Next year then we will do some more.

In addition to that, all the lighting fixtures on the masts, as I call them – I think there is a technical word for them – are now obsolete, again corroded by salt spray, and they have to be totally changed. I anticipate from very, very preliminary and cursory figures that to repair the lights around the field at the stadium is going to land us in expense of the order of \$140 000. When you realise that in the last four years by trying to repair the lights every year we have already spent \$150 000, it magnifies the problem, and it proves that if there had been a conscious programme of attention to these steel structures and fittings over the years, this perhaps would not have happened and the expense would not have been

so great and so sudden. But we have to do these things because of certain linkages that have developed.

I do not know how many people are aware of the linkages that are being developed in Government. Community Services, Information and Culture and Sport are linking up to do joint projects for the benefit of the community which will touch on recreational and leisure activities and sporting activities. But perhaps more important than that, Sport and Tourism have established a linkage, and this is one of the reasons why Sir Garfield Sobers is back here and is working very hard to develop programmes to sell Barbados overseas as a place to which sportsmen can come not only to relax and have fun, but to play sport.
3.00 p.m.

In April, we have the CARIFTA games, over Good Friday weekend. Those games finish on the Tuesday night. As soon as those games finish, the Champion Athletic Club of England, with a team of about 60, is coming to Barbados to engage the best of CARIFTA athletes in athletic competition, culminating during the weekend after Easter. We are expecting that there will be about one dozen English athletes who attended the Los Angeles Games and represented Britain here in Barbados, and possibly one or two gold medalists. Efforts are being made to see if Daley Thompson — he is in Trinidad this week — and Sanderson will come. The BBC will be here with David Coleman. I think most of us who have watched British television know David Coleman, at least from television if not personally. They are going to do a documentary on Barbados. I think this is going to be very important, and I do not think we have to pay anything for it.

All of this means that we must have a proper athletic track in place by April, a track that will allow us to offer the stadium as a site for international athletic competition. I wish to give the House an assurance that by April a new athletic track will be in place, a rubber surface. I have made the contacts already, and no later than Monday or Tuesday. I expect that the financial angles will be tied up.

I forgot in my little recitation of things done by the Sports Council to mention basketball. Hard courts are planned for this development at Dash Valley. The actual location of the hard courts is dependent upon a site visit by Ministers Tull and Bradshaw within the next week. We have a little problem with the actual contours of the land and we want them to meet with us and determine the best possible location for the hard courts.

I remembered two years ago when I spoke at the opening of the basketball season, the *Sunday Sun* the next day made a very sarcastic comment — and I do not forget sarcastic comments made about me — because I

promised the Basketball Association that they would shortly have the courts at the YMCA resurfaced. There were words like 'promises, promises' and 'you will never see that', or words along those lines. I was offended, of course, but despite that, they now have a resurfaced court at the YMCA.

They never had proper seating at the YMCA for basketball which is the fastest growing sport in Barbados. It is really an indoor sport, and we do not have an indoor stadium. We took over \$50 000 from the seating that was used for the World Cup Table Tennis Championship and placed the vast majority of it at the Basketball Stadium, and yet you hear about promises, promises. When you do these things you do not hear performance, performance; so I have to get it in the record. The Press has a habit of making snide remarks at you, but I will catch them on the hop, and out them too.

When a project such as this one before us is conceived, and goes to fruition, what I believe the Ministry of Culture and the National Sports Council would like to see, and it is part of our policy, is that when we hand over the project to the community, the community looks after the facility, makes the maximum use of it, and try as far as possible to police any vandalism. We have always encouraged in the development of facilities inputs from the persons in the area, and when the community offers assistance this is welcomed by the Sports Council and, I am sure, by the Ministry of Information and Culture.

When we developed the playing field at Orange Hill, on which we are going to put a pavilion next year, we found that after levelling, clearing the field and grading it, we had a number of small stones on the field. We approached the representative for the area, I think Mr. L. B. Brathwaite about this problem, and he agreed to get one of the youth groups, as a project helping themselves, to pile the stones on one side. We then went and moved them.

We did a similar thing in St. Lucy this year and, to my horror, one day on his way to the Labour College, the honourable Opposition Senator — it was reported to me at the Sports Council. If it is not true, I hope you had better get up and deny it; but I have a belief that it is true so your denial would only be self-serving — he passed and saw some of the youngsters piling the stones, helping themselves, and he told them not to do it, that is not for them — Let the Sports Council come and do it. That is not being public spirited.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I think that Senator Simmons ought to be a little tighter and certainly be a little more honest. I do not know if he can be. He said "on my way to the Labour College." If he is speaking about Durhams in St. Lucy or Connell Town in St. Lucy, where clearing of the area is going on, that is not on the route to the Labour College.

Secondly, if that was reported to him, it is an abominable lie.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Do not mind about "on the way to the Labour College." That was just for him to spring to his feet. He was sleeping. That is not the burden of my criticisms. The burden of my criticisms related to the report that came to the Council and was told to us at our last meeting that the former parliamentary representative stopped these youngsters from helping themselves in clearing the field.

I know that in politics people have a habit of putting things on you and telling lies, and I accept his denial, because in the Senate I would not expect anyone to come in here and tell a lie. I accept Senator Greaves' assurance that it never happened. If it was so, it would counter everything that we are trying to do, because we try to assist groups and let them assist themselves and meet us halfway.

3.10 p.m.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is this a point of order or a point of elucidation?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: A point of elucidation. You are talking about public spiritedness. I was not really going to say this, but just to indicate my involvement, I have personally made arrangements for football posts to be delivered to that same group of youngsters this week.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am grateful for that. We see how he is trying hard to win the seat again. He is starting to buy it from now.

I am only warming up, because I am going to be involved in the coming election campaign.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Simmons, you have only three minutes to warm up and cool down.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Well, Sir, you will have to come to St. Peter and see me really warm in the next couple of weeks.

I accept the honourable Member's assurances. He says that it never happened. But as I say, people can be mischievous in politics, especially the Dems, and if it has not happened we will just forget it.

I wish to encourage members who have interest in particular districts where there may be a Sports Council plant to try and involve the community and let them assist us. There are a number of self-help projects that have gone very well, best of all at Deacons, where the

residents down there raised their own money and erected their own lights, and recently in the Pine a similar thing has been done. We need more of this community involvement. Government can put down the super-structures, but Government cannot bring people out to use the premises every night and make sure that they are properly used, so we welcome this kind of community involvement.

I thought the time had come when some of the work of the Sports Council should be recorded in Hansard for posterity. I am much obliged to you, Sir.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Mr. Deputy President, I have great pleasure in supporting. I want to talk about people from the other side going about giving the impression that this Government is not doing anything for the youth of this country in the way of playing facilities.

I am well involved in sports from an administration point of view — I was formerly as a competitor — and I remember that in years gone by, some of us had to take part in games in very primitive conditions. The Democratic Labour Party was in power for fifteen years and, as far as I am concerned, they did very little to provide sporting facilities for the youth of this country. I would hate to think that they should take any credit for the stadium. The people who should take the credit are the Jaycees, because it was conceived by the Jaycees, and I regret very much that people do not remember that and give the Jaycees the credit which is due to them. I believe the stadium was allowed to fall in the condition in which it is in because of the indifference of the former Administration. They did not pay any attention to it. They may say that they built the netball stadium, that ill-conceived structure which was put up, and the very night an international tournament should have been coming off the workmen were still on the field building up certain parts of it.

Since 1976, as you have heard from Senator Simmons the Labour Party has built — I do not want to repeat them — a number of pavilions, playing fields and things like that. He forgot the one at Haynesville, which is known as Holders Hill, where there is a playing field and pavilion. I am appealing at this level to the people who are using these facilities to try and maintain them and care them as best as possible.

There is a very wicked approach by some people in the community who should know better, just for reasons best known to themselves, of not encouraging people in the communities to use the facilities in a proper manner. They get the impression, as they do in most things, that it is not their money, it is the Government's money. I do not know who is "the Government" and who is "they". The Government is all of us, and I hope that all of us will try to encourage the people in these communities to

use the facilities properly, because when they do that, the money that will be spent in refurbishing facilities could allow either the Cultural Foundation or the Sports Council to build new ones.

I should like to compliment both Ministries for the thrust which they have put into these facilities. I hope that they will continue this work, and I hope the public will recognise that it is the Barbados Labour Party which has seen the necessity to give the youth of this country proper playing facilities and cultural activities, counter to the impression that has been going around. There is a saying going around that impressions are greater than facts or truth, but I think in this case this is not impression, this is truth and reality.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I did not think that a Resolution to acquire land at Dash Valley in St. George would have provided an opportunity for a wide-ranging debate, but nevertheless that has taken place. I did not really intend to participate in the debate, but since Senator Simmons in a rather slimy way brought me into the debate, I should like to.....

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, Sir. It is true he may have eaten okras for lunch, but he must not now vomit out that kind of language. It is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, I agree with Senator Simmons that "slimy" is an unfortunate word to use, and I will ask you to withdraw it.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I agree, but I think it had the effect that I intended, and he fell down in it. I withdraw the word "slimy"; I will leave the slime for the platform, I will not bring it in here.

Since mention has been made of what the Barbados Labour Party has done about providing playing fields in this country, one has got the impression, having listened to that dissertation and the contribution by Senator Jemmott, that the Democratic Labour Party did absolutely nothing in this area. We even have Senator Jemmott making the statement relative to the National Stadium that we should not be misled into the view that the stadium was built by the Democratic Labour Party, but rather it was built by the Jaycees. I do not know that anybody in the Democratic Labour Party claimed that the stadium was built by the Democratic Labour Party. I think it is generally known that the National Stadium was built on lands I believe provided by the Government out of monies which the Jaycees collected from Radio Bingo.

However, in supporting Senator Simmons about the general state of disrepair which has overtaken the National Stadium, Senator Jemmott indicated that the deterioration of the National Stadium has been as a

result, and I quote of "the indifference of the former Administration." When a building is constructed, usually there is a period of time after the construction of that building that repairs are not normally done or expected to be done. I believe that repairs are hardly done on a new structure over maybe a five year period, apart from brushing up and painting.

3.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Excuse me, Senator Greaves. I am under the impression that the reference was to maintenance, not repairs.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Even maintenance. It was a new structure, even if we are talking about maintenance, there is usually a minimum period of five years before one finds that maintenance is required. Between 1970 - the stadium was built and opened in 1970, not 1972 - and 1976, the Democratic Labour Party held the reins of office in this country, which is a period of six years. But the Barbados Labour Party has held the reins of Government between 1976 and 1984, which is, I believe, a period in excess of six years. You would find that with buildings becoming ten years old, that in the latter part of that period they demand a greater degree of maintenance than you would expect on a building in the period early after its construction. So I do not think that it should come well from Senator Jemmott, if he understands the whole concept of maintenance of buildings - he worked at the National Housing Corporation and if he learnt anything from the sinecure which he held there, at least he ought to be able to appreciate these problems of maintenance.

In listening to Senator Simmons, I did not get the impression that he was in any way being critical of the Democratic Labour Party. And I do not think that it sounds good or that it is honest for Senator Jemmott to make the kind of statement and try to give the impression that the National Stadium is in the state that it is in now because of the gross indifference of the Democratic Labour Party. They in the Barbados Labour Party have had the reins of power for the last eight years and any deterioration of the stadium would have been as a result of a lack of attention by the Barbados Labour Party.

There are other reasons, too. The Stadium has had, because of the nature of its operations, to accommodate a whole set of other sporting activities for which it was not designed. In my view, these activities have contributed to the deterioration of the stadium. It is nothing to do with any particular Administration. I will be that generous and charitable to indicate that. You had the night cricket, you had all sorts of shows, you had Crop Over, and structures go on the ground, even on the track, which would have the effect of destroying the track.

I thought that we would be hearing now of maybe a Phase 2 in the development of the National Stadium,

because I think that anybody looking at the National Stadium would recognize that it is incomplete. We ought to be moving to upgrade the facilities, get them back in a presentable and proper manner, and certainly move to a point where we could maybe have better seating. The stands should be covered properly and an effort should really be made to develop it into an indoor stadium. We are talking of millions of dollars when we talk of that kind of thing. I would imagine that any Government would have to consider what would be devoted to particular areas of activity and the value of such things.

I think that Senator Jemmott's criticism was misplaced. He should really be criticizing himself if he wants somebody to criticize for the stadium.

The Chairman of the National Sports Council, Senator Simmons, took the opportunity to mention what the National Sports Council is doing in St. Lucy; mention was made of Durhams and Connell Town. I hope that Senator Simmons has had an opportunity to go and see the work which is being done there. I am sure he has not. I would suggest that he goes and look at the areas – and we will have a private discussion on those areas. He may be a little embarrassed. Certainly, the area at Durhams is an extremely small area. I am not too sure how much sporting activity can take place there. Maybe they can just get a football field in that particular area. I am a little disappointed with the choice of the site, because it is not really in the district – it is way outside of a district.

What I would have wanted to hear him address us on in relation to these two areas would be whether or not these two areas would be playing fields or whether community centres will be constructed on these areas. Based on what he said, with the kind of co-operation which is going on between the National Sports Council and the Ministry of Culture, hopefully I will see certainly in the Connell Town area, some provision made for a community centre in that particular area.

In the Durhams area, I do not think that is possible: They will possibly get changing facilities. It is a pity that the area is not sited more properly in a community – it is really on the outside of the community and there will be need for other development in that area. I would like to suggest to Senator Simmons that he does take a drive down there and see what is being done. I would not want you to be embarrassed about something about which you may not have been properly advised. 3.30 p.m.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I will go before the 22 November, probably twice. For Senator Greaves' benefit, the representation for those two playing fields, in Durhams and Connell Town, came to the Sports Council in the form of petitions, signed by people in the two areas. The matters

were fully discussed with the present representative of the parish and both places seem satisfactory to him. In addition to that, Mr. Winston Johnson, who is from St. Lucy and is on the Council, was asked as a member of the Building Committee to supervise those two playing fields.

I indicated when I was making my main speech that it is not every area that will have a community centre cum pavilion. Some will have a small thing like Wildey, which has a changing facility which meets the BCA requirements of a pavilion – it has enough space for two dressing rooms. Others will be a larger complex. I would say that in relation to the two alternatives, they will have to determine which one is preferable for the bigger development and certainly take into account Senator Greaves' representation as to Connell Town being more suitable for the larger one.

SENATOR MRS. G. READER: I should like to congratulate Senator Simmons on what he said. I understand about the National Sports self-help project. It was like when they put the hoses into the Nightengale Day Nursery, used up all the water to build the Belfield Centre and have not paid back the Child Care Board yet.

I should like that when the Dash Valley development is completed, he goes and take a look at the Ellerton playing field and see what condition it is in now. I do not think that very many people can play there. I understand it is holding water.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, we have a community centre at Ellerton and I think that the Ellerton problem is being addressed. It is being addressed, first of all, by the National Cultural Foundation, because it is not only the playing field – the centre itself was in a fairly bad condition. A tender was put out for a contract for some quite extensive works to be undertaken – I think it is between \$120 000 to \$150 000 – and I believe that the National Cultural Foundation will be awarding a contract for that. I know that in doing that the Foundation is going to put down seating so that the pavilion facility will be added to the centre. All of this will also be of interest to the National Sports Council.

I found a number of points made in the course of this debate of interest. When I heard Senator Greaves get up and say that in listening to the recitations of what the Barbados Labour Party had done, he got the impression that the Democratic Labour Party had done nothing, it immediately occurred to me that would be most unfair, because, to my knowledge, in the 15 years it did succeed in building some 11 hard courts, including the tennis court out at Lowthers, Christ Church, where people do not play tennis. I also believe they put up two pavilions in that time. But in the area of community development, I have been jotting down the number of community centres they built in the 15 years, and it is a very

impressive list, so it is not true to say that they have not done anything.

Senator Simmons made some very interesting points and I take fully what in fact may be termed strictures in relation to the delay of putting into action the policy of the joint conceptualization of facilities both for sport and other cultural aspects of community development. I really do believe that the delay in putting that conceptualization into work is in no small way related to the fact that people had really forgotten how to build community centres. I made the point sort of facetiously just now, but I am now making it seriously. If you go back to the community centres as they existed before, the community centre at Ellerton is built in conjunction with the sports facility. If you go to Gall Hill, St. John, or Grazettes, where there are sport facilities in the area, or Sargeants Village, to almost any part of the country where the Labour Party Administration before 1961 had been building community centres, you will find that the tendency was to put down a community centre and a playing field. So there was a facility that tended to cater to groups meeting, doing their drama and dance, and also playing sports.

We recognize that all communities do not need the same amount of size plant. Then, there are areas where a community might need a fairly large plant, but the availability of space may be such that you have to go into a small unit. If, for example, down in Western, St. James, we had the amount of land that we have in Rock Hall, St. Andrew, we could have gone in and put down a large facility. Instead, what you put down was a center which has about 1150 square feet on top and a similar amount of space downstairs, whereas you put down something under 100 square feet over at Rock Hall. But in each case, you will find that there is a good paved area for playing volleyball and other kinds of sports.

Senator Simmons made the point that only at Belfield is there a building that meets the criteria established in that manifesto commitment. I have to disagree, because the provision at Belfield for cultural use is too small, and that is the kind of problem you tend to run into when you do it that way. At Belfield, you got a lot of mileage for the money you spent, I do not think that is money at all badly spent, but the problem there was that X dollars were available and consultation did not take place between us and them. Otherwise, for another \$30 000 or \$40 000 we could have had precisely the unit that would have met all of the requirements.

3.40 p.m.

I noticed that Senator Simmons took credit for the hard court at Boscobelle. It is his now, but we put it down. He should also take credit for the pavilion, because when we did those, we did them for him. We did not do them to keep them, we did them as part of the joint conceptualisation. Why we did it in

Boscobelle that way is interesting, because our consultations with the community revealed that the community wanted the centre located where it is, which is not an appropriate place for locating the pavilion and the court. Therefore, we decided to put the centre on one side and the pavilion on the other side.

I mentioned this because in carrying out this conceptualisation of the joint approach, we are from time to time going to end up with split units. At Ellerton, where the pavilion is already on the west side, it is going to be easy to just add on the pavilion arrangement, but very often we are going to end up with split units, because what the community says is going to have to be taken into consideration, and it is going to have to dictate a lot.

This leads me to the general point of vandalism. What we have found in the Ministry of Culture is that if the facility is appropriate for cultural use, it is very heavily used and then people protect that facility, and we have not of late been getting any reports whatever about vandalism. There is the identification of the community with the facility, and one of the things which I may as well say here now, but which I was going to propose more formally to the Ministry of Labour and therefore to the Council, is that we should do an appraisal of every pavilion and see whether it is so located in relation to the community that it serves and if it can in fact be converted into a centre. At Sion Hill, we have arrangements for the joint use without any difficulty. It has now been established that that facility is too small, so it is going to have to be expanded to provide about 500 square feet more, and that is what is probably going to happen. At Eden Lodge, I have no doubt that we are going to have to expand the facility there. It is in a rather bad state of disrepair, but we will have to expand it to enable it to be used for wider general community purposes. I think that if we can do this, that that is halfway home in terms of licking the problem of vandalism.

I now want to make a plea to Senator Simmons on behalf of someone who shall be nameless. I heard him in the list mention hard courts at Pleasant Hall, and I know that there is some representation which will be made for a similar facility to be provided for the Bay Land area, because you see we have to think not only in terms of when people actually live in the Bay Land, but when people move perhaps from one place like Pleasant Hall to the Bay Land and the growth factor in the district that comes with that. The visiting element perhaps will sometimes create a demand for facilities a little greater than is always apparent to the eye.

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

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I move that Senator Linton be Chairman of Committees for the day.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I beg to second that.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

AIRPORT SERVICE CHARGE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, I think this has been certified as a money Bill, so there is no need to go into Committee on this one.

This is a very simple Bill. It goes back to the 1984 Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals in which the Minister of Finance stated that airport charges should be constantly reviewed to ensure that the operating costs of maintenance and the provision of various services at the airport, which are estimated at being in excess of \$12 million, are recovered, and that the airport pays for itself over a number of years.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith, may I interrupt you for a minute? It has just been drawn to my attention that these Bills which appear on the Order Paper have not been read a first time. I was under the impression that I had asked that they be recorded as having been read a first time. If that is not the understanding, then I do so now, and ask the Clerk to record that these Bills have been read a first time. It has been done.

The amendment principally is a follow up to the proposals made in the Budget in which the Departure Tax has been increased from \$12 to \$16, with effect from the 1st June, 1984. The opportunity was also taken to amend the ages of the dependents who are eligible for exemption from airport Departure Tax, from 21 to 18 in accordance with the provision of the Minors Act, Cap. 215.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. Deputy President, I support this Bill. I have no objection to the Government and the Minister of Finance raising funds via Departure Tax. However, I believe there are a few points that should be considered.

As a tourist you are unaware that it is necessary to pay a Departure Tax — there is no sign to that effect at Grantley Adams Airport when you arrive. It is only after you check in your bags that all of a sudden \$16 is demanded of you. I think it should be mandatory that all the airlines place signs at their counters stating that,

according to the law, you have to pay a Departure Tax of \$16, so that at least the people will have their money ready. It can be a big surprise. A lot of them do not have the Barbadian currency, and I am aware the airlines do not even have any change — they never keep any — so I think that that is required.

Government should also consider whether to include this charge in the ticket. Certainly I can see no problem with journeys originating in Barbados. I believe there may be a little collection problem, or it may be a little slow to come in if you did it if the ticket did not originate in Barbados, but it would also reduce the problem at the airport of collection. If it was done by the travel agencies, there would be no real necessity for any Barbadian travelling who has his ticket issued here in Barbados to have to take another \$16 when he gets to the airport, because most of us going away carry no real Barbadian currency with us. In fact, there is a law now that if you take out more than \$200 Barbadian currency, you can get locked up.
3.50 p.m.

Once there was a law that you could take as much Barbadian currency, but now you cannot take more than \$200 out with you. This also needs a little looking at, because in all honesty, when you come back and the Customs demand money — they say they do not take any U.S. money or they do not take any pounds — what are you going to do? I just came back from England and I had to fork out \$380 for duty, and when I told them that I did not have any Barbadian money on me, they said "Give me a cheque". We cannot take any U.S. or we cannot take any pounds. Basically I would have been in trouble, because my duty was \$380 and the law said I should not have taken out more than \$200. As it was, I did not take out any at all, so that I think that wants looking into.

I think what is really needed is some display area at the airport. It is a good way of collecting money. I do not see anything wrong with it. The airport is losing a lot of revenue which it could have by not having this. You have a big departure concourse. Why not allow some of the motor car agents here to display motor cars for sale there at a charge, or even allow some of our local manufacturers to display some of their projects there. We see that in many airports, and we have a long building there and there is lots of space.

Another thing is our Immigration. You are going through and the desk is right behind the door — only one person is allowed in at a time — and then there is another one at the corner of the door with a very heavy spring about to knock you out. I do not see any real reason why Immigration should be in any Departure Lounge. I believe that they could be accommodated outside so that the people could walk around and shop and do other things. When you have finished checking with Immigration, you can be given a card which would not allow

you to go into the Departure Lounge until you surrender that card, so that you would not be allowing the wrong people in there. So rather than having Immigration squeeze you up between the two doors, bring the Immigration outside and avoid a lot of the congestion that is taking place there right now.

The last time I went away, the plane was delayed for two hours, so I sat down in the Departure Lounge and I wondered what to do about Barbados again encouraging some kind of shops. Everybody was just sitting down and looking up into the air. There was nothing there. We should have a lot of shops. Government is attempting to maximize rents, but it should be attempting to maximize jobs. By having another 30 shops there, 120 or more jobs could be created overnight inside that Departure Lounge. Barbadians would rent the little kiosks and man them; and those shops have to be manned for nearly 24 hours, so you have to have a lot of shifts in there. So when a person gets one, it would create a couple of jobs very well, because one man cannot stay from morning until night. I think we could have a lot of shops.

Our own local handicraft is stuck up in the end. We are encouraged to buy duty-free items that are imported, but our own handicraft, made here by our own local people, is hidden at the far end.

One of the problems is that that airport was designed by Canadian architects, I think, probably good architects, but you ought to think Barbadian down here. They gave you a building and you said "yes", but it needs refinement now, and I think this is the time to look at it. As a tourist in there, you have foreign currency, and we should try to get every cent out of them — do not let them leave Barbados with anything at all — and we should have better shopping facilities within that Departure Lounge.

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

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I beg that the Bill be not committed.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I beg to second that.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 2 was called — To move the First Reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Act, Cap. 66.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, as a result of representations made by interested parties in the Barbados Chamber of Commerce, the Barbados Manufacturers Association, and a few others, the Government set up a committee some time ago after the Import Licencing Review Committee met to look at certain serious problems affecting the importation and sale of goods in the country.

I had the honour to be made chairman, I think we had one meeting, but the committee was very broad-based. It had representation from the Chamber of Commerce in the person of the President, Mr. Philip Goddard; a representative from the Commissioner of Police; the President of the Barbados Manufacturers Association, Mr. Frank DaSilva; the acting Comptroller of Customs; the Chief Price Control Officer, a representative of the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

The committee had certain terms of reference and among them were: to investigate complaints from members of the public, manufacturers and retailers in relation to the illegal importation of goods, to investigate complaints relating to false invoicing, to investigate complaints relating to the Caricom Rules of Origin, and to make recommendations to the Government on matters relating to the operation of the import licensing system.

The work of the committee has not ended, and there a lot of activity is going on to try to stop the problem which has really caused some difficulty — I call it a devastation — in this country. I had to refer to these matters in a statement I made when the committee first sat. I spoke about this illegal activity which has done untold damage to this country through the massive loss of revenue to Government and loss of sales by legitimate manufacturing concerns, causing layoffs, which affected the lives of those people who had to feel the axe in the private sector. There were closures at some businesses because of lost opportunities for sales, thus creating financial hardships for the entrepreneurs themselves and, in fact, having an adverse effect on the capital formation of the country, because these people who operate in this kind of way clearly have no overheads. Their interest simply is to import goods, pay off who they have to pay off and sell their goods on the local market or, indeed, in some cases, re-export them in the CARICOM region as having been originally manufactured in a CARICOM country. 4.00 p.m.

This has created all kinds of problems. I have sat in several CARICOM meetings and we have had wranglings over this activity. I like to call the money generated from that kind of activity 'blood money', that is what essentially it is. You have a few unscrupulous, really unscrupulous, people engaged in this practice for their own personal gain, without care about the damage that

they have done and are doing to people in the country and the country as a whole.

The Bill which is before us to amend the Customs Act seeks to provide an increase in the maximum fine that may be imposed under Section 13 of the Act. The fine now goes to \$100 000, or three times the value of the goods, whichever is the greater, or imprisonment for a term of two years, or both. The Bill spells out a situation which would occasion that kind of penalty.

It is no good if we are going to have the legislation and we cannot get enough evidence, enough proof to support the allegations that are made. I remember hearing from members on the committee that they had calls from people saying they know who is doing this and they know who is doing that, and when you ask them to identify themselves, they preferred not to identify themselves. So it is not helpful. I think that we all owe it to ourselves and to the country that if the perpetrators of this kind of dastardly behaviour is known, we really bring them to justice. The Government may legislate and determine penalties, as for drug abuse and the use and possession of hard drugs, where you provide penalties that are deterrents, but the objective is to get people to be responsible citizens and try to provide some hard evidence in support for the Government and the people of Barbados really to put a stop to this thing.

This is not only going to benefit the economy, and while some people may feel it is going to help the Government, it is not really helping the Government. If we can wipe out some of the vagabonds who live very well in this country and other CARICOM territories, and who live this way at the expense of hardworking businessmen who put in their sweat, tears, capital and who employ people, then the economy will benefit. These people function above the law, and we need to get together and try to root out this kind of evil practice in the society.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Mr. Deputy President, it is my considered opinion that the companies in Barbados breaking these regulations at the present moment or in the past have not been companies that are owned by Barbadians, born and bred, and therefore I wonder whether instead of having a monetary penalty, we should not have a penalty of a revocation of their residential status and an immediate sending out of the guilty proprietors. I think that would be more meaningful since you cannot get around that so easy. That is the penalty that we should really have.

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. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, SENATOR H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

THE MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984

Order No. 3 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Miscellaneous Controls Act, Cap. 329.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. President, this Bill is a companion measure to the previous Bill that was amended, and the point that was made by Senator Seale before is well made.

There is a new clause in this Bill which will go a long way towards assisting in dealing with the people who are perpetrators of the kind of activity that is reeking so much havoc on the community. For instance, in this Bill a new Section 14A gives the Minister the power to authorise in writing a public officer so that he may enter and inspect the premises in search of these kinds of goods, and in effect put the burden of proof on the owners of the goods. That is very important, because this was not the case before, hence the provisions for forfeiture under the Customs Act and the power to inspect and seize should be deterrent factors.
4.10 p.m.

The whole point at issue to me is not only the size of the penalty but also, the ability to gather evidence. So whether you provide for revocation of citizenship or heavy fines, the most important point is – hard evidence. I think that this new Section 14 (A) is one means of being able to acquire the hard evidence which may help in trying to solve some of the problems.

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

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I support this Bill grudgingly, not because I have any objection to the increasing of the penalties for contravening the Act. As far as I am concerned, I as a businessman, have no intention of breaking the law. So whether you have a penalty of

\$1 000, \$10 000 or \$1 million, it does not really mean anything to me. This Act, however, stands in the way of progress; it causes serious damage to business viability in Barbados, it generates unemployment and it assassinates small business.

Before I get into the meat of it, I want you to understand, that this Act is the baby of the Democratic Labour Party. The darling of that party, because although it has been here a long time, its viciousness only came to the fore between 1971 and 1976. That is why I am amazed now to hear the former Minister of Trade talking about bankruptcies and lay-offs. This gentleman, within hours of being appointed the Minister of Trade, let it be known that he was declaring war on all merchants in Barbados, and that the day of the one day establishment and its methodology was long gone and should be forgotten. Through this Act, he proceeded to close down four hundred and fifty small shops and about twenty businesses in Roebuck Street. In fact, he can be credited with getting rid of food from Roebuck Street.

I would not like to call any names, Sir. I could call so many names that it would get to you. There were DLP businesses, too, because I recall that one of those businesses belonged to the then Chairman of the BMC. As his parting gift to Roebuck Street, he put some bounced cheques on the BMC and left with their money.

What is also interesting is to see that the Shadow Minister of Finance has now appointed himself as the Messiah of the private sector. He is now talking for us. He is now telling us where to buy goods. He is saying, "Go to Europe." I have a little news for him. My rice has been coming out of Europe since six or seven months ago. The price is nice and it is the best selling. Let him know that.

However, it is not him that I am really worried about. I am worried over the mark-ups that are permitted under this Act for prices that are controlled. I notice that in all the fulminations about the private sector by the former Government, they have not said a word about price controls. They have not said a word about increasing mark-ups to assist business.

There are some mark-ups in here that have been in existence since 1972. A porter got \$12 a week. A gallon of gasoline was thirty-six cents. And you are working on those same mark-ups. Do you understand that a wholesaler is allowed three cents a tin gross profit on evaporated milk and a retailer ten cents a tin? Do you understand that a small shopkeeper in Black Bess, St. Peter, would have to sell three hundred tins of evaporated milk in a day to make \$30. He cannot sell that amount in a day. It is ridiculous!

In Barbados, at the moment only basic food items which are covered by this Act are under control, and they

are under control at suicidal mark-ups. I can give you a list of them: five cents a pound on sugar and the empty bag costs eleven cents; four cents on macaroni. That is the type of mark-up.

I worked out that the Master Mart, the biggest supermarket in the island, would have to sell 560 000 tins of evaporated milk to pay its electricity bill. The electricity bill has gone all over the world. It has gone up in space. I do not know what has gone wrong. One thing I would agree with the Shadow Minister of Finance with is that you have to look at that. You have to look at the Light and Power Company. After all, Carlton's electric bill was \$4 000 a month in 1979. We have the same place and it is now \$12 000. Where is the \$8 000 to come from, the three cents a tin that we are getting on evaporated milk? It cannot do!

Chicken. We hear: "Buy local, help local!" Do you understand that this Act legislates against my company carrying one pound of chicken? Do you understand that I cannot carry a chicken in my store? I can carry imported chicken wings, imported chicken backs, but I cannot carry a local chicken, because, by this Act, I have to buy it at \$2.60 per pound and sell it at \$2.60 per pound. I do not know where in the world you could buy and sell at the same price and exist. Do you know the retail price that is allowed to the retailers? Twenty cents per pound, an average of sixty cents on a chicken! You have to sell something like 300 chickens to make the wage of one cashier. It is a ridiculous situation!

But what is even more ridiculous is that under this Act, the retailer gets a 30 per cent mark-up for backs and necks, a 25 per cent mark-up for imported wings and a 7 per cent mark-up for local chicken. Where are we? How can we talk about unemployment?

This Act, perpetrated on the Barbados Labour Party by the Democratic Labour Party, has ensured in the last several months that 1 500 people have gone home; and in the next two months, unless something is done about it, another 1 500 will be going home. You cannot exist under this Act. This covers televisions. It covers everybody. It covers gasoline gas attendants. It covers furniture, appliances, motors cars. All of them are being sold at below the cost of operation of the business. We cannot continue in that way.

I want the Government to get out of that old idea, get out of this Act. Look at it good. Look at it meaningfully and come to grips with the situation. If you are going to control somebody, control. I do not mind them controlling, I am not against controlled prices, because, in all honesty, you do not have any problem. When the ban comes in, nobody asks you about getting something off a controlled price or telling you that it is five cents cheaper down the road, so controls are all right. But let us have

mark-ups that are fair and reasonable to the cost of the operation of the business. That is what we want.

There are some half-baked economists in this island — I think the former Prime Minister used to use those words — telling you that when interest rates go up, you reduce your inventory, you reduce your receivables and all of a sudden you are back to normal, you are easy, you are cool. Let me tell you something. Any efficient business in Barbados keeps its inventory at a minimum, its receivables current. So when you increase the interest rates, as we had in the last couple of months, you increase the cost of operating the business, because the only way to offset that is to create more sales. If you create more sales, you have to create more inventory, and you have to create more receivables, and therefore it costs you more money.

I believe that if Government would see the wisdom of dropping interest rates immediately by three per cent, we will then see cash flow flowing in to businesses in Barbados. Take one of the big businesses in town, Cave Shepherd, a public company, I think their borrowing is in the vicinity of \$10 million to \$12 million. Do you know that a three per cent drop in the interest rates would immediately put \$30 000 into their cash flow every month? That would immediately keep at least forty people more employed inside of the place. That is the type of thing we want. So we have got to talk about removing the controls on personal credit. We have got to talk about removing the distributive sector if we are to recover in this — and we have to.
4.20 p.m.

There is another thing under this Act — this is the application or method of arriving at a price. I believe sometimes we are in Russia, because I will tell you how it is done. Let us take a local manufacturer, a feed company, his raw materials and labour go up. He goes to the Ministry of Consumer Affairs. He puts his case. The Minister of Consumer Affairs, after a few meetings, sitting down and laughing a little bit, agrees finally. But what else? No wholesaler, nor retailer is called in. No increase in labour cost goes to a wholesaler or retailer. No increase in electric rates goes to a wholesaler or retailer as far as that Ministry is concerned. You have got to really do something about it. You have got to straighten up, because it is threatening the viability of business in Barbados.

In 1978, when many more items were controlled, Minister Bolden at that time, Sir, took the bull by the horns and removed controls from many items, and that gave us back a certain amount of viability. However, the recession has come and made the basics the kings. Basics are the only things selling, so you have got 40 per cent of your turnover at 3 per cent. It is impossible to live, it is impossible to make a dollar, and I feel that the

Government, rather than come out amending penalties, should talk about revoking the whole Act, get rid of it, and let some prosperity return to Barbados.

President Reagan has now got the United States as the most prosperous place in the world because he brought the interest rate from 22 per cent down to 12 per cent and put the cash back into businesses in the United States. That is why I believe, without a doubt, that on November 6 he is going to landslide home. I believe that if this Government does not do anything, the Government is going to invite disaster, lawlessness, and poverty. I hope you know what that stands for — disaster, lawlessness, and poverty!

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I did not expect that this Bill would have generated so much heat, but then I forgot Senator Seale was a member of this Senate and was present, and has more than a vested interest in the Miscellaneous Controls Act, Cap. 329, which was passed in Parliament, the commencement date being the 1st October, 1970. I seem to recall that in his presentation he indicated that the then Senator Brandford Taitt, who became a Minister in the Democratic Labour Party Administration in September 1971, was responsible for bringing this bit of legislation to the fore and operating it. I want it understood very clearly that the Bill commenced on 1st October, 1970.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: If he did not say that, I am glad for the clarification.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I did not say that. Sir, on a point of order, I said that this Act was in effect before he was appointed Minister of Trade. But he livened it up and really went to town on it. That is what I said.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Let us look at what the Act says so to do. It says in the Introduction:

"An Act to make provisions for the prohibition or restriction of the exportation and importation of goods and for the control and regulation of the production of vegetables and the keeping of live-stock and of the price of goods generally."

One can see that this Act has a lot of objectives in it. I do not believe that Senator Seale would have much of a problem in supporting a number of the provisions of the Act. It seems as if his quarrel has to do with the control of prices of goods generally.

Let us put this matter in its proper perspective, bearing in mind that Senator Seale says that this Act assassinates the business community. He used all sorts of violent, emotive language in describing the Act, and by inference, and even direct statement, indicated that this is the most wicked bit of legislation that has ever been perpetrated in this country — and that it was perpetrated by the Democratic Labour Party.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: On a point of order, Sir. I did not describe it as "the most wicked Act."

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I said that, by the use of the emotive and violent language, he indicated that this was the most wicked

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I understand. I do not think that Senator Greaves said that he said that it was wicked. He is inferring from it and I really find no harm in that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Precisely, I know you understand the English language quite well. I sympathize with Senator Seale.

Let us look at the provisions of the Act. I think one has to be very dispassionate about this. I know that Senator Seale cannot be dispassionate about it because he feels that he has been hurt particularly hard by this Act. It says that the "Minister may make regulations for maintaining and controlling or regulating the supply of goods or services so as to

- (a) secure a sufficiency of those essential to the wellbeing of the community their equitable distribution and their availability at a fair price."

In the name of all that is reasonable and just, could Senator Seale have any quarrel with this particular objective as outlined in this particular bit of legislation? The mere fact that the Barbados Labour Party has not been able or would not touch the fundamental principles involved in this bit of legislation is an indication that they recognize that the Government has a role in this community in ensuring that rapacious businessmen — maybe Senator Seale might fall in that group — do not exploit the community in the way they would exploit the community if there was no legislation in place to bring some measure of control, reason, and justice to the whole pricing system in this country.

It also says that it would:

- "(b) seek to regulate exports and imports in a manner calculated to serve the interests of the community and
- (c) ensure generally that the resources available to the community are used in a manner calculated to serve the interests of the community."

It says the resources available to the community are used in a manner calculated to serve the interest of the community — not the interest of the businessmen. The businessmen from part of the community, but they cannot expect to

get everything. They must also recognize that they have a role in ensuring that the resources of this community are used in the interest of the community.

Since Senator Seale was the person who is making the attack, I will have to deal with him. Senator Seale seems to think that as a businessman he must have all the advantage, he must be able to exploit the community. This Bill is designed to prevent Senator Seale and his likes from exploiting this community. I have absolutely no quarrel with the Bill. Anybody who has any philosophy of life must appreciate the aims and objectives which are contained in this bit of legislation.
4.30 p.m.

Senator Seale has indicated that as a result of the Miscellaneous Controls Act, some 1 500 workers have lost their jobs over the last seven months. Maybe he would like to deny this. I certainly am not in possession of the unemployment figures in Barbados over the last seven months. I know that unemployment is very high, because if you drive around the country and see the number of people who are callously walking around and sitting around the corners, you would recognise that unemployment is very high in this country.

I also know that a number of people have lost their jobs in the hotel industry. I am not too sure whether the Miscellaneous Controls Act of 1970 has any particular application to what goes on in the tourist industry, particularly in the hotels, whether this Act controls pricing in the hotels or, generally speaking, in the tourist sector. As a matter of fact, I would make bold to say that the Act certainly does not exert any control in that particular area. I also know that hundreds of people have lost their jobs as a result of the downturn in the manufacturing sector, and I do not think that this particular Act has anything to do with basically what goes on in the industries and the production costs in the manufacturing sector in any real way. So when Senator Seale gets up and tries to suggest that as a result of this Act and as a result of this "wicked" Democratic Labour Party we are now placed in this position, 1 500 people having been sent home, and that if something is not done very soon disaster would befall this place, I say that disaster will befall this place whether or not something is done to the Miscellaneous Controls Act unless the Barbados Labour Party Government changes its course. It is a fact that the policies pursued by the Barbados Labour Party Administration has brought this country to the brink of disaster. There have been layoffs all over the country and almost economic standstill, bankruptcies up and down the country — nothing to do with the Miscellaneous Controls Act.

The Prime Minister himself recently has had to admit to what a number of people who have been ob-

serving the performance of the economy, and particularly the effect of the measures which he has instituted in the tourist industry, have been calling for — some kind of relief in that area. They were particularly pointing to the impact of utilities on the industry, and for years the Prime Minister turned a deaf ear to those calls. It was only last week that some sense seemed to have got into his head, and he made just a token move in the direction of alleviating some of the difficulties.

I do not believe that the utilities and their impact on the business community have anything to do with the Miscellaneous Controls Act. Senator Seale talked about the impact of interest rates. I have been in this Honourable Chamber like someone crying in the wilderness, not being able to get any support from the likes of Senator Seale, trying to impress upon the Government the deleterious effects of a high interest rate on the business community. Senator Seale sat down and never said a word in support of that position, because it was a position which was coming from a spokesman of the Democratic Labour Party, and he does not feel, it seems, that he ought to be critical of the Government in areas in which they should be criticised — he is supportive of everything they do. But now Senator Seale's chickens are coming home to roost. Maybe his business is on the verge of bankruptcy, like a lot of others, and he is now beginning to feel the pinch and see the wisdom of the positions which have been taken by the Democratic Labour Party on a number of these issues which he has identified as affecting adversely the business community of Barbados.

Interest rates, as far as I can see, are not controlled by the Miscellaneous Controls Act, and I believe that the impact of interest rates in this country has probably been one of the most harmful things on the business community. The interest rates have been set by the Barbados Labour Party Administration. The last time, maybe about a year or so ago, the interest rates were raised, the Government said they had to raise the interest rates because they wanted to stop the flight of capital from this country, and they wanted to attract more people to come in and invest in Barbados.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President. Unless Senator Greaves is prepared to produce the evidence that Government said it wanted to stop the flight of capital from this country, I believe he should be prepared not to make these reckless statements and mislead the House. I absolutely do not know of any Government statement to that effect and it is a very dangerous statement, the likes of which always come from the Democratic Labour Party platform. 4.40 p.m.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The interest rates in this country have done more harm to the business community than any other single problem which the business

community has been confronted with, and it was the Barbados Labour Party Administration which was responsible for the high interest rates which we are now forced to endure, about which Senator Seale now finds it convenient to talk about and to be calling on the Government to reduce these interest rates.

As far as the statement from the Government and the flight of capital and, at the same time, encouraging foreign investment is concerned, you can check with the Governor of the Central Bank about that statement. They said that more capital would remain and come into Barbados as a result of the high interest rates. I want to find out whether or not the position taken by Government on that particular matter has been justified.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President; whereas in the first situation where the Honourable Senator is clearly misleading the Senate, he now seeks to hide behind the Governor of the Central Bank. I am to go and ask the Governor of the Central Bank about that, as though the Governor of the Central Bank talked about the flight of capital!

I am sure that the honourable Senator is fully aware that when he talks about the flight of capital from a country, he is talking about loss of confidence and movement of money out of the economy. He ought, if he is not totally unaware of the implications of these things, therefore to take stock before he misleads the Honourable Chamber on the point, and it is extremely important that he does not mislead this Chamber by attributing Government statements that have never been made by the Government.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, the accuracy of your statement has been challenged, and I hope that you would feel able to make an appropriate reference to give us.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I do not have the reference at hand. You would not expect me to have the reference at hand at this point, but certainly this can be checked. The interest rates came in because they were introduced into this debate by Senator Seale.

If you were to go a little further into the general objectives of the Act, it talks about regulating the distribution, purchase or sale of goods of any class or description of goods, and controlling and regulating the prices at which goods or any class or description of goods may be sold whether by wholesale or retail. I believe this is where Senator Seale has his problem. I believe that this particular aspect of the legislation is one which can be adjusted from time to time to suit particular circumstances and particular difficulties, and for Senator Seale to make the kind of broadside which he launched on the

Miscellaneous Controls Act, I believe that is really misplaced and certainly uncalled for.

He referred to the United States of America and the fact that President Reagan has introduced his freewheeling capitalism where everything goes without any controls and.....

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Senator Linton asked me if I am a communist. I am going to put it in the Record.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would you like to reply to that question outside of this debate?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: No. It has gone into the debate under *sotto voce* remarks, so I will reply to it. He asked me if I am a communist.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Linton did not address the Chair. I have taken no notice of his remarks.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, for your benefit, I am not a communist.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am sure we are all grateful for that assurance.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: That may be more than what Senator Barrow may be able to say, probably because of his past record.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President; this is now a direct unparliamentary slur. If Senator Greaves is able to substantiate it then, I suppose, the comment can stand, but otherwise, I must insist that it be withdrawn. I thought at first he was saying that I was in no position to say that he was not a communist, with which I would agree.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Neither am I in a position to say whether he is still one or not. Anyhow, let us go on.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I consider the remarks withdrawn. Let us go on.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, they are withdrawn.

On the subject of free-wheeling capitalism, I believe that there are a number of good points in capitalism, but I believe that capitalism has to be controlled. This is the point of view from which I am speaking and, certainly,

this is the point of view which is addressed by this Miscellaneous Controls Act. I do not think that we want to have in this country a situation where anything goes, where businessmen can charge whatever they want for whatever they are offering for sale. I am very sorry, Senator Seale, I would hope that I would not live to see that day. That would be a good day for you. That sort of thing happened in the days when the people of your likes were in control of this country politically and economically. You are still in control of the country economically, and you wield tremendous political power, but I would hope that the pressures which are brought to bear on the political decision makers by the business community, the likes of Senator Seale, would not see us giving way and, as it were, falling down on these particular provisions which are controlled in this particular bit of legislation.

I believe that if there is any call for some kind of consideration being given to removing controls, the particular point can be made, and can be made more effectively and rationally, than the emotional and very personal position which has been taken on this particular bit of legislation. I know that when Senators are speaking on matters in which they are personally involved and from which they would derive a direct benefit, it is very difficult for them to be dispassionate. I can very well understand that, but one ought to be able to try to bring some measure of objectivity to discussions. I try at all times to bring some measure of objectivity in my approach, particularly when it comes — outside of the political matters — to things relating to workers and workers' welfare and this kind of thing.

4.50 p.m.

I am in total disagreement with Senator Seale as far as his call for the removal of this Act from the Statute Book is concerned, but I agree with him that the policies which have been pursued by the Barbados Labour Party Administration, policies of high utility rates, high interest rates, and no particular care for the impact which taxation measures, direct and indirect, have had on the business community and on the community generally, have certainly led to the present crisis in this country. If we are not careful and if something is not done almost immediately, it can lead to the kind of situation which Senator Seale has described, and which, in my interpretation, would suggest he is warning that if we are not careful we can have riots in this place.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, this is not a Bill that I anticipated being a contributor to, listening as I was to the positions being put between a classical free marketer and a classical price controller, but there are a couple of points which have been made, to which I have to reply, and I am not referring to points about communism or my

past associations, because everybody knows that my past associations were with the Democratic Labour Party. Perhaps that does make me a communist, but, by the same logic, it would certainly make Senator Greaves one.

If we are going to speak about business and operations within the parameters of this Miscellaneous Controls Act, I believe there are a certain number of truths that have to be told. We can either choose to go down the road and follow some theory or we are going to face certain obvious realities. There are people in this country who live below what the economists call – it is a term very often used by American economists, but it is used by all economists – “below the poverty line”, and it is because of that that in every enlightened country there are some forms of relief brought to such people. Whether you are going to use food-stamps to supplement their real income, or whether you are going to look at a basket of essentials, a basket of necessary items, and put controls on these items in order to ensure that they are still within the reach of people who live below the poverty line, whatever the approach, there is need for the society to look after its very poor, and that is what we attempt to do through the Miscellaneous Controls Act.

Having said that, I believe that the other side also has to be looked at. If our interpretation of the operations of that Act, and our application therefore, could be one that the target should be what Senator Greaves calls rapacious businessmen, we are likely to go overboard and overlook the fact that there is nothing in a society which causes us greater frustration and which is so debilitating as joblessness. Everytime we lose jobs, it costs me sleep. If we have to use that Act so to fetter and control business that the profit margins then become very narrowly proscribed, we are going to be using that Act to put people out of work. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind about this.

So there is room for the operation of this Act in order to make things affordable to the very poor in the community. There is also the need to apply the Act that we recognise that if businesses do not make money, they cannot employ people; and if they cannot employ people, then the larger social problem of joblessness is created. I therefore find myself sympathising with some of what each of the two Senators have said.

I cannot overlook, however, the fact that within the cast of the Miscellaneous Act, two things emerge very prominently, one is the machinery for the control of prices and the other one is the machinery for licences. I believe that a reasonable approach to the control of prices is the approach which this Government adopts, which is that we have taken a whole lot of items completely off price control – there are other forms of monitoring of such price control – and we have reserved them on the

basket items which we consider necessities for the poor man to make his way. I therefore do not believe that the perils of business are going to be avoided by interfering with that small number of items.

Senator Seale was at pains to point out how many tins of evaporated milk he would have to sell. He was not, of course, at pains to point out what percentage of his stock would be represented by the evaporated milk or by the totality of price controlled items.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: On a point of order, I mentioned that 40 per cent of our sales, supermarket and retail, were in controlled items, Sir. I mentioned 40 per cent.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Forty per cent of sales in the supermarket in 1984, I am told, are in price controlled items. It looks like we are going to have to look at that list, because certainly the information which we frequently receive on an ongoing basis indicates that so much of the foolishness that used to be on price control has been removed that if Senator Seale's statistics are correct, it would mean that before 1976 pretty close to 100 per cent of the sales would have had to be price controlled items.
5.00 p.m.

(SENATOR C. D. SEALE: About 80 per cent).

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: These are the circumstances under which I can understand some of the fire with which he speaks, because I did not believe that in a free society there was ever a time when anybody could have had anything like 50 per cent of the items on the price control list, far less 80 per cent. Therefore, with so much being taken off, I certainly thought that we were now having not more than 20 per cent of items on the list.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I stressed that I have nothing against price controls. What I stressed is that the mark-ups are still at the 1962 levels. I said that the mark-ups are so low on these now that they have not taken care of 1984 costs.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I thought that most of the mark-ups were percentage mark-ups. If the mark-ups were percentage mark-ups, then the point would perhaps be a different point. But if they are absolute money mark-ups, well then perhaps you want a different point with sufficient background of fact to take Senator Seale on, on a point by point basis, in his argument.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I overheard an aside by Senator Greaves that he made most of his money before 1976. This is something I hope Senator Greaves would say a little more often on the platforms and not only in here, because we are used to hearing from the platforms of the Democratic Labour Party that it is the big people making the money now, when we know that the reverse is true. It is the small man who now has an opportunity once more.

The other point which I wanted to address is that in the cast of this Bill, we find the legal machinery for a system of licences. This is something about which I feel extremely strongly. In every country that I know of, where a system of licences is operated, it has been the avenue for corruption on a grand scale. That explains why, as a Government, we dismantled the licensing machinery. That explains why it is that you do not have to go to the Minister and get a licence to import cement, not under this Administration. It explains why weird people and strange birds do not get licences to import cement. It explains why you do not have to do a deal with a fellow merchant in order to get some potatoes because somebody else has the licences to import all the potatoes. It explains why you can go and buy a local ham and if hams are allowed in at Christmas — I do not think that they have to be now because I think we are self-sufficient — you do not have to know who to go to get a ham as before, because you had to know who had the licences. The people who operate licensing systems have always made money out of licensing systems, and it is an unfortunate block upon the public life of this country when we move to any system of licensing imports.

I want to make it absolutely clear that while I must support machinery that operates to make a basket of goods available for those below the poverty line, I am not in any way going to support the application of policies which drive people out of business and therefore cause a loss of jobs. I also want to make it clear that even if we do not want to believe it, the record is there that if you start driving businesses out of operation, the first businesses that fail are the small businesses. So you either create a healthy climate within which business will operate and employment will be created, or else you may as well move to the business of seeking to control the economy in the way in which it is done in communist countries. There really is not a half-way house. If you want to know what happens in this so-called half-way house, look at the economy of Guyana and you will find out. You destroy the climate, you destroy the initiative, and then you still expect employment generation activities within a private sector.

To give an example of what I am talking about, when I talk about not having too many items under control, we must look also to the fact that too widely applied price control also generates the climate in which

prices are kept artificially high. If your sale of corned beef is likely to be 100 tins, there is no point in importing corned beef at \$2.00 and get, if the mark-up is a percentage mark-up, 10 per cent of \$2.00, if you can find it at \$3.00 and get 10 per cent on \$3.00. If we look at the price of corned beef in 1984, the brands that were available, and not freely available either, on the shelves at \$3.60 and \$3.70 a tin in 1973 are freely available on the shelves at \$2.60 and \$2.70 a tin, and there are cheaper brands ranging from....

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I thought it was ranging from \$1.99 to \$2.20, but apparently they range from \$1.75 to \$2.20. In the meantime, wages in this country have multiplied by three. So there is not any particular fascination in price control.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: On a point of elucidation, Sir. It was the wisdom of the Barbados Labour Party in taking off the controlled price of corned beef which has now brought it down to be selling so low. When it was on control, it was at \$3.25 but now that it is not under control, it is \$1.75.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, \$3.25. They were not \$3.60 or \$3.70. I do not want, for the second time today, to be misleading the House. I have already misled the Senate, I am sorry about it, when I said that the Democratic Labour Party had built eleven hard courts. In fact, they only built two.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I am giving the advice that I have. I thought it was eleven. I am advised that it is only two.

I think the essence of argument on this Bill should not be whether there should be no controls and therefore whether the free market ought to be able to operate entirely unfettered, or whether we should have controls of the order practised under the Democratic Labour Party and certainly reflected in Senator Greaves' contribution. I believe that we must recognize what the two elements are — in the first place, why do we want controls at all? — and it may well be that if we can find a way to ensure that those below the poverty line are protected without having price controls, then, perhaps, we could move to that. But it is what the objective is, and the objective is to give protection to those. At the same time, we are not now to get trapped in the belief that there is something fascinating, some justification of itself, in having controls. If we do, we will get ourselves back into the situation where controls spanned almost the whole gamut of business activity, with the result that people were driven out of business and profit margins were squeezed, and,

of course, the first people to be driven out were the small operators.
5.10 p.m.

At the end of Senator Greaves' statement, when he was just about interrupted when a note was passed to him, he was saying "I try to bring some measure of objectivity to my" — and I think he meant "deliberation" — and the next words that followed were "outside of political matters". When we are in here, we are in here on political business, but it is because he made that clear and definitive statement that I understand why he could have made the statements which he made in relation to the Government's position and the tourism industry.

I cannot understand how it is that any Senator is going to come in here and tell us that tourism suffered because Government had the 8 per cent tax, for example, which has now been taken off the hired cars. You have to look at the things we have taken off. What we have done is to provide a package of additional incentives, like more money for advertising, like upgrading the general environment, where money has been provided for the National Conservation Commission, like giving monies to refurbish the plant. Are we hearing that because we have now done these things, which were done because a study of the industry was done and arising out of the study, recommendations were made to Government — I believe, that any prudent Government, when faced with a problem, operates by studying the problem first and then seeking to supply the solutions recommended — that by taking a deliberate and sensible approach we are damaging the tourism industry? Because in fact, unless Senator Greaves is saying that, he is talking such arrant nonsense that it should be laughed out of court.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, on a point of elucidation. I am sure that if Senator Barrow was listening to what I said, he would have recognised that I said that the measures which were taken by the Government in the past — I am not talking about the corrective measures now — have had the effect of damaging the industry to the extent that it has been damaged. The Government, now, after many years, during which this was continuously being pointed out to the Government after many pleas from many quarters they are now coming around to introducing corrective measures to the industry.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: General statements never advance any arguments. Let us be specific. One of the arguments in the tourism industry is that overheads are too high. One of the arguments has to do with the level of wages they pay. We are not blaming the union for negotiating wages on behalf of its workers. We are not telling the hoteliers how they can see their best interests. But are you going to blame us if unrealistic settlements might in some cases have been arrived

at? What are we saying about the measures that Government has taken? Government has done a whole lot to encourage the tourist industry — new tourist plant built under incentive legislation, put in place not under this Administration but under the previous Labour Party Administration. The Board of Tourism dates back to 1958 as the promotional arm for the development of the tourist industry. What are these governmental policy decisions that Senator Greaves is talking about that have damaged the industry? I do not know and you do not know, that is the trouble, but at least I have some respect for the truth and I am very careful to check my facts before I talk. Consequently, I am not going to come in here and make wild, unsubstantiated statements and get away with newspaper headlines created out of a generalization which has absolutely no value and which is unworthy of the thought process of any intelligent human being.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Senator Greaves, in my view, was doing quite well in his reply, mainly to Senator Seale, but then he clearly lost his balance and thought he was on the platform and could not be replied to in here. But he was replied to by the Leader of the Senate. I will have a say on two areas and I am certain that Senator Griffith will have something to say as well. You can make these sweeping statements without anything whatsoever to verify what is said and carry the headlines, but even if the replies are not carried in the press, they will be placed on the Record.

What has happened in here is what has been happening repeatedly in this Chamber and on the platform, to Senator Greaves. It is when he is not informed and loses his balance and we hear the same foolishness about bad policies responsible for everything.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Carry on.

SENATOR StC. E. HOWELL: Thank you, Sir. Thirteen or fourteen years in Parliament and he has not learnt much.

The Democratic Labour Party, particularly the shadow spokesman on policy and Trade and the shadow spokesman for Finance have been saying the same foolishness for three years. The thing that amazes me — because I really have to say in praise of the Press that I thought they had covered a statement made last week very well indeed is that sort of foolishness is reported and given headlines week after week and the rebuttals are never put forward.

Since 1981, the Democratic Labour Party, not only Senator Greaves, has failed to acknowledge that the entire world is experiencing its worse downward trend in

economic activity for fifty years. They have never in three years told the people of Barbados that. They have not bothered to tell the people of this country that until the middle of July last year, over 10½ million people were unemployed in America, even though that country had experienced eight months of growth in its economic activity. Today the economy in the United States is as buoyant as it has ever been, but the more than 10½ million people unemployed up to the middle of July were the worst unemployment figures in that country for over 40 years. There was no pointing out of the very high level of unemployment throughout Western Europe, ranging from between 2½ million to five million, in places like West Germany, the United Kingdom and France, and almost three million in Canada.

Even here in the region, in 1981 a leading Guyanese trade unionist said that by the end of that year it was expected that as a result of the current economic conditions, 40 per cent of the working population in that country would be unemployed. We know that between 1981 and now things have actually got worse in that country. We find too that a leading trade unionist from Trinidad forecast that by the end of 1983 because of the prevailing economic conditions, it was expected that more than 50 000 people will be unemployed in that country. These are things that are happening in the real world, of which Barbados is a part. Only in July this year it was reported that the Public Service in Jamaica can be expected to be cut more than 6,000 people at a stroke. 5.20 p.m.

None of this has been explained to the people of Barbados. Everything is happening on the basis of the Barbados Labour Party being in power. That is the foolishness you hear when you are discussing serious matters. When you are trying to lay blame in a small country with limited economic resources and say everything is a result of the management of the Government that is nonsense, and, mind you, only the Democratic Labour Party is saying this. They are by themselves.

The fact that ten and a half million people are unemployed in the United States, and that people will not come here if they are not working, the Government must take the blame for that. But sensible people should know that if workers are placed on a short week they cannot afford to come here. Even those who are working a full week, if they are of the opinion that they are next in line to be sacked, they are not going to come either. It is a question of cause and effect, and Barbados is a small country with limited resources; so when things are bad throughout the world, the worst way in 50 years, it is obvious that Barbados would be affected.

It does not appear that anybody in the Democratic Labour Party bothered to have a look at the 1984 Report of the Inter-American Development Bank. The underlying

conclusion is that despite the somewhat disappointing economic performance of 1983, Barbados' economic prospects for 1984 and beyond are not bad at all. If I have to listen to Senator Greaves, not properly prepared, not being able to when called upon to verify, who am I to believe? Him, or the Democratic Labour Party or the Inter-American Development Bank? I know which one I would rely on.

The Report says that we are going to do reasonably well from now on, because we have taken the proper measures, and among the number of things listed was the sound economic management of the country. You cannot pay people to write things like that, but they go on the platform and talk this foolishness where they cannot be challenged. I think they are really selling their supporters short, too, because when they have to stand up in the Lower and Upper Chambers and slug it out and be questioned and be called upon to substantiate their claims, they walk out. They did it again last week. They are not prepared, they cannot verify anything, but they get on the platform where they cannot be challenged and make all sorts of claims.

Senator Greaves, speaking about the hotel sector, said: "It is only last week, that some sense seemed to have got into his head" — and he is referring to the Minister of Finance — and he added that there is only token relief now. The shadow spokesman, if he was quoted correctly in the daily newspapers, also described relief to the hotel industry as little help. Let me contrast what was said on the platform, where there was no right to reply, and in here, when Senator Greaves lost his balance, with what the people who actually run the hotels, the managers, have been saying if the daily newspapers are correct. They used these words: "Considerate" "delighted" "very helpful" "much needed" and "welcomed". These are words of the management of some of the leading hotels in Barbados.

Aside

SENATOR St.C. E. HOWELL: Sir, I do not mind how often Senator Greaves interrupts me. I have not interrupted him once. I am on the ball, he cannot move me.

The main speakers in the Democratic Labour Party are out of touch with what actually took place last week, because the captains of that industry are saying it is good, we wanted it, we are grateful for it, and they are saying it is nothing.

It is not true to say that nothing has been done for the hotel industry. They know that. What must be said here is what was said last week in the Other Place, that the Chairman of the BDB and his team must be congratulated for putting forward some very

comprehensive proposals. But it is not as a result of those proposals alone that the package which contained six very important elements was created. I looked at the existing legislation, because I have been dealing with these matters for well over a year now, and the Government has been giving considerable assistance to that industry, notwithstanding that I am on record as saying in here that to my mind that industry is well looked after. Because in addition to the very extensive four schedules to the Hotel Aids Act, there is a ten year tax holiday, and I think as a result that the hotel industry is well looked after.

5.30 p.m.

It is not fair to say that nothing has been done. The Government has now come up with a comprehensive policy whereby all of the hoteliers in the industry, provided they satisfy Sections 3 and 4 of the Hotel Aids Act, will benefit without each and every one coming to the Government individually. But you hear that nothing is being done, everything is bad — and we have international investors saying the opposite. It seems as though they do not read. They do not inform themselves, but they say all this foolishness on the platform because they cannot be questioned. I think it is time that the supporters of that party should insist on higher standards.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, when I first said I would move this Bill, I thought that we would have targeted 4.30 p.m. as the end of this whole exercise. I was not prepared for the onslaught Senator Seale made on the Act itself, and indeed I believe he touched a raw nerve which caused Senator Greaves to get up and defend the Act. I sat enjoying what, indeed, seemed to be a defence of a Bill moved by the Government, but of course, Senator Greaves got lost and exposed not himself, because he was not a decision-maker in the former Administration. He was just a number, who went along with the game.

This kind of debate causes one to think about what the economy is all about. Senator Seale quarrelled about import controls, interest rates, electricity rates and mark-ups. I do not think that it is fair for any of us to make judgments on these things. Senator Seale is a businessman and therefore he, I dare say, is one of the most expert to talk about what happens in that area, but the Government has a role to play, as stated by Senator Barrow when he spoke.

We have talked about controls in this country. In 1973, we saw the establishment of the Price Control Commission, which was supposed to be the Saviour of the small man in business. It was supposed to control rising prices. It was supposed to do everything that was beneficial to the economy of this country and to help people from the lower end of the scale to the highest end of the economic scale. It did the opposite. At the full

operation of the Price Control Commission, we had an inflation rate of 40 per cent in this country.

I had my doubts; but was designed to catch attention. A Price Control Commission should control prices, but a Price Control Commission was set up with some learned economists and some people who the then Government felt had an input to make, and these people went willingly along, knowing that a Price Control Commission could not work — and some of them have confirmed to me it could not work. It could not work because Barbados is mainly a mercantile community and in order for a Price Control Commission to be effective in a place like Barbados, the country would have to have effective policing of the suppliers internationally, and to have effective policing of the suppliers internationally, it means that the people who we send abroad, attach them to the Missions or what have you, would have to have an understanding of the manufacturing and marketing of goods.

I will give you a classic example. It is very easy for a manufacturer, say of buttons to sell them much cheaper to a Japanese importer than a Barbadian importer. There are the same buttons, with the same cost, everything, but the Japanese importer may buy 20 million buttons, while a Barbados importer may buy 200,000. There are price differentials, what you call volume discounts, and these are the kinds of things that a Barbadian emissary abroad would have to appreciate when you are talking about dealing with the manufacturing of goods that are imported into Barbados.

Therefore, a Price Control Commission, not having the ability to deal with those things and to understand those things, but having to sit in Barbados, would have to rely on the very importers in order to make their mark-ups. We saw a classic example of this with the importation of cement, where the only man who was allowed to import cement in this country was able to use overtime as a base for calculating mark-ups — and that happened in this country when the Price Control Commission was in full cry. The establishment of that Commission showed us that full price controls are not the most effective means of controlling inflation, and that is the legacy of the Democratic Labour Party. Indeed, during the era of the full price control, as Senator Seale said, they put 450 small shopkeepers out of business, the small man that they claimed so much about, and it really hurt me to see that a man who came from among the small people was the architect of that destruction.

Roebuck Street was devastated. I remember, as a school boy going to the Modern High School at "Newbourne" in Roebuck Street and seeing places like Gittens Croney, Martin Doorly, Ince & Co., L. S. Sainsbury, C. C. King, E.S.A. Field, Harold Proverbs & Co., Stuart

& Sampson, S. E. Cole, Alleyne Arthur, Ashley & Medford, Smith & Atwell, F. A. Cheeseman, M. L. Seale, J. O. Tudor and Richard Connell. That was in the 1950s. By 1976 they were no more; they were devastated, wiped out completely, because of price controls.

When we talk about price controls, we have to look at the whole question of mark-ups within the context of the system that we are having. In Barbados, you can have either a vertically integrated system or a horizontally integrated system. In Barbados a vertically integrated system would mean, in the channelling of marketing, for instance, that an importer will be a wholesaler and also a retailer, controlling every aspect of the delivery of goods and services to the ultimate consumer.
5.40 p.m.

I believe that there can be no justification for high mark-ups. If a business is vertically integrated, the mark-ups that must be occasioned are done to facilitate the cost of bringing the goods to the people, and normally an importer who is wholesaler and also retailer would have to justify the kind of cost that he or she has to meet at every level in that marketing channel. So you cannot look at controls outside of the context of the type of system that you are operating in. In Barbados we have a lot of vertically integrated businesses. The horizontally integrated system is what has caused a lot of the shopkeepers in Barbados to close the small shops. They suffered because of the type of system which was imposed at the time.

I must take issue with Senator Seale on the electricity rates, not to defend the Light and Power Company, but just to make a simple point. We said he was paying some \$4 000 for electricity in 1979 and in 1984 he is paying \$12 000. In 1979 oil was \$US12 a barrel, now in 1984 it is \$US29 a barrel. The Barbados Light and Power cannot set those prices, nobody in Barbados can set those prices. Those prices are set internationally, so we have to deal with that reality. We have to decide whether we want to be sure we have a supply of electricity or whether we want to pay little or nothing for it and have it when they can get it to you. That is the key to the question.

I have heard a representative of the St. Vincent Government constantly state that they have difficulty in their tourist industry because they cannot guarantee electric services to the people who visit St. Vincent. The Government of Jamaica had a similar problem, and they had to borrow a barge from the United States to provide electricity. In Trinidad some time ago, a Minister almost lost his job because businesses were affected through the loss of electricity services. In Guyana, you found yourself picking up the *Daily Chronicle* to see where the outages would take place from day to day. In Barbados, you get outages and even I complain about outages, because I

am accustomed to a good service, and that is the point. We are spoilt with the good service in Barbados, so when we get an hour's outage we start complaining. Days' outages are routine in some places in the Caribbean, and it has nothing to do with cost. We cannot control the cost.

I am no economist, but I keep hearing from people — well of course this is the thesis of the shadow spokesman for everything — that we can have low interest rates — he is fed this by some of his tutors at the Cave Hill Campus and a few other people — that lower interest rates in Barbados would be the salvation of the economy; low interest rates, high wage increases, import restrictions and the problems are solved in Barbados. The interest rates in Barbados have to be where they are because of the influence of the US level of interest rates. We cannot get away from that, no matter how we try.

In 1981, at a Commonwealth Finance Ministers' Meeting, I had the honour to head a delegation in Nassau and spearheaded an argument about the impact of high American interest rates on the developing countries, and the British and the Canadians were defending the Americans. I had the good fortune only last month to be a member of the Barbados delegation to the Commonwealth Finance Ministers' meeting in Toronto, and I heard everybody talking of American interest rates and its impact on the economies. That is the problem.

If the high US interest rates are kept at that level, they must have an impact on us, because the cost of borrowing money to bring in here will be at a high level. Conversely, if Barbadian importers have to pay for goods overseas and we have a low interest rate regime, it means that they are going to borrow at low interest rates here to satisfy the carrying charges abroad, and it means the flight of capital. This is not the flight of capital that Senator Greaves was talking about, because when he says flight of capital I do not think he knows what he means; he might be thinking of a capital of a country. I am talking about the movement of money to satisfy your overseas creditors.

It makes sense to me that if I have bills overseas which are carrying interest rate charges of 12 per cent and I can borrow money in Barbados at 6 per cent, to borrow all I can and pay off my overseas bills. But there is danger in that, and this is why we have to make sure that we have an interest rate regime which can be a restriction on that, because the key to providing the high standard of living which we have in Barbados, and do not let anybody fool you — it is high, is the management of the foreign reserves. Do not let anybody get up there and fool you that high wages and so on provide a standard of living — we are an importing society.

I saw a document by Dr. Courtney Blackman, Governor of the Central Bank, and I can quote him — I can show you the document — in which he said that \$5 out of every \$8 a few years ago went to pay for importation of goods into this country. It means that you have to find foreign exchange to pay for them, and, thank Goodness, the fact that we are still able to maintain a creditable standard of living for the people of Barbados is due to the ability of the Government to maintain a stable standard of foreign reserves.

You cannot carry a Barbadian dollar anywhere and pay for anything; you have to have US dollars and you have to earn US dollars. How do you earn US dollars? By having a tourist industry that really is doing something, by exporting goods, or if you have a low export earning, by controlling the importation. How do you control the importation? Just as in the oil field. We have saved \$36 million in foreign exchange, so you have \$36 million to spend otherwise.

I heard the Shadow Minister of Finance with the crap about the oil industry has not made any difference to the balance of payments. He does not know what he is talking about, because if you are saving \$36 million, it means that the people of this country can use that \$36 million to buy other things, and the people of Barbados like good things — they like good food, they like good clothes. I do not understand this thing about suffering in Barbados. I see 19 year old girls wearing designer jeans, Gloria Vanderbilt jeans, that cost \$200 and all kinds of foolishness.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I used to look and I used to see it up to August 24; I do not see it now.

We get in here and we fulminate about what the Government is doing. When you get an onslaught from Senator Greaves or his cohorts, a mindless onslaught where they cannot explain anything themselves, because they do not know what they are talking about, the difficulty is to explain to the people of Barbados why it is that we are able to maintain a standard of living for them that is almost second to none in the developing world. I say the key to it is the management of the foreign reserves.

I hear a lot of talk about tourism and that we have not done a thing for tourism. Last week, the Prime Minister spelt out a lot of benefits for the tourist industry. But, what we keep forgetting in this country is that a lot of people in Barbados — I am not saying that they are the sole cause — have to take the blame for some of the fall-off in tourism, those people who say they are not

coming back to Barbados and are telling their friends that they are not coming back.
5.50 p.m.

We forget that tourism in this country was built on the strength of word of mouth references. We forget that in the Sixties and Seventies people would go and tell their friends what a good time they had in Barbados, and would bring back their friends the next year. Those same people are going back and saying that they are molested on the beaches. People come here on their honeymoon and find their wives raped in the hotel rooms. Beach bums harass them and kick sand in their faces because they pay them no attention, and they say they are not coming back.

We have to understand that they do not have to come back to Barbados. If they want sun, sand and sea, they can go anywhere in the Mediterranean, they can go to Nassau or Mexico. I have been to Acapulco, this great tourist resort. It is nothing compared to what we have here. You cannot even drink the water and eat the food in Acapulco. But you cannot get into a hotel room there, and we are down here having difficulties all the time.

We hear about this calypso "Jack" that was immortalized. We took the beaches, because "the beach belong to we", and now we are seeing what has happened. And they come now and blame the Government.

We have heard the Opposition get up and boast about "Jack". As a matter of fact, "Jack" is a creature of the Opposition Democratic Labour Party. Their resident calypsonian made it. You used to hear it at the Auditorium in Belleville every night. It won the Road March. It made fun of Jack Dear. It took everything that he said and distorted it. And you see what has happened to this country? The people left and did not come back.

I keep telling people that if you want to see Buckingham Palace, there is only one Buckingham Palace in the world. So whether you are beaten by the Teddy Boys or not, if you want to see Buckingham Palace you have to go to England. If you want to see the Empire State Building, no matter how many people mug you in New York City, you have to go to New York City to see it. If you want to do business on Wall Street, the financial capital of the world, no matter how many people meet you at the airport and cut your throat, no matter how many taxi drivers rob you at the airport, you still have to go to New York City.

Let me tell you something about the hotels in New York City and Washington D.C. They carry higher prices than anything we can get down here. Only last week, Dr. Cheltenham was telling me he had difficulty getting a room in Washington at \$255 per night in Washington.

They were packed to capacity. But we get in here talking about the Government has done nothing for tourism. Do you know what the Government has done for tourism? We have the Tourist Board. We have a Minister who they say all kinds of things about. They had a Minister of Tourism and Information who, when they told them that his hotel was on fire, said, "Not yet." That is the Minister of Tourism they had in the Democratic Labour Party. They told him, "The hotel is on fire" and he said, "Too early."

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Like Truss in the building.)

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: The same thing. If you want to call names, you can call names.

The point is that you cannot decry the efforts to market a country like Barbados. But you must have an end product. When people come here, they want to be glad that they came, having advertised this country as a country you can come to and enjoy yourself. They want to be able to say their money was well spent. I do not agree with Senator Seale that you should make sure they leave without a penny. I think people want satisfaction for their money. They would feel good when they leave here, if they have spent all, knowing that they had a very well spent vacation, once they are satisfied. But they have not been getting satisfaction in Barbados, because workers in the hotel industry have been very surly to visitors, believing that they have to come here. They have cursed them openly and done all that kind of foolishness. They do not have to come here.

We have to look at Canada, which was adversely affected by the high interest rates in the United States of America. A lot of layoffs were created. There is high unemployment in Canada. And what happened? Canadians, who are a regular source of tourism for Barbados, have stopped coming to Barbados. One company, Sun Tours — that is not the fault of the Government — went bankrupt. Can you blame the Government for that? Sun Tours went bankrupt and left Sunset Crest holding a bill of \$269 000. They had to layoff people down there.

The only thing that has brought back Sunset Crest is the same thing that the Democratic Labour Party opposes now, the Medical School. I had to tell the Opposition spokesman for Finance the other day that his best friend, who he spends almost every Saturday at down there, owns ten apartments in Sunset Crest and all of them have Medical School students. The 312 Medical School students in Sunset Crest are the people who have brought it back alive. Their parents, relatives and wives are coming down all the time. The taxi drivers down there who work at Sunset Crest are saying, "We now living, because we have something to hold on to." But

they walked around this country talking foolishness, all they did was to put money in Tom Adams' pocket — they had to pay the Prime Minister all the time — instead of supporting services that will bring back meaningful tourism to the country.

We have a situation here now where a number of people coming into this country are barely able to get their air fare and come to the airport with all the food-stuff they want to bring in. There is no benefit. The ancillary services suffer. They catch the bus. That is not the kind of tourist that Barbados really needs to help it out of its difficulty. We need the tourists who are going to come and spend money and, as in the old days, be able to enjoy what we have to offer.

It is incumbent on all of us, not just the Government, to try to ensure that when people come to Barbados they can go away and say, "We have enjoyed Barbados" as they used to say. We subsidize Caribbean Airways, the beach patrols and the lifeguards. We talk about beach patrols and lifeguards in here and you hear the Dems out there saying that you want to restrict black people from going to the beach, when there is a need to make sure that people can swim and bathe comfortably.

I have been to some countries where tourism is important to the economy, like the Bahamas, where the natives cannot bathe on the hotel beaches. We have not reached that point in Barbados. The beaches are still all open. But in the Bahamas where tourism is important to the people of the Bahamas, the natives cannot go on those beaches to molest the tourists. Ask anybody who has been to Nassau.

We developed Harrison's Cave. We had a first class Summer Festival, brought by the Minister of Information and Culture. We bring all of those people to Barbados during the summer. We have the great Crop Over Festival. Wherever I go in North America, everybody is talking about planning their vacations to come down here for Crop Over. We have the Baxter's Road Mall. We have proper health services, because people want to know that when they come to a country, if they get sick, they can always turn to the local health services even for maintenance of life. Proper health services is a very important key in the tourism sector. Last night I was pleased to watch TV and hear the ambulance drivers speaking about the training course and thanking Senator Trötman. We have modern highways, a new airport and such facilities.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Griffith, two minutes to wind up.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I just wanted to point out these things, because I think that

some of us try to get away with this foolishness about the Government did this and the Government did that without looking at the fact that Barbados is a part of the world. The high interest rates cannot be looked at in isolation. The high oil prices cannot be looked at in isolation. The tourist product cannot be looked at in isolation, because people will travel and compare, and they will recognize that they must have value for their money; and if we cannot give it to them, they are going to get it from somewhere else.
6.00 p.m.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 – 3 inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

MOTION RE LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: At the beginning of the sitting, Senator Greaves made a statement about Senator Hall's long absence. We have consulted, and Senator Greaves can now move his motion for the acceptance by the Senate.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I would like to move that this Senate approve leave of absence for Senator Hall until, I believe, the end of February next year.

Aside

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Notwithstanding the aside, I beg to second the motion.

The question was put and agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before the motion of the adjournment is moved, I want to say a few words about something which happened in the debate on the last Bill which rather concerns me. This is for my own satisfaction, and I feel sure that I am right to raise it at this time.

In his speech, Senator Greaves made a comment about the flight of capital, the accuracy of which was disputed by the Leader of the Senate and challenged. In reply to my comment, Senator Greaves said that he had no reference and the Chair could not expect him to have a reference to the matter.

As a matter of sheer courtesy in debate, it would seem to me that if you make a remark which is challenged, you are in duty bound either to apologize for the inaccuracy of the statement, or to say something which suggests that you know where you have taken it from. No writer or person who makes a public statement can carry all of the quotation in his head, but he has to make sure that his reference is accurate or that he clothes his remark in such a way as to suggest that he knows where he can get it.

It seems to me that not to be able to make an accurate reference or to suggest where your reference is coming from; if you are not going to take responsibility for making an unreasonable remark – then you cast a doubt on the validity of anything you say, and I do not think it is worthy of any member of any party to have his words or statements doubted simply because he has not been able to provide an accurate reference. I say this because I want to be able to accept what people say for what it is, that they do in fact know what they are saying, and that when they are challenged, they are able to say that they saw it or read it, or that they would like to withdraw it, if it cannot be supported.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, there are two items, which I gave notice of today, and there is a third item on the Order Paper held over for today, in respect of which I think the Attorney General has had representations made by the Bar Association. I would ordinarily move the adjournment to one week from today. However, I think we should give ourselves time for this item to be cleared up, and accordingly I move that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

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

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE INDIRA GHANDI, PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA 536

Senator Barrow, 536; Senator Greaves, 537;
Mr. Deputy President, 537.

MESSAGES

Message re absence of Governor-General and acting
appointment of Sir Arnott Cato 537

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW 537, 538

The Annual Report of the Commissioner of
Police for the year 1982.

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs
and Excise Receipts for 4 months ended
31st July, 1984.

The Financial Statement showing Net Customs
and Excise Receipts for five months ended
31st August, 1984.

The Customs (Transit Goods) Regulations,
1984.

The Annual Report of the National Assistance
Board for the period 1st April, 1983 to 31st
March, 1984.

The Annual Report and Statements of
Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Cor-
poration for the years 1980, 1981, 1982 and
1983.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Employment Injury Claims and Payments)
Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Benefit) (Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Employment Injury Benefit) (Amendment)
Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Non-Contributory Old Age Pensions)
(Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Collection of Contributions) (Amendment)
Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Claims and Payments) Regulations, 1984.

The National Insurance and Social Security
(Self-Employed Persons) (Amendment) Regu-
lations, 1984.

The Severance Payments (Fund Contribution)
(Amendment) Regulations, 1984.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts
of the Barbados Community College for the
year 1982-83.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts
of the Insurance Corporation of Barbados for
the year 1983.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6)
Order, 1984.

Recommendation No. 169 concerning Employ-
ment Policy adopted at the 70th Session of
the International Labour Conference held in
Geneva on 26th June, 1984.

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts
of the Barbados National Bank for the year
1983.

MOTIONS RE BUSINESS OF SENATE

INDICATION RE CERTAIN ITEMS ON THE ORDER PAPER 538

Senator Barrow, 538.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW 538

Resolution to approve the compulsory acqui-
sition of land at Six Men's, St. Peter for the
construction of the Speightstown By-pass
Road (Phase 3) and for housing re-location.

A Bill to amend the Stamp Duty Act, Cap.
91.

EXCUSE FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Motion by Senator Greaves re leave for Senator
W. W. Hall 538

Senator Barrow, 538; Senator Greaves, 538.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT

CHECKER HALL, ST. LUCY. 539
 Senator Barrow, 539, 542, 543, 544, 545,
 546; Senator Greaves, 540, 541, 542.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT

FONTABELLE AND EXMOUTH, ST.
 MICHAEL RE ROAD IMPROVEMENT. 546

Senator Barrow, 546.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT

TURNERS HALL, ST. ANDREW FOR
 VARIOUS PURPOSES. 546

Senator Barrow, 546, 547, 550, 551; Senator
 Greaves, 547; Senator Seale, 548; Senator
 Griffith, 548, 549, 550.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
 BECKWITH AND WELLINGTON STREETS,
 BRIDGETOWN FOR RECREATIONAL
 PURPOSES. 551

Senator Barrow, 551, 552, 553, 554; Senator
 Reader, 552; Senator Linton, 552; Senator
 Seale, 552.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
 DASH VALLEY, ST. GEORGE FOR
 VARIOUS PURPOSES. 554

Senator Barrow, 554, 555, 560, 561; Senator
 Simmons, 555, 556, 557, 558, 560; Senator
 Greaves, 557, 558, 559, 560; Senator
 Jemmott, 558; Senator Reader, 560.

AIRPORT SERVICE CHARGE (AMENDMENT)

ACT, 1984. 562

Senator Griffith, 562; Senator Seale, 562, 563.

CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1984. 563

Senator Griffith, 563, 564; Senator Seale, 563:

MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT)

ACT, 1984. 564

Senator Griffith, 564, 574, 575, 576, 577,
 578; Senator Seale, 564, 565, 566, 570, 571;
 Senator Greaves, 566, 567, 568, 569, 572;
 Senator Barrow, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572;
 Senator Howell, 572, 573, 574.

STATEMENT BY DEPUTY PRESIDENT. 578

SUSPENSION. 551

ADJOURNMENT. 578

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Hon. N. A.
 GREAVES, E. E.
 GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.
 HOWELL, St.C. E.
 JEMMOTT, C. E.
 LINTON, H. R.
 READER, Miss G. G.
 SEALE, C. D.
 WICKHAM, His Honour, J.C.W.