

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, June 26, 1985.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, June 26, 1985, at 11.10 a.m.

PRESENT

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

Senator the Hon. O'B. Trotman, (Minister of
Health and Social Security)

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of
State (Planning) and Leader of the Senate)

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary
Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)

Senator H. R. Linton

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

Senator Miss J. Clarke

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece

Senator E. E. Greaves

Senator W. W. Hall

Senator A. W. A. McClean

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

Senator C. D. Seale

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones

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

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

Senator J. E. Jordan

Senator H. E. Yearwood.

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

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This proceeding is called to order.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY, THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Members of the Senate, I have a number of messages from the Governor General,

some of which have been overtaken by events. Nevertheless, in the interest of administrative tidiness, they will have to be read.

The first one is dated May 2, 1985, and it reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Deputy President,

I am aware that you have been informed that I will be away from the island during the period 5 to 12 May 1985, on a visit to Britain to attend the 250th Anniversary of the West India Committee in London on 7 May 1985, at which I have been invited to speak, 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 Honourable 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 next it meets.

I have the honour to be,

Yours faithfully,

HUGH W. SPRINGER

Governor-General

The second message is dated June 13, 1985, which reads:

Dear Mr. Deputy President,

I am aware that you have been informed that I will be away from the island during the period 15 June to 5 July 1985, in Britain on private business, 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 Honourable 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 next it meets.

I have the honour to be,
Yours faithfully
HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

The more recent one is dated May 17, 1985 – this has only just come to hand:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE SENATE

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The Senate that on the advice of the Prime Minister, the seat in the Senate held by Mr. David Anthony Cathcart Simmons has been declared vacant under the provisions of section 39(1)(f) of the Constitution with effect from 2nd May 1985.

HUGH W. SPRINGER
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.
17th May, 1985.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am sure Members will wish me to formally welcome Senator Griffith in his new role as Leader of the Senate.

Applause.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, thank you for your welcome.

The complex nature of Government activity demands that we pay greater attention to the issues since we are not only here to protect the peoples' interest, but to promote it as well. I have taken steps to ensure that we on this side will be in a better position to join with the issues in this Honourable Chamber from time to time.

Thanks for your welcome and the good wishes of all.

I am commanded to lay the following:

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 11 months ended 31st January, 1985.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 10 months ended 28th February, 1985.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 31st March, 1982.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 31st March, 1983.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year 1980–81.

List of amendments to the Economic Report 1984.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1985.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Order, 1985.

The Land Development Duty (Rate of Duty) (No. 2) Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1985.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 2) Order, 1985.

The Land Development Duty (Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

The Service Tax (Amendment) Order, 1985.

The Land Surveyors' Rules, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1985.

Report of the Family Law Council for the year 1984.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances Regulations, 1985.

The Defence (Rate of Pay and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Port Authority for the year ended 31st December, 1984.

11.20 a.m.

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

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, there are a number of items on the Order Paper down for First Reading. At this stage I move to suspend Section 45(2) of the Standing Orders.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, there are two Bills which were passed in the House of Assembly on Tuesday, 25th June, 1985 which I would like to introduce for First Reading:

A Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on the proceeds of sale of minerals mined in a quarry; and

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, Cap. 114.

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

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, there are a number of minor and housekeeping matters which I would like to take care of at this time as far as the distribution of the work load is concerned.

We have some 18 items on the Order Paper which we hope to conclude by the end of the day's sitting, and I would just like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Chamber that these Bills will be under the responsibility of Senator Trotman, Senator Williams and myself.

Item No. 1 will be standing in the name of Senator Trotman, also Item No. 2. Item No. 3 remains as it is, No. 4 in the name of Senator Trotman, No. 5 in the name of Senator Trotman, No. 6 in the name of Senator Trotman, No. 7 stet, and No. 8 is an item which we will have as the last item of the day, which will be No. 18. That will be moved by Senator Trotman also. Nos. 9 and 10 will remain as they are. Nos. 11 and 12 will be handled by Senator John Williams, Nos. 13 and 14 will be

handled by me, Nos. 15, 16 and 17 by Senator John Williams, and what is now No. 18 will become No. 8, because there is a change in the two numbers, and that will also be handled by Senator John Williams.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO. 49 OF 1969

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the amendment to Resolution No. 49 of 1969.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, on the 18th August, 1969, Parliament approved a Resolution to acquire 2.21 hectares of land at Gall Hill, Christ Church for the purpose of providing a playing field.

The land was acquired and in fact it was used as a playing field for some time, although no facility was ever established on the land. After the present Administration took office, facilities were provided for the youngsters in the area at Wotton, Christ Church with a fully-serviced pavilion – in fact I think they are playing Second Division cricket there now – and it was not necessary to have this land in Gall Hill to service that area any more. The Government decided that it should be used instead for housing development, and that is the object of the Resolution before the Senate today.

We have heard arguments in other places that the Government spends time only on playing fields and on houses, but in this case we have done both, because we have provided a playing field in Wotton and now we are providing the houses in Gall Hill. There can therefore be little argument that we are taking away the land at Gall Hill, because before we did that, as I said earlier, we provided a proper playing facility at Wotton, which is being fully utilised at present.

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

SENATOR Mrs. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. Deputy President, I know of the pressing need for house spots and I know that housing must have priority over many other claims, but I am a little concerned that this particular area of land is lost to the young people of that area.

Wotton is a densely populated district, but Silver Hill is even more so, and I notice that there is no provision for the adjoining area of Maxwell Hill. It therefore seemed to me that a facility or some kind of provision for recreation was in order for the combined areas of Maxwell Hill and Silver Hill.

Young people are very restless, they face a great deal of unemployment and other difficulties at this time,

and I really wonder whether Wotton can provide facilities for those three dense areas of Wotton, Silver Hill and Maxwell Hill combined. I would like, on behalf of the young people who came to me in distress when this was going to take place, to ask whether some consideration could not be given to providing some kind of playing facilities for the combined areas of Maxwell Hill and Silver Hill, which are both very densely populated areas.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I take the point made by Senator Lynch that Wotton is densely populated. However, Wotton itself could not justify a playing area. We are talking about a development of 20 blocks of houses, and certainly this alone could not justify its own playing area.

It was intended that the young people of Montrose and Silver Hill living within half mile of Wotton should walk to Wotton and use the facility there. You cannot argue in one breath that you are making young people strong and in the second breath that they cannot walk half mile to this area. It is not outside of walking distance for young people to get to Wotton.
11.30 a.m.

In another item on today's Order Paper you will find that provision is also made at Gibbons, so there is adequate playing facilities for the youngsters in Christ Church. Maxwell Hill has a great number and this is 600 yards away from Wotton, and I have said over and over that most of the playing facilities, if not all, which at present exist in this country were built under this Administration. We are very aware of the need of playing facilities, in fact, we have been criticized for having too many playing facilities, and I do not think it is unreasonable to ask people to travel from Silver Hill to Wotton. I really cannot take that point.

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

VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING
CORPORATION OF LAND AT
GALL HILL, CHRIST
CHURCH

Order No. 2 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of land at Gall, Hill, Christ Church.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, having changed the purpose of the acquisition of the land, it is now necessary for the National Housing Corporation to use the land for housing and that the land be vested in the National Housing Corporation.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CLAPHAM, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Clapham, Christ Church, for the resiting of houses which will be affected by the construction of the Airport to the West Coast Highway and for housing development.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, I see on the Order Paper that the Resolution is listed as Clapham, Christ Church, but the Resolution really refers to the Simmons Road/Rendezvous general area.

It has become necessary to relocate some residents who will be dislocated as a result of the construction of the corridor which will be a part of the Airport/West Coast Highway, so the Government has taken steps towards acquiring land situated at Simmons Road, Rendezvous, Christ Church. The land is owned by several different people and it is presently used for limited residential purposes. A substantial portion of it, however, is an unused open area, although water and electricity services are already provided.

There are housing and other types of activity which will be affected, and these include nine houses situated to the west of the Roodal's Drive-in Cinema, three houses situated West of "Lyrias," the property of the estate of the late Sir Erskine Ward, 11 houses situated on the eastern side of Rendezvous and opposite the Drive-in and four houses east of the existing Regency Park entrance.

The National Housing Corporation has prepared a sub-division lay-out of this area making provision for approximately 75 house spots as well as a recreational field.

This acquisition is important – indeed, all acquisitions which impact upon the development of the Airport/West Coast Highway – because of the importance of getting the site ready for whoever the contractors will be.

Quite recently, there was a great to-do in Barbados about the difficulty with concluding the contract for the highway but, as we have noted in the Ministry of Finance and Planning, the deal has been a blessing in disguise of sorts, because there is a lot of work that the National Housing Corporation has been involved in, not only in that area but in the area of Lodge Hill in St. Michael and in the St. Barnabas area, to ensure that the corridor is prepared and handed over to the proposed contractors. This is important because it has implications

of cost over-runs if we were to hand over the proposed corridor without the site being ready for construction activity, and these would fall right into the hands of the Government who must accept the responsibility. Indeed, there has been a great deal of difficulty in some of the areas. Utility companies have to be involved in some of the utility infrastructure. Even near University Drive there has to be some utility work done there, so it is very necessary that all of the corridor is cleared before the activity can begin.

We have looked at a proposed starting date for the construction of the highway, October 1, once all of the other activities are in place, for instance, the submission and award of tenders. This is only one aspect of all of the activity required to ensure that when the contractors start, there will be no hitches, or the minimum of hitches.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I do not think I have had an opportunity when this Chamber was discussing the acquisitions relative to this road going from the Airport to the West Coast to make some points which I believe are of importance to this whole development. At the same time, I believe that the passage of events would indicate that a number of things have happened relative to this particular road, and it is my considered opinion that the Government owes an explanation to the public.

Let me, therefore, start at the beginning. The construction of this road, which is going to cost the taxpayers of this country, as I understand it, some \$90 million, does not seem to have total support within the community, because I do not believe that the Government has taken time out to explain in detail the advantages to be gained from the construction which is going to involve so much money. Indeed, one would question whether at this time, in view of the very serious financial stringencies facing this country, the construction of this road is absolutely necessary, whether there could not have been an alternative approach and, at the same time, whether the Government should not be paying attention to improving the existing stock of roads throughout the length and breadth of Barbados, because there is no doubt that there is need for very serious attention to be paid to this particular area. Certainly the question of priorities would obviously come into play here, and if, as is obvious, the Government would have or has access to this kind of money, would it not have been more advantageous to the community to have earmarked these funds for other kinds of development in which there is a crying need, as for example, in the area of housing, which I submit would serve the entire community in a much more meaningful manner?

11.40 a.m.

Senator Griffith, in introducing the Resolution, referred to the confusion which developed over the award of this contract and indicated that the delay may have been a blessing in disguise. I want to refer to the whole sordid business surrounding the award or non-award of the contract relating to the construction of this road. You will recall that it must have been towards the end of 1984 that the late Prime Minister did a rather surprising thing, and indeed I would say that the Government behaved in a most unseemly manner. It was smelly. Here it is we have a situation — and I use the word “smelly” for very particular reasons — where Barbados is negotiating a loan with an international agency, the Inter-American Development Bank. Before these negotiations were concluded, the late Prime Minister made some announcements to the effect that the Government would prefer the contract to be awarded to one of the particular competitors, in a situation where bidding was invited not only from firms in Barbados, but biddings were invited internationally. The result of this, of course, is now history, because the IADB obviously did not bend to the wishes of the Government. It did not take kindly to the arm bending and arm twisting tactics which were employed by the Government, and rather than taking instructions, as it were, from the Government, it obviously decided to stick with certain basic principles which it had laid down relative to the award of contracts, and as a result indicated to the Government that the contract would have to be re-advertised for tenders.

But that is not the end of the story, because we had somewhere in the month of March the Minister of Transport and Works being “despatched to Washington,” to use his words, “to bring home the bacon.” When he returned to Barbados, the public was led to believe by words he spoke that the Inter-American Development Bank had awarded the contract to the local firm, C. O. Williams. He further stated that within a matter of days an announcement would have been made. To the consternation of all Barbadians, I believe even to the consternation of his Cabinet colleagues and fellow members of the Barbados Labour Party, we were all shocked when we learnt that the IADB had not awarded the contract to C. O. Williams, or to anybody for that matter, and that they had advised the Government to re-advertise for tenders.

I think this was a very sad day for Barbados in international relations. It was, in my view, a direct slap in the face of the Barbados Government. I believe that the way in which this present Administration behaved when they sought to twist the arm of the Inter-American Development Bank has damaged significantly the reputation of Barbados in the eyes of the international community, and we have to do a lot now to restore this country to the level that it was prior to the sordid behaviour which was demonstrated by the Barbados Labour Party Administration.

There are certain things which one just does not do, and for a Government to have been in power for the time that the Barbados Labour Party has been in Government, they ought to recognise that that kind of behaviour, in public at that, conducted in the newspapers, where the Government would even expose to the public the whole question of the tenders and what was submitted and what was not submitted, was in my view, a most embarrassing display of bad manners on the part of the Government. As a Barbadian, I was embarrassed at the way in which the Government behaved in this particular matter, and I am saying that a lot has to be done in order to restore our reputation internationally.

One would have thought that decency would have prevailed and the Minister of Transport and Works, or the Prime Minister, or indeed some source of Government, would have, as it were, faced the issue quite squarely, admitted that they had made an error and apologised for the Minister having misled this country. But no such apology, no such explanation has come from the Government. Up to today there has been no indication from the Government as to what went wrong in that particular dispute with the IADB. The Government behaved in a typically arrogant fashion, not as though it seems to care about the taxpayers, because in the final analysis it is not money which is going to be paid out of their pockets alone — it is money from the taxpayers of this country they have to find to repay for that loan. The country ought to be treated with more respect, rather than this typical arrogance which has overtaken this Administration. 11.50 a.m.

I believe that we have to examine this matter very carefully, examine the way in which this whole matter was conducted. I can very well recall that when the announcement was made by the Inter-American Development Bank, the Minister of Transport and Works stated that he had no comments to make, but that there would be a Cabinet Meeting the next day and a statement would be issued. To this day, no statement has been issued. The only statement I believe that was made in this matter was when the Prime Minister, in winding up the debate on the Budgetary Proposals, stated that the President of the Inter-American Development Bank would be visiting Barbados the next week and the Government would be having discussions with him. That was all that was said.

As I said, I think that this is a very, very serious matter, and the Government must be castigated for the way in which they mishandled this particular issue. I think that it is really very sad that it degenerated into the kind of confusion and in the manner that it was allowed to degenerate. You had the spectacle of firms putting full page ads in the newspapers supporting one side and firms supporting another, the black and white, blue and red, all sorts of issues. It is very clear that the Government had lost complete control of the situation, and the reason why, in my view, the matter got out of hand was

because, in the first instance, it was the late Prime Minister, and therefore, the entire Government, which caused this kind of situation to develop. They have to be blamed for that.

If this is the way in which they are going to conduct the people's business, if this is the way in which they are going to be behaving when they are spending such massive sums of money, taxpayers' money — it is not their money, it is money that belongs to the taxpayers, because in the final analysis we have to pay for it.

Aside.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: They may know all that transpired, but the public needs to know more than it has been told. I am saying that it has been distressing, and I would hope that Senator Griffith, in his reply, would do this Honourable House, and, indeed, the public of this country, the courtesy of some proper explanation for what happened on that particular occasion, so that we would be in a better position to judge for ourselves on the entire issue.

The construction of this road will obviously lead to dislocations in a number of communities, and quite apart from the financial cost which will be involved in relocating people who fall within the path of the road, there will also be a number of social costs which have got to be taken into consideration. I hope that this particular aspect of relocation will be taken into consideration, because moving people from an area to which they have grown accustomed and putting them in another area is not always the most pleasant of experiences. I hope that enough has been done in terms of trying to acclimatize the people who would be going into these new areas, and that the kind of environment in which these people live would at least be maintained, or improved for that matter, and that the kind of facilities that people would have been accustomed to would be provided. In this respect, I suppose that what Senator Griffith said, that the delay might be a blessing in disguise because it would have given the National Housing Corporation more time to prepare these areas for the people, might be some indication that they will be looking at this aspect.

The other point which I want to raise relates to compensation. Almost each time that we have a debate in this Honourable Chamber relative to compulsory acquisition of land, the question of compensation arises. I believe that the Government ought to behave in a responsible manner and when they acquire lands from people, they ought to make every effort to ensure that the persons so deprived of their lands are compensated, as soon as possible. There should be an effort by the Government to meet this commitment without much delay. Unfortunately, the present Administration does not

have a good record in this particular area, and there are instances of people whose lands have been compulsorily acquired for many years but who have not yet received compensation for this.

Sometime I think in May, the Minister of Housing and Lands, in a statement following a visit to St. Lucy, also expressed disgust and dissatisfaction at the slow speed with which the Government, of which he is a Member, was proceeding in compensating people for land which they acquired for public purposes. That is the same position which I have taken and the same position which the Democratic Labour Party has taken on this whole question of land acquisition. I do not think it is fair to people. Government has legal powers to acquire land, but because the Government has powers, it does not mean that they should run rough shod over people in the way that they do. People have rights, and when you take away people's property like this, for whatever purpose it has been taken away, then adequate arrangements ought to be made for settling compensation. I would urge the Government to ensure that those people whose lands have been acquired in this particular exercise should receive their compensation without delay. I hope that in this you would not hear, as we have heard in a number of other instances, of people complaining about the fact that they have not received money for their lands.

12.00 noon.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: On a previous occasion I had asked a certain question relating to the reasons for the particular path of the road from St. Barnabas to the airport. I do not think that I have had any explanation for that. Indeed, it is my understanding that there was a time when it was anticipated that the road would have traversed a more direct path from St. Barnabas to the airport, and it still seems to me, and to many people, that, on the face of it, that seems to be a rather more reasonable path for the road, not only having regard to the length of the road but also to the possibilities for all of Barbados using that section of the road. It would be beneficial to much of inner Barbados who now have difficulty in finding their way to the airport along proper highways, so to speak. To have it in such close proximity to the existing road from the airport down along the Christ Church coast, to me seems to be providing a circuit of roads in that general area when there will always be some need for improvement in the section closer to the direct path between St. Barnabas and the airport.

On that occasion I also suggested that perhaps Government should re-evaluate the entire path of the road, including the section down by the university. Senator Griffith said that it was fortuitous that they did have some delays in implementing the scheme. He viewed this, however, in terms of getting the path cleared to hand over to the contractors. Perhaps they

should perceive these delays as providing them the proper opportunity for re-evaluating the entire exercise, and I am still interested in discovering why it is perceived that the appropriate path from Warrens to the Bridgetown Harbour is via Lodge Hill and the University, and all the way around, rather than straight on down Highway 2 and on to President Kennedy Drive.

I strongly urge that Government, if they have already given consideration to these things, should quite clearly indicate to the people of Barbados their particular preference for the present path over the one which I have just suggested. On the face of it, it would seem to me that the path which I suggested would cause less dislocation than the one which is proposed. It will be a shorter road and, on the face of it, it seems to me as though it would cost rather less. All in all, I think it would be a preferable path, and I believe this would be the view of most laymen. But if there is any good reason why the other path is preferred — and in recent times it is not quite evident the basis on which roads are constructed in Barbados — I suggest that we should have the full benefit of these reasons so that our minds will be set at ease that Government is doing the best thing in terms of choosing the path for this particular road.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I think it is incumbent upon anyone, whether in this Chamber or elsewhere, who hopes to present himself as a candidate at the next General Elections, to represent and state the views of those persons whom he hopes to represent. In this regard, I make bold this morning to speak on behalf of the good people of St. Philip, with particular reference to the people of St. Philip South. I think it is incumbent upon me to do so, because I have been speaking in St. Philip to both supporters of the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party, and to a man, they want this road constructed. I do not know how it could behove any Member, I should perhaps restrict that to any member of the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party, to believe that the construction of this road does not have the support of the majority of the members of the community. I am sure that I am on firm ground when I say that, to a man, the people of the parish of St. Philip would be happy if construction of this road could be started tomorrow. That includes the truck drivers, truck owners, donkey cart owners, labourers, masons, carpenters and steel benders. Almost everyday I get inquiries from these people regarding the proposed starting date for this road.

This is a common sense thing, really. Perhaps it may be expecting too much to ask people who oppose the construction of the road to understand the importance of having this road, but it is really a common sense thing. The social and economic benefits that will flow from the construction of the road, not only directly during the construction of the road itself, but also upon completion

of the road, are self-evident. To tell you the truth, my strongest, if not my only regret is that it is going to terminate at the southern tip, which I hope to represent, and it is not going a bit further, right up to the lighthouse.

Something strikes me most forcefully. Everytime over the past eight years that this Government has sought to introduce legislation, the social and economic benefits of which are so obvious and evident, it has been opposed by the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party, not by the rank and file. It has been opposed by the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party. When we introduced the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, they opposed that. When we sought to introduce the National Health Service, which will benefit the old, young and middle-aged, they opposed that. Now we are seeking to construct a road, and the benefits which are quite clear, they are opposing that. Everytime you have a development of a serious nature in this country, the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party are opposing it.

They are just playing politics. I think the Opposition wants to see tenantry roads constructed in St. Lucy as well as they want to see main roads constructed from St. Lucy to St. Philip. If they are not interested in having these roads constructed, then they should come out and say so clearly, and not hedge their bets. They should not pretend they are attacking a road, whether it be a tenantry road or industrial access road, on what they call "a point of principle" if in truth and fact they know the construction of the road will benefit the people of this country. It is time that they stop trying to pull wool over the eyes of the people of this country.

The Democratic Labour Party does not have too good a record in the construction of tenantry roads. Now, all of a sudden, they are coming out and they want the money diverted from the construction of an industrial access road to the repair and revision of tenantry roads. Yet I can call villages in St. Philip, where they have had what I could call "notorious support", in which they have only dropped some marl between ten and twenty-one days before every General Election. Ruby in St. Philip is one, Lucas Street in St. Philip is another, and there is Gemswick, Harlington and Marley Vale in St. Philip is another. None of these roads have been surfaced by the Democratic Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party has held those seats for close to 30 years and they have not seen it fit to surface these roads. Now, they get up in this place and in the Other Place and will have the public believe that their main interest is in seeing that tenants of lands are properly provided for *vis-a-vis* the construction of tenantry roads. They do not have that interest.

12.10 p.m.

I saw the M.P. for St. Philip South on television asking for roads in Harlington and roads in St. Philip. Do

you think that after all these years of being represented by the Democratic Labour Party the M.P. should be in the Other Place asking for a road to be constructed or for roads to be resurfaced in St. Philip? If it is one place which should be properly serviced with roads, it is St. Philip, and the former representative, the one just before the incumbent, used to be the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Transport and Works. I am sure that the people of St. Philip would have been happy had he built tenantry roads in St. Philip, even if they had gone across his own property. The people of this country want to see tenantry roads. They do not care whose lands they go across. If the Government wants to take a piece of my land to build a tenantry road in St. Philip, they can get it, because I am interested in seeing that the tenants in Barbados are well provided for.

I was born in a tenantry. I understand what it is to be born in a tenantry. I understand what it is to have to pull off your shoes to walk through the mud to get from one point to the next. In those days you could not buy two pairs of shoes, you could not even buy one pair of shoes. You had to carry your shoes in your hand and walk with a pail of water to wash your feet when you got near the road. Now we are doing tenantry roads, doing industrial access roads, all we are getting are criticisms from the Democratic Labour Party, and we are hearing these speeches over and over.

I believe that I have on tape the speech which Senator Greaves just made in here. I believe I have it about six times, because I was taping the meetings in St. Thomas, and he was saying that over and over in St. Thomas, I will risk to bet that he is going to use that speech over and over again.

Aside

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: It is not on record, it does not have any rhythm to it, so it is not a record. A record has rhythm, even if it is sung by Smokey. It is a bad sounding tune, and I have it on tape six times. It is stale!

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy President: It is all right to make sport. I do not mind Senator Linton making sport to lighten the sitting, but just for Senator Linton's information and for the information of the Senate, I spoke in the St. Thomas by-election one night when I introduced the Democratic Labour Party's candidate. I then, unfortunately, had to leave the island. I never spoke on a Democratic Labour Party platform in the St. Thomas by-election, because I was not here.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: It must have been somebody representing himself as Senator Greaves, Sir, but I have a Mr. Greaves on tape making that speech six times.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I do not think it is right for Senator Linton to repeat a lie, and I want him to acknowledge that he is lying.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: One moment, Sir. I do not believe that the lying bit is allowed in the Senate.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Linton, Senator Greaves has denied your accusation that he spoke six times on the same subject. I hope you will be prepared to accept that.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: He is free to deny that, Sir. I am sticking by my guns that I heard Mr. Greaves representing that same speech on the Democratic Labour Party platform six times.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir: If Senator Linton gets up and repeats a lie, I will have to object. He is lying.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: He can deny he was the Mr. Greaves, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, as you know, it is unparliamentary to call a member a liar. I have asked Senator Linton to take note of your denial of the fact that you made that speech.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: And I have taken such note, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Okay, please proceed.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: A long, monotonous speech!

The whole point is that we cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. We have to state a position, and state it clearly. We have to adopt a policy, all of us, whether we are Government or whether we are Opposition. We have to determine whether we want tenantry roads and whether you want industrial access roads. We have to have some rationale. We have to work out whether it is beneficial to the country to have these roads. We are not going to tell a big country that a Government of intelligent men and women has sat down and determined to construct a road costing \$90 million without first working out the benefits which will accrue to the island as a result of the construction of that road. Consequently, if we are going to oppose it, we cannot oppose it for those reasons. We have to give other reasons why we oppose it.

The road is being opposed on the ground that it may lead to dislocation in communities. This is so small a

country that the construction of almost any road in this country, even a tenantry road, is likely to lead to certain dislocations in the community. But Bajans are very good at adapting themselves. Bajans have left here and gone to England, a totally foreign country, a totally different culture, a totally different way of life, and they have adapted. They have gone to New York, they have gone to Canada. In fact, it is said that if you go to Czechoslovakia you will find a Barbadian. I do not see that as any great problem.

The greatest evidence of what can be called dislocation, but what in truth and in fact is a transformation, was the late 1960s when Bajans started to migrate from the villages to the "Parks" and "Gardens" and what not. Bajans like this sort of thing, Bajans like to be on the up and the move. Bajans are conservative in one way and in another way they are very outgoing, and I do not think it is going to put out Bajans greatly because they have to up and move to give way to the construction of an access road.

We have some M.Ps who leave the parishes in which they live and go and live in other parishes simply because they want to become the representatives of those parishes. We also have some M.Ps who refuse to live in the parishes which they would like to represent, and who commute to those parishes once a month and then expect to get into the House of Assembly on that basis. Senator Greaves would know what I am talking about.

The question of compensation. I am being accused of seeking to mislead this Chamber, yet I sat here and heard the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands either being misquoted or misinterpreted or misconstrued, because, if I remember correctly, the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands was critical of the procedure for compensating persons whose lands had been acquired. He was not critical of Government's policy, he was not saying that Government's policy is that you must take as long as you like before you pay people whose lands you have acquired. What he was saying was that because of the cumbersome machinery which by and large was as a result of certain legal strictures and procedures, he had found it necessary to establish a semi-legal department within his own Ministry, which is now charged with the responsibility of calculating and approving the compensation in respect of persons whose lands had been acquired.

In my professional capacity I have had experience with that cumbersome machinery which existed during the time of the Democratic Labour Party. I hear a former Attorney General out there now criticising the system, yet when he was Attorney General he did nothing to modernise or update the system to alleviate the hardships which he knows were suffered by people whose

lands were acquired. If I am not mistaken, he was the first Attorney General of an independent Barbados, and he did nothing, yet he is critical of it too. The Democratic Labour Party did nothing to assist with the procedure for paying out compensation. In terms of people waiting years, as was said in here earlier, to receive compensation, right now I have two files on my desk from people in St. Philip whose lands were acquired under the regime of the Democratic Labour Party who have not yet received compensation because the papers cannot be found somewhere, so they are not in any position to talk about it.

12.20 p.m.

I heard the Leader of the Senate say that we are scheduling a commencement date for the 1st October. I trust he will be able to come back to this Chamber and say that we have been able to accelerate that — perhaps, he may not be able to — because I happen to know how many people out there are waiting for the commencement of this road. We all know in Barbados that for years the construction industry, whether it was the construction of houses, factories, or roads, has been the barometer for measuring employment and, consequently, for measuring the standard of living in this country, and that if the construction industry slows down or fails, there is a concomitant drop in the standard of living. So we have to keep the construction going in this country, because there are a lot of people depending, either directly or indirectly, on the construction industry to make a living and, therefore, we have to keep these things going. We have to concentrate on both construction of tenantry roads as well as the construction of the Industrial Access Road.

While we are on it, I would like to see Government take a serious look at extending the East Coast Road. If you want to see what the development of a main arterial road can do for an otherwise inaccessible or depressed area, you only have to look at the construction of the East Coast Road. You can pass down there any day now and see the amount of economic and social activity which has been brought to that area as a result of construction of the East Coast Road, and the social life that has been brought down there as well. It would please me greatly if that road could be extended from where it now stops right up to Ragged Point Lighthouse and probably into Foul Bay in St. Philip, because I want to see some economic and social development for the people of St. Philip, and everything is stopping on the borders of St. Philip.

If you look at this Order Paper, you are going to see land being acquired even in St. Lucy, St. Peter, Black Bess, Gibbons, all over the place. I challenge you, Mr. Deputy President, or any of the other Senators to look at this Order Paper to see if any land is being acquired in St. Philip at all. However, I must state that

only yesterday I received a call from the Minister of Community Development asking me to submit areas which I thought were right for this sort of development in St. Philip and I made certain submissions to him. He has given me his assurance that he will make every effort to see that St. Philip is well provided for. It happens like this sometimes. The fellow in the Other Place receives a salary as the representative but the fellow in this place has to do all the hard work. But I do not mind; once we are working in the interest of the people, I think we ought to be supportive of the endeavours of the Government and should not just come in here and criticize Government just because you are the opposition party and just because you are jealous of the great strides which this Government has made in terms of economic and social development.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Earlier in the Senate I spoke on this access road and I think everybody should be quite clear by now what this access road really would mean to the public of Barbados.

Firstly, I think it should be quite clear that spending this sum of money, \$90 million, cannot in any way be something which would not be for the benefit of the public of Barbados. Spending this sort of money would generate a lot of employment which, at this moment, is lacking, something which we are all looking forward to. This project has been one which has been very much looked forward to by persons in all walks of life in this country. There have been people, whom we know, who have been just standing by waiting to get their trucks, donkey-carts, all sorts of things, into action to make a living for themselves. I know of people myself who have actually mortgaged their houses and had bought trucks waiting for this project to start.

Senator Greaves says that the Government tried to bend the arm of the IADB. How can you bend the arm of the IADB? The fact is that this project was put out to tender — I think we all are aware of the resolution — and I think it has gone back out, but to tell me that there is anything wrong with the Government fighting hard to get a project like this coming to Barbados is quite ridiculous. It is quite clear that the project would have benefitted every person in this country. We have to recognize that we need the roads in this country.

Most of the roads which have been built cannot now cope, of course, with the ever increasing number of vehicles. They cannot cope with the ever increasing new types of vehicles. At one time we are accustomed to just small cars and small trucks, but if you look around nowadays, you can see the types of motor vehicles moving from one end of this country to the other, and you will see that a lot of the roads in this country cannot cope with that sort of weight which is going on them daily. We have to recognize that the country has

improved, and improved at a rate which, I presume, the Opposition would not like to see. Clearly this project could help to generate a lot of employment. But I suppose it is not in the interest of the Opposition to see that we have a low unemployment rate, so all of these sorts of criticisms will be coming constantly from the Opposition.

Senator Greaves says that after the Minister of Transport and Works had gone to Washington, he came back and everybody was embarrassed; he was embarrassed. When — and Senator Greaves would know this — negotiations take place at all levels, sometimes you are going to win and sometimes you lose. Something must have gone wrong or there was some misunderstanding about this whole set of negotiations, but these things will happen from time to time. Perhaps the embarrassment which was caused to Senator Greaves, because it happened around the same time, might have been the result of the St. Thomas by-election, but that is another matter.

In these projects, the dislocations.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, on a point of information. Timing is very important, and dates are very important. There is no point in Senator Yearwood — he is a neophyte in here — trying to mislead this Chamber.
12.30 p.m.

He indicated that when the Minister of Transport and Works returned from Washington and made a statement to the effect that the road was awarded to C. O. Williams Construction, it was around the time of the St. Thomas by-election. The St. Thomas by-election was last month, in May, and the Minister of Transport and Works went to Washington in March. Indeed, when the former Prime Minister died he was still in Washington, and he returned, I believe a couple of days after that, somewhere around the 10th or 11th March. I have a sense of history and a sense of time in case you do not know, so do not worry to pull that over anybody.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Greaves, for the heckling. I do not mind that. Can I go on now?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I do not think that a valid intervention on the part of any Senator should be described as heckling by any member.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Nor do I, Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I would therefore ask Senator Yearwood to withdraw that remark.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please sit.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: I had got to the point where we were talking about dislocation. I think this was another concern of Senator Greaves. In any of these projects there are going to be dislocations, but if you just look across the St. Barnabas Highway where there was a similar project, you will notice that many of the houses which were removed from one area to another were rebuilt and many others were changed to such an extent that there were improvements about which the people were very happy, and for which we as Barbadians should be proud. You get dislocation, but it must be realised that the Government has a social conscience, and there is no doubt that if there are dislocations in this particular project the same thing will happen, because the people who are dislocated will be looked after and will have their houses just as good, and in many cases better, than they were before.

Senator Linton alluded to when the Minister of Housing spoke about the time it took for compensation. This, in my view, should show that those who have the responsibility for this type of thing in this country are concerned about these things. Compensation does take some time, and it has always done so, but the fact of the matter is that a Minister is not responsible just for looking after this from day to day, and these things do take time. In fact, this is exactly what the Minister was saying. He was saying that he would like to see that when people have got their lands taken over, they should be compensated, but compensated in a much quicker period than it has taken previously, and I can see nothing wrong with saying this sort of thing. Senator Greaves thinks that the Minister was criticising the Government for this. I do not see it as that at all. I think he was just saying that he would be interested in seeing that people are compensated in a much quicker time than they have been previously.

We have to support this measure, and hope that rather than this project starting in October, it will start a lot earlier, and so relieve the anxiety and so forth which people have been going through for the last few months.

SENATOR G. D. SEALE: Sir, I support the Resolution, and I am very pleased to hear from the Leader of the Senate — and I wish to offer him my congratulations on his appointment, too — that, hopefully, the road will start about October 1.

I listened to Senator Linton, because he says he is going to be a candidate in the next General Election to represent St. Philip South, and as a resident of St. Philip South I was keen to hear what the prospective representative or not would have to say. I was very pleased to hear of his defence of St. Philip, because I am absolutely certain that this road is going to be of great economic benefit to the whole of Barbados, but especially to St. Philip, because

Gemswick, an area there, is going to be opened up. The Barbados Development Bank in its role to help industry has led the way by opening up the first industry in Gemswick. We have financed the first industrial building there, and I am satisfied that after this road, Gemswick will become an industrial centre and there will be many jobs provided by having the road and its access to Bridgetown and the west coast.

I would like to dismiss it that the road will do nothing or will be of no benefit. I listened to Senator Greaves and I got the impression that he, and perhaps by extension his party, are opposed to the construction of this new highway. This is a democracy and therefore everybody is entitled to his own opinion, and they can oppose it. From a recent debate in the Other Place on a tenantry road, I got the impression that his party is opposed to tenantry roads as well, because I saw some stupidity from a Member which said that the two houses that the road went to should have been moved and brought back to the road, instead of the road going to the houses. If by logical conclusion all of the tenancies were brought to roads in Barbados, we would not have to build any more tenantry roads, and we would not have to provide any more lots. I do not know if that is really what is being meant by that, because you can see the sort of stupidity in that, moving houses to a road rather than taking roads to houses.

Coming back to this road, the point has to be made here that in order to open up economic activity, we must have good highways and good road systems. I am satisfied in my mind, for instance, that when I leave my home in St. Philip, I will get to my business in Tudor Bridge in at least half the time when the road is constructed, and I am satisfied in my mind that I will use half the fuel consumption and therefore we will save on imports of fuel. I am certain that it is going to provide jobs while the road is being built, and it will provide many more thousands of jobs when it is concluded.

I congratulate the Government on the decision to build this road, and I only hope that they shove the IADB a little faster and let us start a little quicker.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I never thought that a simple acquisition measure would have caused me to learn from the Opposition spokesman about the lack of respect for the Government of Barbados internationally. I just came back from Washington after spending seven days at the World Bank meetings, and I never got any indication from those meetings that we have suffered any disrespect in this country. Indeed, we have been exposed to several plaudits from some of what I would consider the most difficult analytical experts when it comes to economic management of small and developing countries, indeed to the extent where we cannot make the boast in this country anymore of getting large amounts of economic

inflows, because the country is so well managed. I heard that only last week, but I had to come back here today to hear that the country does not have any respect because of a tussle with the IADB!
12.40 p.m.

Honourable Senators have spoken on some of these measures. I keep saying this in this Chamber, and I must say it again, people who come into this Chamber to lay claim to representing the interest of the public ought to understand what they are talking about before they come in here. Senator Greaves particularly is guilty in this respect. He demonstrates abysmal ignorance — and I do not mean it in the pejorative sense, Mr. Deputy President, I am talking about the literal sense — when it comes to matters affecting the economy of this country. He does not understand the process of negotiation and development when it comes to dealing with international institutions because, on the one hand, the exalted and aged Leader of the party says that the Constitution of Barbados is in Washington where the IMF, the World Bank and the IADB reside, and, on the other hand now, he who is out of tune as to what is happening in his party comes back and says that we are twisting the arm of the IADB. Which are we doing?

There is a process of negotiation — this is very important. Anybody who deals with the multi-lateral institutions and project financing must appreciate that there are certain steps to be followed. Not only that; in these institutions, the consultants who have an interest in spending the money that they lend out have their contacts right in the breast of the institutions. I know that for a fact. My own experience has been in the Wind Energy Project in Barbados. The consultants in Washington knew that we had a project in Barbados before the Government knew. That is because of their level of contact within the institutions.

Not all consultants are good for developing countries. They have their own interests to pursue, even in the multi-lateral institutions, and in this particular case there was a whole question of interpretation of the rules that created a problem, and that has been addressed.

I do not know of anybody in Barbados, except the Democratic Labour Party, who would have been against a local company, with the expertise to build the road, coming out against the company building this road. Everybody in Barbados have got an interest in seeing that the expertise we have in this country is for the benefit of the country. There is a substantial reason for this — If a local company is engaged in building the road, the foreign exchange outflows would be considerably less. That is a substantial benefit in a country where the management of foreign exchange is one of the key factors in the overall management of the economy. That is not clear to the people in the Democratic Labour Party, and if it is clear

to them, they are being dishonest in not spelling out that to the people whom they claim to represent. That is the most important element.

We have the expertise *in situ* to build such a road. It is demonstrated by the Spring Garden Highway, which the Opposition, when they were in Government, had proposed to build. But, of course, the then Minister of Trade has said that he had it in a file in his office. A whole road, he had in a file in his office! A whole road that we are now driving on, he had in a file in his office in the Ministry of Trade — not the Ministry of Transport and Works! We built that road with a local construction company.

The other point that we must make very clear is that we must understand that if we are going to go to a multi-lateral institution for project financing, there must be some justification to get the funds. No multi-lateral institution worth its salt is going to lend Barbados money because people want to get to the airport more quickly or because they want to avoid the noises that might affect a certain development. Those are not good reasons to go to get funding from anywhere. The justification must have certain basic principles, and one is the fact that it can be justified on economic grounds.

Senator David Seale made some points about cutting the cost in the transportation cost. That is very, very important, because that can be justified on economic grounds. There is a benefit of foreign exchange savings because you are cutting down the cost on the use of imported fuel — a substantial benefit. Everybody on the west coast will benefit. Indeed, it is of benefit to the entire tourist industry when you have such a highway. So I do not understand this great deal of anxiety and hostility over the construction of the road which the people in Barbados will stand to benefit by.

I heard some things which I jotted down. I am accustomed to this diatribe and the well-rehearsed catch phrases; they remind me of Shakespeare, "Wind, full of sound and fury signifying nothing."

He said that the Government has lost complete control and he wants an explanation so that we would be in a better position to judge for ourselves. The Democratic Labour Party has already made the judgement. They have judged that the road is not good for Barbados. They have judged, with the exception of Junior Rock — their star boy — who says we need the road. There is utter confusion. Of course, you would get that. If the head is confused, everything else is confused, the whole body goes bad, so that is understandable.

He made startling accusations about what the Government has not done, and he wants to know if the

road is necessary. Indeed, Senator Greaves has said it is his "considered opinion" — and these are the words that he will be tried on and will be found wanting, that the Government owes an explanation to the public and the construction of the road does not have the total support of the community.

I do not know how Senator Greaves has been able to discern this. I really cannot find out what scientific approach has been used by the Democratic Labour Party to determine whether the people are against the road. If I had to judge, even without a considered opinion, I would come to the conclusion that the people in Barbados want the road. I remember that even before the Spring Garden Highway was completed, people were driving on it and they had to prevent people from driving on it.

People want the road, and it is clear that it will not only benefit the travelling public. For instance, we have called the road the "Industrial Access Road." These terms must mean something. An industrial access road indicates to me, if I want to have a considered opinion, that we are opening up a pathway for the creation of a road where industrial activity will come about after the road is completed, and this is precisely what will happen. If you go up by Warrens, where a roundabout will be built, you will see that the C. O. Williams group of companies have already started development in that area, building industrial space for renting out. Just travel around the country and you would see that — do not go to Trents all the time and tell the people that they do not need the tenantry road.

Another objective of the road is to link the two major gateways to the country, the harbour and the airport. If that is beyond the understanding of Senator Greaves and the Democratic Labour Party, then you could understand why there is so much confusion about who is right and who is wrong. Unfortunately for Senator Greaves, he was led into the trap of saying that the people in St. Lucy did not need that tenantry road — poor fellow! and he had to back up when he realized that he was incurring the wrath of the people in the constituency. That has been taken care of and will be taken care of whenever the General Election is called, because the people down there, with the exception of his secretary, will give a resounding vote of confidence to the man who supported the construction of the road. Yes, Senator Greaves' secretary is one of the people who asked the Ministry of Transport and Works to build a road to her house. She was still out there demonstrating against it on the Saturday when they carried the two bus loads from up here. That is commonly known.

12.50 p.m.

When the Opposition starts talking about taking action that does not enjoy the total support of the

community, I employ the Opposition to reflect, think on these things: the North Point — nobody knew about the North Point; HARP, the Space Research Corporation that caused them to introduce legislation against the interest of the people of this country. Remember those.

He said that we should concentrate on improving the existing road system rather than build the road. We are saying that we can accomplish both, and we have indicated our intention in accomplishing both. Both have priority in the scheme of things. The Industrial Access Road has a priority and the refurbishing of roads and indeed the improvement of tenantry roads all have priority in the scheme of things, and we have addressed them all. We have addressed some of the problems through the use of the Transport Levy Fund in a road building programme and a sidewalk programme, and the Government has just approved \$7 million for the improvement of tenantry roads not only under the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act but also urban tenantry roads, and soon you will see a lot of activity. Indeed, activity has already started, and a significant number of tenantry roads will be improved this year. People in Christ Church along Maxwell Road are now benefitting from the fact that there is now a sidewalk programme, and it is a very popular road in this country. Go up Beckles Road and you will see it at Government Hill, where the children of Springer Memorial School are now going to be able to walk the streets in more safety. The Government is using the funds, and using them wisely, to ensure that the road system is improved for the benefit not only of the travelling public but also of pedestrian traffic in the country.

We have heard that it would be more advantageous to the community to earmark this type of fund for housing development. I do not know where he is at. Senator Greaves said he was away during the by-election and I believe he is still away. He probably was away during the Budget also, because in the Budget the Prime Minister indicated that \$32 million would be allocated for housing and more assistance will be set in place to ensure that the housing stock is improved. Indeed, in the list of the Resolutions we have on the Order Paper you will find that acquisitions are going on for building more houses for the people who cannot afford to build houses. In Pondsides here in the City of Bridgetown that is going to happen. Lammings in St. Joseph will be completed, so will the Maynards Housing Development, and there will be more at Ferniehurst in Black Rock. Apart from that, we have made it possible that people now can borrow more money, and if you read the paper today, you will see the indicators. Barclays Bank is now advertising for people to come in and borrow money for the purpose of buying land and building houses.

All that has come about because of the Budgetary Proposals of this Government. Where was Senator Greaves

of the Democratic Labour Party? Of course, the \$32 million will not appeal to Senator Greaves because his party voted against that, among other things, in the Budgetary Proposals and they must stand condemned. Whenever they get up in this Chamber and the Other Place and start attacking the Government, they have to come, and come good, because we have all the facts.

We recognize that unemployment in Barbados is very high. We have not hidden behind the figures. We have not done like the past Administration did and quarrel with the U.N. When the unemployment was 28 per cent, they told the U.N. to change it to 22 per cent. We are not doing that; we have said that it is eight and a half per cent, and it is unacceptably high to me and to everybody else. I do not suppose anybody in Barbados wants to see people unemployed, but the important thing is that the Government has decided to do something about it. If you oppose construction of the Industrial Access Road, you are also opposing the generating of employment for the people of Barbados. That is the implication. In the same way that you opposed Trents Tenantry Road for the people of St. Lucy, you are opposing employment for the people of Barbados when you oppose the Industrial Access Road.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order: Let me correct the impression which Senator Griffith has given in the last statement he made when he said that I opposed the construction of the tenantry road for the people of Trents in St. Lucy. I want Senator Griffith to produce any evidence or any statement made by me on which he could substantiate that particular charge. I most certainly have never opposed the construction of the tenantry road for the people of Trents in St. Lucy. As a matter of fact, the Record of Parliament would indicate very clearly that I have been constantly representing the cause of the people of Trents as far as the tenantry road is concerned. What I oppose, however, is the blatant misuse of public funds by Mr. "Vic" Johnson, Minister of Transport and Works, where, in addition to the roads which was provided for the people who live in Trents, he put a road through his plantation which would lead to his personal aggrandisement. That is what I oppose.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: The allegation that Minister Johnson blatantly misused public funds is a reflection on the decision of the Lower Chamber, and I would ask that that remark be struck from the Record. You are not going to get away with anything in here!

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I was about to point out to Senator Greaves that the Standing Orders precisely forbids pejorative references to any Member of the House, especially when that Member has been exonerated in a debate in the House, and I would ask him to acknowledge that ruling and withdraw that remark.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: In the light of the Rules which we have in this Chamber, I will submit; only in light of the Rules. My opinion still stands.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Rules are what we go by.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I must continue because I want to educate Senator Greaves, although it may be falling on deaf ears. If people keep coming to this Chamber or to the Other Place claiming that they want to represent or protect people's interest, I want them to come prepared to make points. The Government is prepared to accept criticism, but I want it to be constructive. Show me that you are doing your homework.

Senator Greaves talks about the financial and social costs. I want to assure him that this Government has a record that whenever people are dislocated, as we have done with the Sewerage Treatment Plant, they are better off. There is a certain anxiety when people have to move from a community in which they have spent many, many years — that is a fact of life, you are being dislocated — but it is not such a situation which ought to be played upon for the benefit of politicians. I believe that if people are representatives, they should try their best to remove the anxiety of people who might be affected and stop trying to extract some personal benefit from it.

I say that to say this. One representative called Greaves from the Lower Chamber tried to stop the people of Lodge Hill, in Airlie Tenantry, from moving into the new development at Hinds Hill, which was earmarked to put people in in relation to this same development. He had a petition, signed by a number of people, which was sent to the late Prime Minister saying that the people did not want to move. A meeting was kept in Lodge Hill where the representative of St. Michael North said you should not move, you would be worse off. It so happened that the people in that area of St. Michael North to a man all want to move. They are even jealous of the other people, because any morning you pass Hinds Hill where the new development is, you can find people from Lodge Hill walking down there to see where they are going to live and they are very glad to see the spacious accommodation that has been reserved for them.

1.00 p.m.

It is important to us and the people that on Friday morning the Governor of Puerto Rico, the country which provided the technology for some of the houses up there, will be paying a visit to that Hinds Hill project. It is a very good project, and it is an indication, like in St. Barnabas, of what the Government has done, and the Government is doing, as far as the dislocation of these people is concerned. The important thing to understand is that once you start to move them from within their own

communities, you have to find some other way of beating the anxieties that will accrue as a result of the move, so we are mindful of that, Mr. Deputy President. We have a very good record in this regard.

On the question of the compensation, cognisant of the fact that acquisitions usually bring about delays in rewarding the people who are affected, with this particular project we decided early that we were not going to let that happen. Money was set aside, \$4.6 million, to cover the acquisition cost associated with the dislocation of people in this industrial access road. Indeed, some of the people who have been affected are already agreeing to the settlements proposed by the Ministry of Housing and therefore we do not foresee a problem with that.

We recognise that there is a difficulty in satisfying people's problems as regard compensation, and not at all times can we blame this Government or any Government for the delay. Sometimes when it comes to a question of acquisition, people want more for their properties than they care to acknowledge when it comes to the question of the taxation of those properties. When it comes to property valuations for tax purposes, people want their properties valued at lower costs. When it comes to acquisition, they want them valued at a higher cost to benefit, and that is understandable in the scheme of things, so not all the difficulties can be placed at the foot of any Government. I believe that Senator Greaves ought to be cognisant of this fact.

Senator McClean has raised certain questions about the direction of the road, and he wants us to re-evaluate the entire section of the road, the entire corridor. I believe that Senator McClean is owed an explanation, and I will endeavour to get an explanation for him, but I also want to point out that in this regard this industrial access road has been studied to death, it has been redesigned to death, co-designed to death. If we were to start looking now at suggestions for redesigning and studying the road again, we may find ourselves putting back this project for another three years. The question we must ask ourselves is whether we are in a position to accommodate the special interests of everybody concerned, or whether we take a position that we design the road in such a way that the broader interests of the public are served.

I think that when the information is provided, Senator McClean will recognise that when the Planning and Priorities Committee looked at this matter, we did look at several alternatives, and I know for a fact that some changes have been made. I particularly remember a change that was made at the junction in Wildey with the Barbados External Telecommunications building. We have to appreciate that we cannot continue with studies, studies, studies, that we must reach a stage of implementation at some point, and this is the point where we have to have implementation.

I did say that, as far as our chronogram looks, we are looking at the middle of October. Two Senators said the first of October, but I said the middle of October, because we are looking at the realistic process of submitting tenders, evaluating tenders, awarding the tender. We would like to see it started sooner to alleviate some of the problems of unemployment, to alleviate some of the problems that the truckers have, the people who have invested money in trying to get their trucks ready to get some of this work, and I believe that the trucks which will be working will be DLP trucks and BLP trucks, in spite of all the hostility by the DLP to this road.

There are other road works that we have to look at in this country and they are all to the benefit of the economy. For instance, the northern access road, which is the road that has been designed for the heavy trucks that use the cement plant. We have been offered financing from the Caribbean Development Bank for the building of that road, but right now in the Planning and Priorities Committee we are looking at the cost of that road again. We think it is too high, and we are looking at the re-designing of that road so that we can bring it within a more realistic cost structure.

I did not think that this Resolution would have engendered so much debate, but I am very glad that we did have the opportunity to air our views on it. I hope that the Opposition would be appreciative of the fact that the people of Barbados want the road, they are behind the Government on this road and we are pushing ahead with the blessings of Parliament and the people of this country.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before I put the question, I must express my gratitude to the Leader of the Senate for the clarification about the first of October and the middle, because I myself was under the impression that he had said the first of October, but it is now clear that he meant the middle.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I propose, members of the Senate, to suspend this sitting for an hour. I have to take account of the distance which we have to travel for lunch as our dining room is not yet ready, and I really do apologise for the inconvenience which this extensive delay in providing the facilities is causing.

The Senate stands suspended until 2.15 p.m.
1.10 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: This sitting is resumed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHANCERY LANE, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Chancery Lane, St. Michael, for the purpose of housing development.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, Government is embarking this year on a massive housing programme through sites and services, through units for rental and the provision of houses at West Terrace for sale.

The provision of houses at Chancery Lane in St. Michael will bring back people, we hope, to the City. At present, people tend to leave the city centre and live out in the greater St. Michael area. The result is we are having a deserted City. It is hoped that with the acquisition of this land and the construction of the units in Chancery Lane, some life would be brought back to the city centre.

Government in the long term hopes, of course, to have a complete facelift done to what is known as Uptown Bridgetown, that area of Chancery, Nelson Street and Beckwith Street, and we hope that people would move back into the area, with some residences as well as some business going up in that area. At present, it is really an area of bars and pubs, and we hope that we can bring people back to the city centre and bring the City of Bridgetown back to life again.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 5 was called – To move the First Reading of a Bill to amend the Occupational Training Act, 1979–28.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that this Bill has now been read a first time.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: The main object of the Bill is to reduce the size of the National Training Board. At present, the Board consists of a Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, three persons representing the employers appointed by the Minister, three persons representing the employees, the Chief Education Officer, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Transport and Works, the Chief Labour Officer and two other persons appointed by the Minister.

Experience in working with the Board after several years has suggested that the Board is too large and unwieldy to carry out its objective, and the Bill seeks to reduce the size of the Board to nine — the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and seven other members.

Even though the Bill before us does not spell out that representations will be taken from interesting parties, it is expected that the practice of asking interesting organisations will continue and the Minister will be asking for suggestions from the people who have an interest in Occupational Training in Barbados.

The Training Board is one of those organisations which works very hard; they are, in fact, training over 300 young people in Barbados per year in various skills. Last year they trained some 393 people in motor mechanics, electrical installation, horticulture, masonry, needlecraft, steelbending, tractor operation and wood work. Most of these people get work on graduation from the system, and the Board is really one of the great success stories which has gone unnoticed by the people of Barbados.

The one other point I should make is that the opportunity has been taken in the Bill to take away the stipulation of the Board to meet once a month. The present Bill suggests that they must meet once a month. We will take that mandatory stipulation out of the Bill so that the Board will be free to meet at its discretion.

This Bill will also make provision for the appointment of officers to act as inspectors for the purpose of carrying out the business of the Act.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, I am a little disturbed about the proposed amendment of this Occupational Training Act. Senator Trotman in introducing this amendment would have this Honourable Chamber believe that the fact that the Board at present consists of 13 members, it has proved too unwieldy, according to Senator Trotman, to function effectively, yet, towards the end of his statement, he said that the Board was one of the great success stories which has gone unnoticed by the people of Barbados. These two statements ought to be taken and reconciled. In the first place, he is indicating that the size of the Board is too unwieldy and, presumably, is hampering the work of the Board, and then, on the other hand, he would want us to believe that the Board is one of the great success stories of this country.

Occupational training is something with which, certainly, I agree. Of course, the Democratic Labour Party is totally in agreement with it, and I believe that all interested persons and organizations within this country

with an interest in the development of this country at heart would recognize that there is an important role and function for occupational training in development. But when you look at the original Act and the composition of the Board, what do you find? You find that the Act says that the Board should consist of a Chairman and a Deputy Chairman, to be appointed by the Minister after consultation with the organizations of employers and organizations of employees, three persons representing organizations of employers appointed by the Minister after consultation with such organizations, three persons representing organizations of employees appointed by the Minister after consultation with such organizations, the Chief Education Officer, ex officio or his nominee, the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Works, ex officio or his nominee, the Chief Labour Officer, ex officio or his nominee, and not less than two persons appointed by the Minister representing other interests.

2.35 p.m.

This is a Board made up of 13 members representing a fairly wide cross section of interested people and ensuring that there is adequate representation of the major agencies that are involved in occupational training. Certainly the Trade Union Movement in this country has more than a vested interest in ensuring that the work force is trained and is skilled. I am sure that the Employers' organisations would also have more than a vested interest in this. I believe that it is for this reason that the Government, when it first conceived of this idea, wanted to ensure that there was adequate representation from the various organisations which would have this kind of interest, and at the same time to get this whole idea of a co-operative tripartite arrangement going. But now we have the amendment which seeks to alter the existing arrangement, and what does the amendment say? By revoking paragraph (1) and substituting the following, it says:

"1(1) The Board consists of a Chairman, Deputy Chairman and not more than seven persons appointed by the Minister."

The whole question of consultation relative to the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, and even the persons representing the varied interests is not there. It has been taken out completely.

Senator Trotman had said that the practice of asking interest parties to nominate will continue, but I do not take Senator Trotman's word for that. I do not trust that undertaking that Senator Trotman has given because I happen to know that the Minister feels that he has too many representatives from the Trade Union Movement and too many representatives from the Employers' Organisations on the Board, and the whole idea behind this amendment — and I am saying this because when the

new Board is appointed you will see — is to reduce the representation of the Trade Union Movement and reduce representation of the employers' organisations on this particular Board. I think that is wrong.

Here it is you have organisations which are making a contribution to the Board, and which I know have been making valuable suggestions to the Board when the former Chairman was the Chairman of the Board. I am not calling any names or trying to bring any particular office of state into the debate. The contribution of all the organisations was well appreciated, and even attempts by the Minister to have things go otherwise were stubbornly resisted by the former Chairman, and I know that the reason for this amendment is not as simple as Senator Trotman is trying to point out. The object of this amendment is to do precisely what I have said, to reduce representation of the employers' representatives, and to reduce representation of the Trade Union Movement on this particular Board.

I believe that if we are going to be talking about development, if we are going to be talking about involving labour and employers into a partnership for development, the organisations' contributions ought to be recognised and they ought to be treated in a different manner. I am not holding any brief for any employers' organisation, and I am only using that along with the particular organisation in which I have an interest to make sure that its case is put and that it goes on record about the way in which we feel about this particular matter.

However, like everything else regarding occupational training, we would wish that efforts in this particular area be redoubled, because it is a vital area in our national development. No stone should be left unturned in ensuring that opportunities are created for young people to develop skills and for workers who at the present moment are being made redundant or laid off, or indeed who are suffering job losses because of technological change, to be provided with as many opportunities as possible to have new training and to be retrained so that they would be able to get jobs to provide for themselves and their family, and certainly contribute to our national development.

I would therefore like to urge the Government to look at this matter of representation again. I believe that the Board has been able to do some good work, and I would like to see the level of representation which has existed before continued, because this is really a very important way in which we can get the partners involved in our developmental thrust.

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

On motion of Senator J. E. D. WILLIAMS, Senator H. R. LINTON was appointed Chairman of Committees for the remainder of the sitting.

On motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called and passed with Senator GREAVES voting "no".

Clause 4 was called and passed.

2.45 p.m.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On the separate motions of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed.

WIDOWS AND CHILDREN PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 6 was called — To move the First Reading of a Bill to amend the Widows and Children Pensions Act, Cap. 37.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, when in 1978 it was decided that the Widows and Children Pension Scheme should be discontinued for persons entering the Public Service for the first time, it was only intended then that persons who left the Service and returned at a later date to the Service should have any eligibility under the Act for the second periods for their service.

The Act, as amended in 1978, did not make this clear and basically what the amending Bill today seeks to do is to make it very clear that a person who is a contributor to this scheme and left the Service and returned to the Service at a substantive date would not have any eligibility under the Scheme for the second part of his service, as far as widows and children are concerned.

It is written in a very complex way, but that is simply what it seeks to do, Sir.

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

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as having passed Committee without amendment, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On the separate motions of Senator O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 7 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act 1981-40.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, I should point out to the Chamber that there was a bit of confusion on the Bill, it was further considered in the Lower House and a further amendment made in that Honourable Chamber. The purpose of that was to give some clarity to one clause and to do a few little things that would tighten up the Bill. Principally, however, the intention of the Bill is to make amendments to certain sections, Sections 2, 11, 76, 80, 103, and to amend the Second Schedule to the Act.

In Section 2, there is a need for the definition of the term "traffic warden". This comes about as a result of the repeal of the Police (Amendment) Act, 1983-45, which related to traffic wardens, and, therefore, in the Road Traffic Act it was necessary to provide for a definition of, "traffic warden" within the body of the Act.

In Section 11, there is a need to rationalize the eligibility for diplomatic licence plates. It was thought at one time that if everybody who was attached to a diplomatic office in Barbados, for instance, I think like the Caribbean Development Bank, could apply for a diplomatic plate, it would cost the country something like \$40 000. So we had to take cognizance of that fact.

The other section that did call for some consideration, the one that occasioned some debate in the Other Place, related to the issue and renewal of driving licences, particularly where the Government has determined that it would be in the interest of all concerned for people to have their licences registered in their month of birth. There was a great deal of clutter and confusion at the Licensing Authority when it was first transferred to that body from the Police Department when it was required that all licences had to be renewed at a certain time of the year. That peak caused an increase in workload, and the Licensing Authority was forced to borrow staff just to resolve the difficulties. Government thought that it would be better if you could have a more normal flow of renewal by having people register in their birth month. We recognize that it would cause a bit of difficulty, but not as much as if you have a continual renewal at one specific time of the year. Those are some of the amendments that the new Bill seeks to address, and I beg to move that it be read a second time.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before I put the proposal, I must make it clear that the amendments are already enshrined in the text. What we have before us is already an amended Bill.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: We on this side have no major problem with this Bill, but I feel there one or two grey areas which I would like to comment on, bearing in mind that our positions, which are very serious, will affect quite a number of people in the society.

I believe that all of the road users in Barbados are cognizant of the Road Traffic Act, 1981, and the amendments, and I believe people try very hard to make sure they are on the right side of the law. But there are times when conditions force road users either to break the law or to walk, and I am specifically referring to the motorcycle riders in this country. There was a time when the motorcycle riders in Barbados could masquerade up and down the country, sometimes riding at fantastic speeds on small roads, and whenever they are involved in accidents, you found that not only they were in danger, but indeed whoever was travelling on the pillion.

The Traffic Act of 1981 stipulated that there must be insurance coverage for those pillion riders and, as a consequence, you found that people who were injured while travelling on the pillion were more or less compensated. There were times when a few of them have died, and obviously no amount of money will bring them back, but some of them have been bread winners and it had cushioned the blow somewhat when their relatives would receive compensation for these unfortunate people. But the Act, in allowing the pillion riders to be insured, has brought a few problems along with it. Some insurance companies have not been insuring motorcycles because of

this problem. In fact, most of the motorcycles in Barbados were insured by one company, about 80 per cent, and that company can no longer take the risk of insuring these motor bikes.

What has been happening is that motor bike riders now either have to leave their motor bikes at home or they must run foul of the law. Some companies are insuring the light motorcycles, by that I mean those up to 250 cc. and you find that they are only doing it third party. I would not venture to say that there is not one company that will insure a motor bike comprehensively, but it is very difficult to find a company doing that in Barbados, and what is happening is that most of the motor bike riders in Barbados now have to insure their motor bikes third party. This creates a problem, because if one has to buy a motor bike in this country and wants to get a loan, it is obvious that the bank will not give the loan if you cannot have that bike comprehensively insured and, therefore, it creates the problem of people actually owning a bike.

Then, there are older ones, and you find that with those even up to 250 cc., people are now asked to pay what can be considered by them, the users, as exorbitant premiums simply because some of the premiums are more than what the bikes are really worth. For instance, if a bike is worth \$1300 and you have to pay a premium of \$1500, it means that you would prefer not to have it on the road. It is a bit of a bother. That is only up to 250 cc. there are bikes of 350 cc., 400 cc. 550 cc., 650 cc., 750 cc., 1000 cc. and 1100 cc. In the Act they are described as "heavy" motorcycles, and when you cannot get comprehensive coverage for these motorcycles, it means that you are in real trouble.

It is not only the motor bike users that have found themselves in a predicament. The people who sell motor bikes in this country find that they can hardly keep their doors open just to sell spare parts, because nobody is buying the new ones, because you cannot get them insured adequately. So there is some measure of redundancy because people will not keep their doors open and employ full staff if they find that you are not selling the motor bikes.

There is talk of a standard premium. Most of the young people who use these bikes have been getting together and trying to see supervisors with an effort of alleviating the problem which has beset them now for some two months or so. I hope that the Minister will be able to say that something is being done or that Government is looking into this question, because right now there are many young people owning these bikes who find themselves not being able to ride them and to go to work by the method by which they are accustomed. I hope that, having brought this plight of the motorcycle riders in this country to this Chamber,

perhaps someone would look at it seriously. Because even though there has been talk for sometime now, no one, as far as I know, seems to be really sure what is the right road to travel. While that is happening, you find that there is utter confusion out there on the roads in terms of people not being sure of what to do next. I hope that the Minister could enlighten us on what steps are being taken; first of all, as I said, to alleviate this problem, and by so doing to ensure that these young people who are using this type of transportation more or less will be able to not only ride their bikes to work but for pleasure as well. I think it is very important, because I met a lot of young people — and a lot of people where I live own bikes — and I have had discussions with some of them, and they are very concerned about it. I do hope that the Minister could let us know exactly what is the situation.

3.05 p.m.

The other area point — and it has been talked about for some time now, it was even alluded to in the Budgetary Proposals — is that some people who own minibuses are a little concerned about their position. I know Senator Linton was talking about the concerns of the constituency of St. Philip South. As a constituent he is concerned, but he was actually standing in this Honourable Chamber and speaking on their behalf. If Senator Linton can do that, I too feel that I can speak on behalf of the youngsters in St. Michael West Central particularly, but all over Barbados in general. I am not particularly going to address my remarks only on behalf of the people in St. Michael West Central, but I shall also be addressing for the people owning minibuses and throughout Barbados.

In the Black Rock area, in every gap you go you see a minibus parked. They own them. I am saying this because Senator Linton is talking on behalf of the good people in St. Philip South — and Heaven knows, Senator Linton is a trier, my friend, very close familiarity with losing the politics and things like that, and therefore as a consequence I must feel that if he is thinking in terms of the people of St. Philip South, that I, with all humility, can venture to speak on behalf of the people in Black Rock.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: You lost by a bus load).

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I had always thought that Senator Trotman had long passed the days when he could interfere with me. I notice he was smiling today when Senator Greaves took Senator Yearwood to task, and I wonder why. Now he waits until Senator Yearwood is out of the Chamber to interfere with me. Senator Trotman, you may talk about the Minister of Transport who, as you know, is my opponent, but at least I have an opponent. It is clear who will run in the next election in

St. Michael West Central. I have one opponent and Senator Trotman has two, just as he did in St. Peter last year when we had another Senator over there, Senator Waldo Ramsay, like Nicodemus canvassing at night, and Senator Trotman canvassing in the day. I do not know why Senator Trotman interfered with me.

Let me address myself to the plight of the minibus owners. As you know, a minibus owner has to pay about \$6 000 a year for the permit, and then he has to pay another \$5 000 to have it on the road. That is \$11 000, but he can pay \$5 000 if it is self-driven. This gives rise to the fact that some people would tend to drive them themselves, even if to save the \$1 000. The minibuses we see on the roads are built to certain specifications, and as far as I know the minibus drivers have been in consultation with the Ministry and in fact have had written confirmation of the fact that these buses must be built to specifications, and they are built by Acme to those specifications — in other words, they are built with the hand rail — and I wonder, and they are wondering, why is it that they cannot be allowed to carry passengers standing. I know you will say that the Act says that a minibus means a motor vehicle that is adapted and constructed to carry from 11 to 24 passengers, and an omnibus is a motor vehicle adapted and constructed to take from 25 or more passengers, but I do feel that the mere fact that you have the facility for standing passengers, I am wondering, and the minibus drivers feel, that it is rather unfair that they are not being allowed to do this. Apart from the fact that they would now be in the omnibus category, and one would have to come here and amend this Bill so as to allow the minibus category to be changed, there seems to be no other earthly reason that this could not be done, and therefore a lot of the people who own minibuses are wondering what is the reason why they have not been able to do this, despite the fact that I understand that they had been promised this in their deliberations with the Minister.

Another group, as you would recall, touched in the Budgetary Proposals, is the maxi taxi. The permit tax was dropped from, I think, \$6 000 to, I think, around \$1 200. The idea was that it would clear them from doing the type of work that some of them had been doing in a pirating fashion, and therefore it meant that they were inconveniencing, or perhaps encroaching on the minibus' domain. One can see on the surface perhaps the idea behind this move, but the stark realities are (1), that it is not working out, and (2), that the Government would now have to take remedial action to make sure that this does not continue any longer. If the maxi taxis are not in a position to do the work, so to speak, of the minibus men, you would find that the minibus men would not bother too much, but what they are saying is that they would rather have the competition of the maxi men and reduce their permit charge from \$6 000 to \$1 200, because they are seeing more and more maxi taxis as the

days come and go. That is a complaint that I think is quite justified. I believe the Government has taken note of this and perhaps the Minister will tell us exactly what they are going to do about it.

The minibus men are concerned — at least the ones I have spoken to, and I have not spoken to the President or any of the people in the hierarchy, I have spoken to the ordinary people who own the buses — about this limit business. One likes to think that there is room for upward mobility, and one likes to think that if you own a little broken down bus in 1985, perhaps in 1986 and beyond you might be able to own something better. Perhaps you might be able to own two, or perhaps three — and why not five in 1990? The proposal that there would be some sort of curtailment or limit on the amount of buses one would own has somewhat annoyed some people who feel that because of the fact that you have to pay \$6 000 for the permit and \$5 000 to get it on the road, they cannot get out. That is the thing, you cannot sell. People find it very hard, because when people who want to buy a minibus hear you have to pay \$6 000 and then \$5 000, some of them do not take the plunge. And some people are wondering why it is that they cannot too be allowed to have a fleet.

One puts forward the argument that you wish people to have a share of the cake. This is quite understandable on the surface if you say you want as many people to sort of get involved in it, but it is not a bread cart, it is not something that cost \$100 — this is something with an expenditure of forty, fifty and sixty thousand dollars, so you will probably find that everybody cannot get in it. If you have to limit the minibuses, one wonders why you cannot limit the people who have poker machines. It is quite safe to argue that if a man who has moved from one to five minibuses, is told that he cannot have six next year, he will say you should look around the society at things like gambling machines, and, as far as I know, and as far as they are aware, there do not seem to be any limitation on those. Perhaps if there is, the Minister can let me know about this.

3.15 p.m.

These two points are of some concern to the average man in the street. The Minister must never see these as nebulous issues. He must address himself to the fact that they are concerns of the ordinary folk voiced by me, because I would like to see something done by him. As I said, we agree in principle with the Bill, but something that must be done to alleviate the problems of the people, not only the minibus men but also the people who ride motorcycles on our streets.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I would certainly like to support my colleague, Senator Hall, in the appeal which he has made relative to the persons who ride motor cycles in this country. It is a fact that the Road

Traffic Act and the Regulations under the new Road Traffic Act relating to the insurance of motorcycles has led to this situation.

We believe that it is a good thing that the stipulation is made for people who ride on the pillion of motorcycles should be covered also, but it would seem as if there has been a reaction from the insurance companies in this country — I am told, that it is probably that they have had one or two serious accidents which has led to their having to pay out some high benefits to families of people who were either injured or killed in accidents — but having said all of that, it must be recognized that a motorcycle is still a very popular means of transport in this country. There are a number of people whose work depend on their being able to get there quickly and the motor cycle provides this kind of aid. In addition to that, if you take, for example, the postmen of this country, you would recognize that all postmen, I believe, traverse their routes on motorcycles, and if, therefore, in the performance of their jobs they are called upon to pay these very, very high rates — in some instances, I understand, the rates charged are in the region of \$2 000 — then it means that this is going to impose a hardship on them.

I believe, as Senator Hall has said, that some people have had to put their motorcycles down because they do not want to break the law. They have been refused insurance; indeed, there are some motorcycle owners who have been insured for a period beyond now and the insurance company has returned that portion of the cheque which would have covered the period beyond which this particular Act would apply, as a result rendering useless the insurance. Even where third party insurance is offered by some insurance companies, it is offered still at a very high rate, and I am told that in some instances, people have to pay about \$1 200 for third party insurance. When you consider the amount of money which one has to pay an insurance company on any motor car, you will find what the insurance companies are now asking motorcyclists to pay is very much what motor car owners are being called upon to pay.

There has to be a way out of this. It would seem to me that the Supervisor of Insurance or, indeed, the Ministry of Finance and Planning, which would have some ultimate responsibility for this, ought to have meetings and arrange with the insurance companies so that they could spread the risks around and at least ease the hardships which obviously have been caused in this particular situation. There is no getting away from it. I think that hardship has been imposed, and there must be a way out, and I would like to appeal to the Government to really pay some serious attention to this, to sit down with the insurance companies and find some way in which those particular problems can be dealt with and the hardships alleviated, because, as I said, there are a number of people

in this country who have to rely on motorcycles to do their work and to get to and from work.

I have identified postmen as one area. There are some marshals in the Supreme Court who rely on those. Just to give you some examples, the various number of messengers around Bridgetown and a whole host of people have to rely on the motorcycle, and I would think that this is an unnecessary burden on them. This is not to say that we do not agree that adequate provision ought not to be made for those persons who are carried on the motorcycles, but, at the same time, we have to recognize that while doing that we do not try to make life extremely difficult for people, as has happened in this particular case, I hope that the Ministry of Finance and Planning would, without delay, make an effort to reduce this hardship.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I do not want to get involved in the motorcycle thing, although I appreciate the arguments on both sides. What I want to say that the insurance companies were very quick in defending their positions when the said position seemed to be affected by the introduction of that particular section of the Road Traffic Act.

Quite recently, however, the Commissioner of Police has made it known that were accidents, not involving personal injuries, occur, then the police would not be going out to the scene, and, if they do go, would not be taking measurements, but would leave the measurements to be taken up to the discretion of the people involved in the accident. This is a move in the right direction, if I may say so. It obtains in the bigger countries, and not because they are the bigger countries that necessarily makes it right, but it should have been introduced here long ago. Because when you have an accident here where no one is injured and the police goes to the scene of the accident, then he becomes investigator, judge and jury. They look at the circumstances, determine who is right and who is wrong, and then send out charges to the person whom they determine was wrong in the first place and do not charge the other person. It very often turns out that it was, in fact, the person whom they did not charge who was wrong. You waste a lot of police time and you waste a lot of court time and then all sorts of bickering goes on in-between.

The next thing that happens, of course, is that the insurance companies concerned where two vehicles are involved in an accident, even where both vehicles are insured by the same insurance company, are lured to accept liability until such time as the police prosecutes one or other of the drivers, which is more waste of time. In the totality of the circumstances, the result of what was happening was that the insurance companies were drawing the premiums, sitting on their laurels and waiting until the police had done their work for them. There is no

reason why this should be so. The insurance companies have to be told in no uncertain terms they must hire lost adjusters, as is done in big countries — create employment — who will go around and take measurements, ascertain the relative position of vehicles after accidents, and then see if they can arrive at an amicable solution to the problem, if necessary on the spot.

3.25 p.m.

They have to spend some of the profits they are making. If you read the balance sheets of these insurance companies at the end of the year, I do not think one of them every incurs a loss. They all make a profit. They are not spending back enough money into the society from which they make the profits. Even the Insurance Corporation of Barbados, they give out a few badges here and there at the end of the year, but they are not doing enough to spend back as much of the money as they are making. I know one of their directors sits among us, but that is true. They are not spending enough of their profits in the society. They must hire loss adjusters, they must hire people who must go around and investigate accidents, they must have people who can take measurements and, generally speaking, they must look after the interests of the insureds not only when the premium is paid, but also when the insureds get into an accident. I think that is a duty, and that is something they must be told in no uncertain terms. The premiums are high enough and they can afford to do that. They may not send me any work after today, but I do not care. They must have a social conscience.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I must say that I was impressed with the representations made in this presentation even by the Opposition, because it must be borne in mind that the intention of the amendments to the Road Traffic Act, indeed the Regulations which require that pillion riders wear helmets and riders of motorcycles wear helmets, came out for a very good reason. The reason was that we found there was an inordinately large number of people who rode motorcycles who were seriously injured or killed whenever an accident occurred involving a motorcycle, so we had to do something about it. Up to when the Act was introduced, I found that Barbados was one of the few places that I had known about where there was not a requirement for motorcycle riders to wear a helmet. It must be also recognised that, in this case, there has been a bit of carelessness on the part of some of the riders in carrying people on the pillion who were not protected, hence you get one measure aimed at protecting the lives of people which might have created a bit of a problem in terms of insurance.

This has not gone unnoticed by the Government. Senator Hall has called for information from the Government as to whether or not something is being done about this. I am aware that the Supervisor of Insurance is trying to resolve the difficulties associated with the problems.

We must recognise that in Barbados we have had a tremendous increase in vehicular traffic within the last four or five years, an increase that could not have been anticipated, say, ten years ago. We may want to appoint that this increase in new self-drive personal and commercial vehicles is a solid indicator of the wealth of the country and indeed of its economic development, but it also brings with it other problems. I like to think that Barbadians are by and large some of the most courteous users of the road that I have known, with a few exceptions, and it is those exceptions who create a lot of difficulty for the regular travelling public. It has been remarked time and time again that it is a miracle that in Barbados, with the small size of the roads and the large number of vehicles on the roads, we do not suffer more fatalities and more serious injury.

We also have to be concerned about the fact that while we can be cognisant of the fact that the travelling public likes to obey the traffic laws of the country and are generally very law abiding, there are still one or two cases which do have a devastating impact on the people who are the insurance carriers. There are even classic examples where every small accident that you get, you find that a vehicle is written off, and people get paid out, and somehow this goes on and on and you can still see the vehicles that were "written off" being refurbished and made to look like new in a very short space of time. That is a common occurrence; indeed, that in itself is an industry. There are known experts who can be called upon to write off vehicles for you. That is a fact, and I am sure that the insurance companies are aware of this, and therefore in the calculating of premiums, while I am not going to defend them on that because I myself am a victim of high premiums, I think that we have to be cognisant of the fact that where defensive measures are being taken, they may not indeed redound to the common good. Those people who are innocent and decent road users and who are prepared not to have their vehicles written off when things become difficult have to pay the price.

I keep hearing people boast of how they can get around, for instance, the 60 per cent no fault discount by moving from insurance company to insurance company. There are all kinds of devious ways to deal with the problem. By the same token, you introduce laws and you find that people are finding ways and means of circumventing the laws.

When we first thought about the idea of introducing the minibus service in Barbados — and no one can deny that the minibus service has been a tremendous help in this country; without the minibus system I do not think we could get very far — the intention was that these vehicles would be owner driven vehicles rather than have concessionaires. We must not forget that the Government by taking over the Transport Board had indeed put an

end to the system of concessionaires, and we have found that, in certain subtle ways, the whole system of concessionaires has crept back into the minibus operation. That was never the intention. I believe that the steps that the Government is currently taking to try to limit the numbers of minibuses is indicative of the determination that the people who own the minibuses should at least be driving them.

Senator Hall made a plea for those minibus drivers who complain that they ought to be able to carry passengers standing, but I think you have to balance that with whether or not you want to have passengers standing whose safety may be compromised. When you have a small vehicle like some of the minibuses that I see tearing away up and down in some of the street corners, I wonder how comfortable or how safe it would be – and I am only wondering – for people to be standing in these small vehicles that carry fifteen or 25 people. These are the considerations, that while one or two minibus drivers might see that there is an opportunity for additional revenue by carrying standing passengers, they may be also letting themselves in for a serious problem by having passengers who are standing and when they get into accidents, have serious casualties.

Senator Linton mentioned this problem of the insurance companies and the importance of having the vehicles move away from the scene of an accident. That was designed by the Government to ensure that we have easy passage for vehicles. Sometimes we find the most trivial of accidents where an entire line of traffic is blocked waiting for the police to come and take measurements, and all you have is a broken light or scratched fender or something like that. Clearly, with the tremendous increase in traffic, you really have to look at whether or not that is the most desirable position. You have to look at whether or not the economic loss that you are suffering because of the delays to people, the waste of people's time, the use of fuel waiting in long lines because two cars have scratched fenders, and weigh them against whether or not we can constantly have that kind of situation interfering with the smooth passage of traffic.

3:35 p.m.

As I said before, we have a tremendous increase in traffic which has brought on significant problems. My contention is, and I have said it time and time again, that with the tremendous increase in traffic on the road in Barbados, of course there is a greater opportunity for breaking the law. There are still people who drive in Barbados and who park around bends and get themselves involved in oblique parking which occasions traffic snarls – and you cannot speak to them and say anything about it, because you are the subject of abuse. There are people who believe in parking on the major arteries and leaving their cars unattended.

(Aside: Driving without insurance!)

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: And driving without insurance. I do not know about that, though, it does not happen to me. The point is that when you get that situation, I see the need now for mobile police patrols, that is a crying need, so that we can resolve some of the problems occasioned by the people who still feel that we are a nation with three hundred or four hundred vehicles and not one where there has been a tremendous increase in the number of vehicles that are using the roads.

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

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported and having been 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.

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1985

Order No. 8 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the age of retirement and the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before the Bill is introduced, may I point out that we have now reverted to the original order of the Order Paper. We said earlier that 8 and 18 would be interchanged, so we have now reverted to the original order.

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, Section 103 of the Constitution of Barbados provides for the payment of pensions to persons holding public office in Barbados. That section makes it clear that any law changing the provisions of pensions must not put the public officer in a less favourable position than he was in before. Therefore, when Pensions Acts are being amended, it is usual to insist in the drafting that the amended Act should make provision for

officers to opt as to which Act they want their pensions to be guided by.

National Insurance came to Barbados, and, from the inception of National Insurance, it was noticed that public officers would get two pensions, one from the National Insurance Board and one from the Consolidated Fund. In 1975, the first step was made towards amalgamating the pensions of public officers with those of the National Insurance Board. The Miscellaneous Act of 1975 provided that where a public officer who enters the Service after that day was eligible for a National Insurance Pension, his public pension would be abated by the amount he got from the National Insurance Board. That was to make sure that the amount of duplication which existed was reduced, and it was also one of the steps taken in providing for a National Insurance Pensions Plan under which all Barbadians would be eligible for a pension under the same scheme.

3.45 p.m.

The Bill before the Senate today is the second step in the exercise of providing for a single scheme. The Bill is necessary because public officers become eligible for pension at the age of 60, whereas persons insured with the National Insurance Board get their pension at age 65. It is necessary to synchronize the two pensions at age 65. It is also convenient to do it at this time, because the life expectancy of people in Barbados has gone up and, therefore, they will not suffer adversely by working until age 65. In fact, it would be a benefit for strong officers to work until age 65 rather than retire at 60 and go home and waste away.

The first announcement of the amendment of this particular Bill was made back in 1984 when the then Minister of Finance made his Budget on April 17, last year. Since then there have been consultations with the various unions, and, as a result, we have the Bill before us.

I want to draw attention to the sections of the Constitution that are affected and to make it clear that the Constitution of Barbados in no way is violated by the Act, since provisions, for option are made in the Bill, at least in three places. Therefore, no officer can say that his constitutional right is being violated because he is being given a worse condition of service.

There is a schedule of persons who are treated differently, and in the Schedule there are many Heads of Departments and Permanent Secretaries. The reason for allowing them to keep their present state is because it was considered that Heads of Departments can become stale if they stay in the same place for too long, and this was an effort to ensure that new thoughts had a chance of rising to the top in the Public Service. But except for the Heads of Departments, as from the passing of the Bill

public officers will have an opportunity to work until age 65 with an option to retire at age 60.

Great fuss has been made about the age of retirement. I must point out that at one time we had three different ages of retirement in Barbados, age 70, 65 and 60. So we are managing to achieve a common age for retirement for all persons who work in the Public Service by the provisions of this Bill.

The date for which the Act takes effect in terms of persons entering the Public Service was June 1, 1984. Those persons who enter the Public Service from that day will not be able to opt, and for that reason no appointments have been made in the Public Service from that day. But persons who were in the Service before and under 50 years of age will have an opportunity to opt as to whether they want the provision to affect them or not.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am particularly grateful that this particular item was moved back into its original position, because I have a commitment later this afternoon and I was a bit fearful that I might have had to leave without getting an opportunity to make a contribution to this very important piece of legislation. I think this amendment relating to the age of retirement and the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances is a fundamental piece of legislation, affecting the lives of thousands of people.

Senator Trotman, in introducing this Bill, indicated that in 1975 the first attempt towards rationalizing pensions in the Public Service was taken and that this Bill is a continuation of that particular arrangement. But it is important for us to examine the way in which the Barbados Labour Party Administration approached this particular measure and compare it with the way in which the Democratic Labour Party, when it was in power, approached the first attempt towards rationalization, as Senator Trotman called the attempt at that time.

In 1975, when the amendment was done, a number of steps were taken. A draft Bill was prepared, it was circulated to the trade unions and other interested bodies, and a brochure with questions and answers as to how the Bill would affect individuals was circulated to the entire Public Service. In addition to that, seminars were organized by the Establishments Division all around Barbados, where groups of public servants, including teachers, came together on Saturday mornings and some evenings during the week and asked questions and had explanations made about the changes which were introduced. It was only after that the amendments were introduced.

I think that particular approach demonstrated a kind of concern for the people who were going to be effected by the change, and every effort was made to explain the change and to have discussions with unions so that if changes were seen necessary, that such changes would be introduced — and if my memory serves me correctly, I think that changes were introduced as a result of these consultations and discussions.

This Administration makes a lot of mouthings about consultations. It takes a lot of postures about discussions with the public, just purely as a public relations gimmick, but in truth and fact it has no uses for consultation, no uses for getting a second opinion, no uses for the opinion of organizations which represent workers who are going to be affected by a fundamental change like this. So when they submitted the proposals to the unions in August last year asking for comments
3.55 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, on a point of order: The unions were approached before last year, the unions were approached on the 10th January, 1983. There was a letter signed by a Mr. F. A. Parris, Chief Establishments Officer, to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, which made it very clear that Government intended to change the age of retirement to 65 and asked for the comments of the Barbados Workers Union.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: When on September 7, 1984 the proposals were submitted — and just let me read the first paragraph —

“General Secretary,
Barbados Workers Union,
Solidarity House,
Harmony Hall,
St. Michael.

Dear Sir,

I have been directed to invite you to submit comments of your Union on the following proposals attaching to the change in the age of compulsory retirement as announced by the Prime Minister in the House of Assembly on the 7th April, 1984....”
and it sets out — the point I making is that.....

“..... and I would appreciate if you would submit your Union's comments at least by the 1st October, 1984.”

This was signed by F. A. Parris, Chief Establishments Officer.

Even if a letter was sent in 1983, let me concede that

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I said so, Sir, and unless he wants to call me a liar in the Senate, he must concede that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Don't get jumpy. I am only reading from 1984.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: But Senator Trotman's quotation from the letter demands a concession. That is a fact. Please continue.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: It is nothing to get jumpy about. My point, however, is that even if there were a letter in 1983....

SENATOR THE HON. O'BRIEN TROTMAN: There was a letter, Sir. I said that, Sir.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Read the letter.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: “General Secretary, Barbados Workers' Union, Corner Nelson and Fairchild Streets,...” They had not yet moved.

“This Division is engaged in a review of the existing pension provisions for Public Officers and Employees with a view to bringing them into line with Government's proposals for our national pensions plan.

In carrying out this review, we are examining, among other things, proposals to extend the compulsory retirement age to 65 and to adjust the optional age of retirement to 60. This would serve to synchronise the age of retirement in the Civil Service with the age at which National Insurance pensions are paid.

It is also in keeping with the trend which has resulted from a decline in the birth rate and the increase in the work life span.

An early response to this proposal would be appreciated.”

It is dated 10th January, 1983.

Of course the union did not respond, but other unions that cared about responding, like the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners and the Fire Service Association responded. But not the Barbados Workers Union!

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think the point has been made that in 1983 the Barbados Workers Union was in receipt of a letter from the Establishments Office inviting them to comment on certain proposals which were envisaged.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: All right, Sir. As far as the union was concerned, that was a statement about general policy proposals, generally speaking.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: It was also an invitation.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Just give me a chance. We thought there were general policy proposals relative to the retirement age and the matter which we are discussing. However, the letter of 7th September, 1984, which I just referred to, and which, if Senator Trotman wanted to present an honest picture.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, he cannot infer dishonesty.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: We know you are dishonest. I withdraw that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Your argument is that before 1984 the union was consulted, and I think that point has been made.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: And in June 1983 they said they would give it to the Executive Council, so he will keep on the narrow line.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please let Senator Greaves continue.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: In 1983 the Government gave broad outlines. As I recall — and he could say this also — the Government also indicated that they would be setting up a committee to review, not the whole question of national pensions, but what I am saying is that it was not until 1984, on the 7th September, that specific proposals relating to the matter at hand were submitted. That is what I am talking about, and I will read the letter. I did not intend to waste time by reading the letter, because as I said, I have another engagement.

The proposals from the Chief Establishments Officer were as follows

- (1) the ages for compulsory retirement and for voluntary retirement of Government employees should be changed from 60 years and 55 years respectively to 65 and 60 years in respect of —
 - (a) serving officers and employees under the age of 50 years on 1st June, 1984, except those holding the following posts on 1st June, 1984,

and it sets out those —

Chief Parliamentary Counsel
Director, Finance and Planning
Permanent Secretary
Secretary to the Cabinet
Solicitor General
Chief Establishments Officer.

I am not going to read the list, but the same list as contained in this particular Bill. That is when they got to specific proposals, not a general statement, about the Government proposing to change regulations relating to pensions and retirement age and that sort of thing. I am talking about the letter which came in September.

Then it goes on:

- (b) persons entering the Public Service on or after 1st June, 1984, the same proposals that are contained in this Bill;
 - (c) persons under 50 years of age who on 1st June, 1984 were serving in any of the posts included in the list at (a) and who gained promotion subsequently to any other post in that list.
- (2) officers under 50 years to whom the new maximum age of 65 years would be applicable would retain their existing right of voluntary retirement at the age of 55 years and onwards.

This is the letter I am talking about where specific proposals relating to retirement and relating to pensions were submitted. That is the whole point. The letter which he read dealt with a broad statement of policy. It is when the specific proposals came in September of 1984 that then one saw what the Government was proposing. This is what I am talking about, so there is no need for Senator Trotman to be jumping up and trying to suggest that I do not know what I am talking about. I have the letter here in front of me. In the penultimate paragraph it says:

"Please note that the reference to persons entering the Public Service on or after 1st June, 1984 relates to persons being permanently appointed on or after that date. Please also note that arrangements have been made to freeze all permanent first appointments to posts in the Service with effect from 1st June, 1984 until the necessary amending legislation has been enacted. Every effort is therefore being made to have the enactment in place as soon as possible. It would be appreciated if you would submit your Union's comments by 1st October, 1984."

4.05 p.m.

The comments were submitted in two basic sections. One basically related to the increase in the age of retirement, where the union said that, in view of the general demographic pattern which developed, from time to time there would be need to look at the whole question of retirement. Then, in a letter of October 11:

"Further to our letter to you of 28th September, 1984, in which the Barbados Workers Union indicated that there was no objection to the proposed change in the retirement age, I wish to suggest however, that there is need for a meeting between the two sides. The call for the meeting is in order that we may discuss the manner of computation of pensions. The BWU needs to ensure that workers are not entitled to less pension as a result of the difference in computation.

"It is also necessary, in considering the retirement age, for us to ensure that section 103 of the Constitution is not breached by the change."

My understanding is that the National Union of Public Workers also had indicated that they wanted to have discussions with the Government on this whole matter of pensions because there was some uneasiness among the membership about what this change would cause them. It was felt that they would be put in a worse position than they were. For example, with the increase of the retirement age from 60 to 65, in order now to qualify for full pension, one would have to do 40 years as against 33 1/3 years under the other arrangement. These were matters which the unions, as I understand it, wanted to discuss, and representation was made to the Government seeking discussions on these matters.

I cannot speak for the National Union of Public Workers, but what I know is that the Government did not have any discussions with the Barbados Workers Union on this particular matter as requested. As a matter of fact, a week before this Bill came into Parliament, one of the Deputy General Secretaries of the Barbados Workers Union, Leroy Trotman, in a meeting with the Permanent Secretary to the Prime Minister, Mr. Algy Symmonds, who now looks after establishment matters, raised this question and reminded him that the Union had been seeking discussions on this particular matter. He was given an assurance that discussions would take place — and the week after this assurance was given, this Bill came down! This is symptomatic of the arrogance of the Government. It indicates very clearly that the Government has no intention of discussing any matter of this nature with organizations and people who may have an interest. That is very clear from the behaviour of the Government.

As I said, the former Administration, when the change was introduced, did everything possible to make all the public servants aware of what their position would

be. They had seminars, they went out and met people, had discussions with trade unions. This Administration had no such intention, because they did not do it, and I believe that that is the reason why we have come to a situation now where a number of people are disturbed by the provisions of this and feel that they will be in a less advantageous position. No opportunity was provided for discussions or explanations on this matter. And if my memory serves me correctly, the Government itself was confused as far as this Bill was concerned, because after giving notice of it — I am speaking from memory now — they brought down a number of amendments to the original Bill, which would suggest, (a), that they brought it before they were ready, and (b), that they themselves were not clear about what they were doing. I say that they are still not clear about what they are doing and I believe that this can have some repercussions in the future.

All of this could have been avoided if the Government had adopted a reasonable position and had sat down and discussed the matters with the organizations representing the people in the Public Service. But the Government has no intention, it is very clear to me, of sitting down and discussing matters and coming to a reasonable conclusion with the organizations representing the workers in the public sector. Their track record is very very poor in this regard. Look at the salary negotiations, look at the discussions with the teachers. All of these are indicative of the kind of scant respect with which this Administration treats the Public Service and the organisations representing people in the Public Service. I believe that if an Administration is interested in its workers, it ought to have established a proper avenue for discussion. At the same time, these avenues for discussion must be made to work; one must not set up systems just for show and not be serious about these things. These are the matters which concern people who work in the Public Service.

I believe that in spite of the fact that an effort is being made to rationalize retirement and have a unified retirement age, at times we have to be very careful with trying to put everything into a legal straight-jacket. There must be considerations which may merit some other approach, and I am sure that the extension of the retirement age to 65 will bring some hardships and some inconveniences to a number of people. I can think, for example, of a fireman who has to work until he is 65, goes to a fire and has to scale up a ladder to put out a fire at age 65. He may be on duty — do not worry to tell me that there will be younger people there — and may have to do it. He may not be in the physical condition to do that kind of work, but if he is employed, he will have to do that at some point, or a policeman, for that matter. These are matters which can be taken into consideration.

4.15 p.m.

There are other groups of workers. There are some groups of workers who can go quite easily to 65 and who I know would want to go to 65. It is a fact that a number of people in the Public Service would like to work until 65 and there are some people who would like to retire at an earlier age, so an opportunity should have been presented for this kind of discussion to take place and for suggestions to be made, and eventually an arrangement worked out where everybody would feel quite happy and satisfied. But the Government, in its typical arrogant fashion, did not think that this was necessary. They have decided that they will extend the retirement age to 65, they have decided that they will make changes to the pension arrangements, they did not have to consult and reach conclusions with organisations representing the people who are going to be affected by these matters, and they have gone ahead with it. I am saying that this is typical of the Barbados Labour Party Administration.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: This is the second or third occasion that I have been informed by way of documents, by way of the evidence, that the Barbados Workers Union failed to do what it was expected to do as an organisation representing workers in this country. It was last year that I was made aware in this Honourable Chamber of an instance where Government sought the input from the Barbados Workers Union long before a proposal came as a final document to be considered in this Honourable Chamber, only to be told that there was no correspondence whatsoever coming from the union. I really want to ask the question: are you suggesting that it is arrogance since 1983 to have asked the Barbados Workers Union for an input or comments on the proposed change from 60 to 65 years respectively? Was it arrogance on the part of Government? Government wanted some kind of indication as to what the comments of the union were at that time. You waited for over a year and a half, then you came up with a final proposal and sent it to the union, and they are going to say, as he said, that at one stage they had basically no general objections with the proposal — I think that is what he said — then you come in here and you say that Government likes to railroad people? Is it arrogance on the part of the Government because the union is not allowed to make an input? To my mind the union is not taking its responsibilities seriously. I really believe that Senator Greaves ought not to have spoken on this particular Bill.

To be quite honest, I am very distressed because I would hate to believe that the union could have sat down for a year and a half and refused to submit any kind of recommendation to Government whatsoever, and then the union representative in this Honourable Senate gets up and tells me that he is going to begin in September 1984, and then talk about arrogance and dishonesty on the part of Government! If the person who was piloting this Bill was not so consciously aware of what he was saying and sharp enough to have drawn

it to our attention that the union was written since 1983, we all would have gone away with the impression that the union knew absolutely nothing about it, it was never asked to make an input into it, and it is just simply dishonest to the workers of this country to be giving them a proposal in September 1984 and asking them to comment on the 1st October, 1984.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of clarification: Is Senator Williams telling this Honourable Chamber that in 1983 the proposals which were submitted in a letter to the Barbados Workers Union on 7th September 1984 were known to the Barbados Workers Union and other unions in Barbados? That the details of the proposals which I read out in this Chamber were known to any given union?

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves rose on a point of clarification. Senator Greaves you have made your point.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: All I am asking is, does Senator Williams want to give this Chamber the impression that the letter of 1983 contained the proposals as described in the letter of 7th September 1984? I am saying that the letter did not, and the specific details came on 7th September, 1984, as contained in this letter.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I do not mind the outburst from Senator Greaves. I really believe that this is one instance where Senator Greaves really does not have a foot to stand on, and no getting up and grandstanding and no loud tones are going to change it, because if Senator Greaves is going to ask a question, I would like to know what kind of response Government got between, say, January 1983 and September, 1984. I want to know even if they had the common courtesy of saying "we acknowledge the receipt of your request" and that some document was going to follow at some subsequent date. I even want to know if Senator Greaves can show me in any way any kind of correspondence whatsoever coming from the union, because if he cannot find any, I think that today is a very sad day for all of us, and I think Government was treated with scant respect by the Barbados Workers Union.

I have stood up in this Honourable Chamber from time to time and congratulated the Barbados Workers Union for the work it has done in terms of the development of this country, but this is one instance where we all have to be very ashamed about the performance of the Barbados Workers Union. And do not worry to come in here and grandstand now, because in truth and in fact, it should be the same workers that the Barbados Workers Union represents that should be killing the union now.

They should be harassing them because they were at fault. You ask for an input into something from January 1983 and you send forward a document for them to comment on, but because, of course, they had no input initially, or they did not want to make any — I can only come to the conclusion that they did not want to make an input; it is either that or Senator Greaves can say they did not receive a letter — it would be more satisfactory to this Honourable Chamber that the Barbados Workers Union never received the letter — they do not respond. I am indeed saddened this afternoon.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: It was indicated that, in recognition of the constitutional provisions whereby pension arrangements should not be changed to the detriment of public workers, the provision was made for persons under the age of 50 to opt for the older retirement age or the one under which they were originally employed. That particular provision could be made slightly more liberal in a manner which would more or less accord more closely with what I would construe to be the spirit of the Constitution. They must decide within one year whether they want to stay with the old arrangements or convert to the new, and I can see no particular problem in allowing people a longer period to opt, let us say, a year or two before their present retirement age. If they are currently entitled to retire at 55 or obligated to retire at 60, around the age of 58 let them make the decision whether they want to opt to continue onwards until 65 years as opposed to retiring at 60. I say that because it would be particularly difficult for people, say, ten, fifteen or twenty years or more before retirement to be absolutely sure that, in changing from what they have to the other arrangement, they are not moving into a situation which would prove to their disadvantage.

4.25 p.m.

There can be no general principles that you can apply. There are a lot of idiosyncratic reasons why something could be disadvantageous to one person or the other, related to their health, personal circumstances and a whole lot of other things. So I would urge that at some time some further consideration be given to this clause about opting and extend the period in which public servants can determine whether they want to stay in their existing retirement arrangements or come on to the new scheme.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am glad that Senator McClean has spoken in such terms, because when I listened to the debate and noticed the deterioration of behaviour in this Chamber, I wondered what was happening, when our behaviour should be of such a standard that it should be emulated by the youngsters. It seems like if out here is getting like over there, where one must rave and rant and things like that. They are behaving as if they are young, when they are just nincompoops. I do not understand how people could behave like that. I wish

that we could resort to our former times and let us debate the issues of the day with some dignity.

I feel, like Senator McClean, that one could easily be given the option, having reached the age of sixty. From the time one gets to the age of fifty, I think that everybody in Barbados has his mind as to exactly when they want to retire, or when they would like to. As I look around this room, I see many people who have reached the age of fifty and who would be able to get up and say if for a long time they have decided in their minds what they would like to do. They might not be in a position to fulfill their dreams, but that does not mean that they have not thought about it.

As you look at it in the old position, where one could retire after 33 1/3 years, when one considers that in the Forties and Fifties, one would leave school because there might not have been any sixth forms in the Forties and Fifties, you would find that one would leave school at the age of seventeen or eighteen, and by the time you got to fifty, you would have reached that 33 1/3 years. It is a two-edged sword, because even though we have at one end people having been in the Service who would want to go on, some people might opt to take their pension and give of their service in a private enterprise. We see so often in Barbados where people have retired and the commercial sector has snapped them up. This is the norm. However, you find that, at the other end of the scale, you have people like road workers who do not go to work on the road at eighteen, but they might well go at twenty-five or after, and you would find that these are the type of people that would try to go as long as possible. One of the reasons that you would find that they would go as long as possible is that some of them have children, and you find that by the time they reach the age of fifty-five, they have still got a lot of children at school and therefore it is not desirable at that stage for them to retire.

So I agree with Senator McClean, it is rather debatable whether people would like to retire. There are people in the Public Service who would like to go early and there are people who would like to go late. Senator Greaves said that, and we all know that it is true. And because of the fact that at one end of the scale you do have people who it suits to go early and at the other end of the scale there are people who it does not suit to go early, it seems to me that there should be some reconciliation of the entire thing.

Aside.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am talking about standards. You cannot get up and puff and rant and get on. He has to understand that he cannot come in here and behave like that.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: But he must behave like that? That is nonsense! I am coming for you!)

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair. Complete your address to the Chair.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair. Please, please.

Aside.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please, please.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: He is coming for me?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please, please!

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am referring to the fact that he is coming for me, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am not finished yet. With what? With a gun?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: And keep to the point.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am saying that at one end of the scale, you have people who would like to go early and, at the other end, you have people who would not like to go early. So, of necessity, you have to come together and work it out. That is what Government has to do in the face of opposition or criticism from over here. We are here to oppose. What is wrong with that?

Aside.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: We are the Opposition. We have to oppose when we see it fit to oppose, and praise when we see fit. I am praising it, I am not saying that it is a bad system, I am saying that if you recognize what the problem is, you should be in a position to make all effort to alleviate it, and you can do so by discussion.

I do not have to talk for anybody. This is Wes Hall talking. You do not have to tell me to talk for anybody. If you want to talk for anybody out there, you talk for somebody. I do not have any brief for anybody, and I object to any Minister of Government telling me that he is coming for me.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I am coming for you!)

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Am I supposed to be fearful for my life, Sir?

Laughter

SENATOR W. W. HALL: A Minister of Government is telling me that he is coming for me!

Asides

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I would be very anxious to know. If you are coming for me, I want to know. It is a serious thing that before the House you could make a point like that.

All I got up to say is that I agree with Senator McClean. I did not even attempt to refer to my illustrious colleague.

Asides

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Hall, please address the Chair and keep to the point.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I am addressing you. The fact that what I am saying seems to evoke some sort of comment from the Government side, is only in keeping with the fact, that they understand what I am saying.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Well, do not allow yourself to be distracted by them.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am not being distracted, Sir.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: You do not understand the Bill. Talk about it!)

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please, please, Senator Trotman.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, if Senator Trotman understands anything, I can put it to this House that anybody who went to school in Barbados, at least to Seventh Standard, or even to Fifth Standard, would understand. If he understands, anybody who is twelve years old and sat the Eleven Plus would understand it.

Government of necessity must look at this, fully realizing that there are areas where there are people who would like to go early and people who would not like to go early. I know that they would look at this very closely and come up with some solution which would mean that the people of this country would have a choice.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I have been very scandalized by the behaviour in the Senate this afternoon and I hope that we would not have a

repetition of this again. I think we have all reached the stage where we should be able to argue a case without losing our sense of balance.

It appears to me that this particular Bill needs some more discussion. I think it is too serious a Bill to be rushed through. I agree with Senator McClean and Senator Hall that people should have a chance, perhaps even more than a year, to decide whether they want to opt to be on one side or another.
4.35 p.m.

This is a very serious Bill. It can affect people in many, many ways and I do think that we should, as the Romans say, "hasten slowly" with this Bill. I would prefer to know that we have given some more thought to it than to rush it through in this kind of way that we are getting on this afternoon.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Greaves in his presentation made reference to a letter from the Barbados Workers Union of 28th September, in which the union said it had no general objection relating to the change in the age of retirement for public servants. The letter also said that the Executive Council is aware of the economic and social condition that give rise to the measurement:

"The Council feels that domestic patterns need to be measured from time to time to plan early for the impact on large employment sectors such as the Public Service."

That would give the impression that that was an original position coming from the Workers Union. The truth of it is that they were replying to the second letter from the Government because they never took on the first letter — they chased away the Government.

The second letter read:

No. M.P.6004/6/T1/77

1983-06-20.

Dear Sir,

I refer to correspondence resting with my letter No. M.P.6004/6/T1/77 of 1983-05-25 in connection with the proposal to raise the compulsory age of retirement of Government employees to 65.

2. I attached a note on the effect of demographic trends on the structure of the Public Service in 1980 with projections from 1985 to 2000. This note has been prepared by the Government Statistical Department and I hope that you will find it useful in considering the proposal.

3. Your early response would be appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

F. A. PARRIS
Chief Establishments Officer.

The General Secretary,
Barbados Workers Union,
Cr. Nelson & Fairchild Street,
Bridgetown..

So not only the Government in January informed the union that it had a proposal of raising the age of retirement to age 65, but the Government itself actually prepared statistical data from which the union could draw a conclusion. But then Senator Greaves does not consider that to be consultation, and then he talks in the Senate about who is honest and who is dishonest!

Senator Greaves made some reference to the publicity that went on in 1975 when the Miscellaneous Pensions Act, 1975, was being contemplated, and he said that no such public relations effort was made this time. The point is that 1975 was the first time that an effort was going to be made to synchronize the Government pensions with National Insurance Pensions and, therefore, everybody had to be brought up-to-date with the fact that they were going to synchronize the position. We are now continuing the process, so it is not necessary to repeat all the PR that was done in 1975.

He talked about the consultation in 1975. I will tell you why the consultation was so bad in 1975. In 1974, when the Democratic Labour Party was in office and they wanted to change the conditions of service — they started in 1974 — to change the pensions for public officers and synchronize with the National Insurance Scheme, they wanted to take away the accrued rights of the civil servants at that time. That was drawn to the attention of the Attorney General, who told them that it was unconstitutional, it was in direct conflict with Section 103 of the Constitution. That is why they had the long consultation process, because the then Government was seeking to violate the constitutional rights of people who worked in the Civil Service, and then they had a long drawn-out debate as to how it should be done. As a result, it was agreed that only persons entering the Service after the appointed date in 1975 could be effected by the change.

In this case, this Administration had no intention of trying to violate the constitutional rights of civil servants. We made that clear from the beginning that no appointments were to be made since last year to make sure there was no overlapping of conditions of service, that the Bill would only affect people entering the Service after the

appointed day, and that, in accordance with the Constitution, persons in service would be given an opportunity to choose between the previous legislation and the present one. So we had two different wickets altogether. In the one case, we had a wicket on which that party he represents attempted to violate the rights of the civil servants. In this case, we recognized their rights, and there was not the need for the long drawn-out discussions which existed in 1975.

Senator Greaves said that workers feel disturbed and they will be worse off. If the organisations representing the workers acknowledge that it is a correct step to take and tells the Government that it has no objection to the principle of raising the age, it must be the responsibility of the Government and of the workers' organisations to see that there cannot be fears among workers who think they are being unfaired. But, of course, they have no intention of meeting with workers. They operate regular DLP strong-man tactics, they do not have to talk to anybody.

The other question he raised was a question about the Government's track record, and he talked about salaries. Senator Greaves was in the Other Place and did not say a word in 1976 when the then Prime Minister refused to discuss salaries with civil servants' unions, but legislated salaries in the Other Place.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir: Senator Trotman is now misleading this Chamber, and deliberately so, because the Record.....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I would not mislead the Senate deliberately, but I will take the point of order.

Asides

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: You cannot say that, because you know differently, that is why I say you are doing it deliberately. The records of the House of Assembly would indicate very, very clearly that this person, Evelyn Greaves, who was then the Member for St. Lucy, spoke against the legislation of salaries, drew to the attention of the then Government that it was wrong in creating a precedent which was a dangerous one. If one would go on and search the House of Assembly's records, you would find that. The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, since Senator Trotman mentioned his name, also took that position. We did not only speak and express ourselves against that particular approach to industrial relations in this country, when the matter came for voting, both the General Secretary and myself voted against the Democratic Labour Party Administration because we voted according to our consciences — something which none of you have never done.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The point is made.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I am sorry if I am misrepresenting Senator Greaves' position. But it does not let him off the hook, because today he says that the other party had a good record as far as consultations are concerned, and now he gets up in his defence and says that he had to talk about them, too, of the lack of consultation. So you cannot have it both ways.

Asides

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: On a point of order, Sir: I am not going to let Senator Trotman get away with that. My statement relating to consultation on this particular matter.....
4.45 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: On the salaries, Sir. He said it was on the salaries.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves, make your point of order.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I always remember what I say. This is the good thing about it. When I talked about consultation, I was talking about consultation in relation to the approach which the present Barbados Labour Party Administration made in relation to this particular matter, and I said that the Barbados Labour Party Administration has a bad record on consultation, and it was then that I brought up the salaries.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That is no point of order.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: There was a question of some merit which was raised by Senator McClean, a question of whether a person should be given an opportunity to opt now, within a year, or be given an opportunity to opt when they reach age 58 or thereabouts. I am not going to say that that point has not got some merit, but I would say in defence of the Act that the Act really follows other amendments to the Pensions Act in which you are always given a year in which to choose which Act you are going to choose. I suppose it is a matter of simply following the system, but there is some merit in that.

From memory I know that, whenever Pension Acts have been amended, officers have been given one year in which to make a decision, so this, in fact, is in keeping with what went before. But I am not going to say you do not have a point.

Senator Hall never understood the Act, because he was making a point that people should be given a chance

to opt. If he had read the Bill before him, he would have seen that officers are given a kind of option, and he would have understood that at present people over 50 can be asked to retire. That is why the Act does not apply to persons who have already passed their 50th year, because under the present law they can be asked to retire, so they do not have any particular bargaining position, if you want to put it that way, in terms of the Pensions Act. This only affects people under 50, in other words, the people who do have an entrenched right. That is why age 50 is the cut off point.

Senator Jones agreed with both Senator Hall and Senator McClean. There were two different opinions, so I am not too sure which one he agreed with. Senator McClean made a point of substance, Senator Hall never understood what was happening in the Bill and therefore rambled on all evening and never made sense.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to, Senators Greaves and Hall voting "NO."

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator H. R. LINTON in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Senate is in Committee.

Clause 1 was called.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I would like to record my dissent to all the sections.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, please take note that Senator Greaves would like his dissent to all the sections recorded, so would Senator Hall, but so far as clause 1 is concerned I think the AYES have it.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Senate was resumed and the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment was reported, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. O'B. TROTMAN, the Bill was read a third time forthwith and passed, Senators Hall and Greaves dissenting.

BUSINESS COMPANIES (EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) (AMENDMENT) ACT

Order No. 9 was called — To move the First Reading of a Bill to amend the International Business Companies (Exemption from Income Tax) Act.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please let it be recorded that this Bill is being read a second time.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, after all the fireworks I hope that we can get back to a more sane method of doing things. We know this is the silly season coming up and the gladiators are already sparring off, so we are hoping that the serious business we came here to do would not be lost in the shuffle.

As is expected from time to time, there will be amendments to specific items, and this Honourable Chamber is asked to approve an amendment to the International Business Companies Act, Cap. 77. The amendment seeks to change the long title of the Act by substituting "certain taxes". What the Government is hoping to do is to make it possible for IBCs not to be penalized with just income taxes, but for provisions to be made for the exemption of these companies from certain stamp duties, import duties and consumption taxes on items of plant, machinery, spare parts, raw materials, goods, components and other articles imported for the exclusive use of the business.

4.55 p.m.

As you know, from time to time there have been amendments coming to the Chamber on offshore financial services, and the IBC is only one element in the array of offshore financial legislation that the Government has on its books. But in this day when the emphasis must be on consumer-oriented marketing, by that I mean that there must be a need to look at what the market will bear, and since we are in a highly competitive business, we must be cognizant of the needs of the people who want to operate in Barbados as opposed to operating elsewhere. One of the difficulties we have faced in this country, and, indeed, one of the problems which causes businessmen to be afraid to move extra-regionally, is the fact that it has always been very difficult to identify the markets with any kind of accuracy, and when I say identify markets, I am talking about where you need to do market intelligence which would enable companies operating in Barbados to know who to manufacture for or what to sell to, and it is time that steps are taken. The Government is now looking at the whole question of market research with a view to identifying markets not only to do with offshore financial services, but also to look at the whole area where manufacturing of goods for the extra-regional markets are concerned. I can cite a significant number of opportunities which are available to the business operations in Barbados which could only come from the importance of appreciating dissemination of market information and catering to certain consuming groups within the community, and I am talking about the offshore community. If we are not in a position in this country to identify markets through surveys and, indeed, to prepare ourselves for manufacturing for those specific markets, then we could find ourselves with a steam shovel.

We all know of the difficulties which are common in CARICOM now where the market has become poorer and it is a finite market, and we have to look seriously at encouraging more and more movement out of the region if we are to improve on our economic conditions. Hence, the Government has taken certain steps already. In the Budget just presented in May, the Government has taken the position that some incentives will be provided for people to move out of the region in relation to manufacturing, and the move to look at the whole question of market surveys so that you can segment the markets and target them for specific manufacturing activity is one which we are looking at seriously pursuing. We have to do this because it is commonly accepted in industrialized countries — indeed in the donor countries with which we do a lot of business in the United States and Europe — that Barbados is a country with the kind of GDP per capita income level which does not attract any kind of soft loan or concessional support.

This has been a bone of contention. You may recall that, within the last two years, the Government has been fighting attempts of the World Bank to graduate this country from access to World Bank funding and insisting that the Barbados Government ought now to go to the private international financial market if we are to obtain any loans for developmental purposes. But we are aware that the private markets are fraught with dangers if we look at the difficulties of countries that are more richly endowed than we are, and we have to appreciate that there is a certain determination by the donor countries to force us out of any concessional type assistance that might be obtaining in the multilateral institutions and elsewhere.

Some other steps have been taken that even spell more difficulty for us in a general way, but particularly for the Eastern Caribbean countries, the OECS countries. I say that it spells difficulties for us because the moves in the international community, specifically the World Bank, to restrict access to concessional loans for OECS countries make it more difficult for them to develop, and hence makes it more difficult for us to have richer markets within the CARICOM area, so any efforts that are directed towards interfering with the development of the OECS countries must have some adverse impact on the markets in CARICOM. Hence, it behoves us to concentrate our efforts not only at surveying extra-regional markets for the benefit of our manufacturers, but also to take cognisance of the interest of the offshore sector and the benefits that can accrue from that sector, once we are appreciative of the aims and desires of the companies that want to do business in Barbados.

This amendment is a reflection of one piece of activity which would, in effect, make us more competitive as far as the international business companies are concerned.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy President, basically, I do not think there is any general objection from this side relative to this Bill. Indeed, if one were to check the original Act, Cap. 77, one would find that the original Bill commenced in Barbados on July 26, 1965. 5.05 p.m.

In looking at this bit of legislation, one has to recognise that the Government has been suggesting over the years that the offshore sector, and particularly the international business sector, those companies which would come here not to establish manufacturing enterprises but more to handle banking and other financial business, insurance companies and what-have-you, is a sector of growth for employment. Indeed it was suggested when this policy was enunciated by the former Prime Minister in the Budget Speech I think of 1977 or 1978, certainly not later than 1978, that as a result of this thrust in this particular area, particularly offshore banking and getting financial institutions coming into this country to set up business, about 3 600 jobs would have been created.

At the time, in 1977 or 1978, those of us who had had a little more experience in this kind of operation in terms of knowing what happened in a number of countries in the Caribbean raised some questions about this, and indeed challenged the late Prime Minister about the figures which he projected as coming from this area for employment. Of course, predictably, we were taken to task and we were accused of being prophets of doom and gloom. I am glad that I have lived to see the caution which the Democratic Labour Party indicated at that time, that is, that this kind of thrust would not have created the jobs that were expected, has now taken hold. We certainly would like to see jobs created, but we indicated at that time that this was not going to happen, and our projection has come true, because I am satisfied that, far from creating 3 600 jobs, the Government cannot point to 100 jobs which have been created as a result of that particular thrust. It is not that business has not been coming — and I am talking in relation to the offshore banking, shipping company legislation, captive insurance where the Government maintained that, as I said, over 3 600 jobs would have been created — but the jobs have not come.

Whensoever the Democratic Labour Party gets up to make an observation or a valid contribution on any matter, the Government always seem to think that we are being destructive, we are trying to sow seeds of discord in the community, but in truth and in fact all that we are doing is looking at this thing in a realistic manner. Even today Senator Linton said that every time the Barbados Labour Party tries to introduce measures to benefit this country, the Democratic Labour Party

opposes it, the Democratic Labour Party is only playing politics.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: On a point of order: He is misquoting me. I said the hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party. I deliberately omitted to say the rank and file supporters.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The hierarchy of the Democratic Labour Party. But the fact of the matter is that whether it is the hierarchy, the "lowerarchy" or the rank and file, the Democratic Labour Party had pointed out that you would not have generated the kind of jobs which you said you would have generated. It is not a question of playing politics, it is a question of being realistic. We would like to see jobs being generated in this country. As a matter of fact the Prime Minister even on that occasion poked a little fun at me when I spoke and pointed out these things, when he said that he would hope that when these 3 600 jobs come the Barbados Workers Union would not then try to go in and organise them into the Union. I remember him distinctly saying that.

We really would like to see jobs created in this country, but, as I said, we have to take a realistic view. And do not worry to go and convey an impression to the public that when we take a stand on a particular issue, we are against job creation. Even the present Minister of Agriculture, the honourable Member for Christ Church East, just a couple of weeks ago in the Lower Chamber admitted that the late Prime Minister was wrong in his projection, far off in his projection. We did not have to wait until 1985 to know that he would have been wrong. We told him so when it was introduced in 1977 or 1978 as a result of the Budget Proposals in one of those years. I am sure it is either 1977 or 1978.

We know what we would like to see done as far as legislation relating to the operation of international business companies is concerned. There is need for a consolidation of the legislation, and we would like to think that more and more we would see the Government moving in this particular direction. That is not a criticism, that is a positive and a genuine concern on the part of the Democratic Labour Party. I think it would make life easier for everybody.

Senator Griffith in introducing this measure referred to certain incentives which are provided for the manufacturing sector. As far as the incentives are concerned, we have no general objection, because one recognises that if one is going to encourage foreign investors to come in to set up, and also some of our local businessmen to get into investment, obviously incentives have got to be offered. But what concerns me is the attitude that is displayed by some foreign investors, particularly in the manufacturing sector where people are employed, where

in a number of cases and in a number of these industries. attempts are made to frustrate the wishes of the workers to unionise. The Intel Corporation is one where workers are told in no uncertain terms that if they join a union they would be without jobs.

Recently, the Barbados Workers Union wrote to Playtex indicating that it had a substantial number of workers employed by that company as members of the union. We indicated the number and we sought to get recognition as the accredited representatives from that company. The company wrote us back a letter stating that they have no intention of recognising a third party in their plant, that is, that they have no intention of having a trade union operating in their plant. That is the kind of problem which workers are confronted with.
5.15 p.m.

You would find that some of these same corporations and companies would go and join their trade union, that is, the Barbados Employers Confederation, which is registered under the Laws of Barbados under the 1964 Trade Union Act, as a trade union. In the same way that the Barbados Workers Union is registered as a trade union for workers, they are registered as a trade union for employers. They go and they join their trade union, but when the workers seek to exercise their legitimate right, a right which is guaranteed to them under Section 21 of the Constitution of Barbados they try to stop them. It is one of the fundamental rights in the Constitution, and it is further buttressed by a 1974 amendment to the Trade Union Act, which says that if an employer prevents or adversely affects a worker from becoming a member of a trade union, or if he threatens to dismiss a worker because that worker expresses such intention, that employer is guilty of an offence, and liable on summary conviction to a fine of — I do not remember — I think it is \$1 000 or six months' imprisonment or both.

We have these as law in Barbados. You may ask, why with all of these laws, the trade union does not go to court? In truth and in fact, one would have to get workers who would have the determination to do that, but it is not for the lack of trying. I can very well recall an instance when a worker came to me and we thought that we could make an issue out of such of an incident and get the legislation tested in the courts. But the worker indicated that she felt that if she did, she would be exposed and her name would be put on the black list and she would not be able to get work in Barbados in the manufacturing sector. No amount of persuasion on the part of the union, even though we told her we would make sure that that does not happen and we would give her whatever support we could, could get her to change her mind.

Even although the legislation is there workers have that fear, and we recognize that a very serious unemploy-

ment situation in this country also has the effect of fuelling this kind of fear. It is really an employer's paradise, when an employer now feels that he can do as he likes, not recognizing the rights which workers have under the Constitution of this country and certainly under additional laws which were passed in this country. So these matters have got to be ventilated and a position has got to be taken on them, from time to time, because it is very important.

I am not at this stage going to accuse the Government of supporting that kind of attitude, but certainly, I should like to think that some very serious words need to be spoken to employers in this particular area.

As I said, when we give incentives to companies to come in and establish a manufacture and take advantage of what we have to offer, in truth and in fact we are giving something. The workers and people in the entire country are making sacrifices for these foreign investors to come and take advantage of or exploit whatever resources we have and we therefore feel that they should recognize the rights of workers in this country. I hope that with whatever additional incentives are being provided in this legislation, they would be told in no uncertain terms that they cannot take advantage of the workers in the way that they would want to take advantage of the workers. I believe that the time is going to come, in the not too distant future, when we could have some very serious problems in this country resulting from that kind of attitude. I would not like to see it happen. One can take so much and no more. I think the Barbados Workers Union has been very, very patient in this particular regard, but I cannot guarantee how much longer this patience will be maintained.

I hope that the words which I have spoken here this evening will be taken to heart and that there will be a recognition on the part of the Government and certainly, a recognition on the part of employers that they have a very serious responsibility towards respecting the rights of workers to organize and to join trade unions, which rights have been enshrined in our Constitution and further buttressed by laws which exist in this country.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: When I started to move this Bill, I could virtually predict what Senator Greaves was going to say about offshore business companies. Indeed, every time we have to bring a measure in here about offshore business companies, you get a harangue about the late Prime Minister and what he said about the 3 600 jobs; every comma, every full stop, every paragraph of that speech has been reproduced time and time again in this Honourable Chamber. The only variation on this common theme today was when we saw Senator Greaves wearing his trade union hat and accusing the companies of acting against the interest of the working class.

I would say that not only has the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in the Other Place said it, but I have said it in here several times, in response to Senator Greaves' recital, that, when we look at the offshore financial services sector, we have to appreciate that it is an area for growth, an area for opportunity in the country's development. We also have to recognize that we are moving into an area which is intensely competitive, and therefore we have to ensure again that you are talking about a consumer orientation that must be addressed, because the people whom you want to attract have several different entities to which they can turn.

In the United States of America, for instance, a lot of companies in the US that go offshore are now being encouraged to stay within the United States and, given the hostility that Americans attract all over the world, they may feel more comfortable within their own environment because they are more familiar with their laws. We are in a tough market; we are in competition with countries in South East Asia and countries in the Caribbean area, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, in particular, when it comes to attracting offshore business. We have made it very clear from time to time that we will not seek to attract the wretched of the earth when it comes to offshore services, we will try to get only the best.

I must remind the honourable Senator that not only has he kept repeating the contention made by the late Prime Minister about the degeneration of jobs, but I remember several times in here that we heard, when we tried to bring business to Barbados, references to Mafia connections — that is also another variation of the common theme, references to Mafia connections — and I know one businessman who told me only recently in New York that it really hurt when an Opposition Member of Parliament accused him of having Mafia connections. That is the kind of attack on the people we hope to attract that can do no good. It behoves us all in Barbados to try and encourage the development of the offshore sectors and downplay those kind of wild statements, and I call them "wild" because they have come from the Opposition in this Chamber and in the Lower House — the statements that we are attracting offshore mafia bandits to our offshore banking services, and we have heard that time and time again — and it does us no good.
5.25 p.m.

The legislation that we have set up is designed to ensure as far as possible that we do not get the worst kind of operators who just come in and take advantage. Even so, with the best will in the world, sometimes unsavoury elements slip through and you cannot legislate for that. Our objective must be to legislate and try to attract the best.

We recognize that the major benefit is revenue generation, which can also mean the generation of jobs, because if the country is earning foreign exchange, it means there is a benefit that will come to the community. So without trying to be facetious, when the Prime Minister said that this kind of activity could generate 3600 jobs, it might not mean 3600 direct jobs, but the important thing is that it is revenue generation. If you look at the experience of Bahamas, virtually half billion dollars U.S. is collected in revenue from offshore financial activity, I am not talking about the kind of unsavoury activity of which the Government has been accused. Look at the Cayman Islands and Hong Kong, where there has been a flight of some of that activity since the talk about the takeover of Hong Kong by the Chinese in the next fourteen or fifteen years.

We must recognize that the attempts made here are attempts wholly and solely to ensure that we orient ourselves towards those people who are in the market shopping for the best place to set up their business, the best place to register their ship, the best place to bring their insurance activity, even the best place to bring their medical schools. Even that should be considered an off-shore activity. We heard how they are connected with the Mafia, again from the Opposition.

This is just a word of caution, since Senator Greaves was waxing warmly in his Barbados Workers Union hat. We keep hearing about the attempt to unionize workers. It is a move I support wholeheartedly, but we also have to look at what is happening in this country when it comes to wage rates and wage structures. Trinidad has suffered tremendously within the CARICOM market because of the high cost of their manufacturing. Barbados is going through that. We have lost our competitive edge to Jamaica not primarily because of high cost of labour in our manufacturing goods, but again because of the Jamaican devaluation, and the Jamaican goods made domestically are much cheaper and hence more competitive than goods made in Barbados. We have to devise a different strategy if we hope to manufacture goods in Barbados that are competitive. We do not have the capability of people in the South East Asia peninsula to mass produce at competitive wage rates and with the quality that they produce their goods. That has been clearly demonstrated. In short, the whole question of productivity must come into play when you talk about competition.

I know the union had been a bit irresponsible, although I would not accuse the union broadly of being irresponsible. A classic example of union activity which I frown on — and we must look at and consider this when we look at what is happening again in Barbados with the inflation rates which hardly moved more than five per cent for the year — indeed for the first four months of the year in the country there was zero inflation — is that

the union, after having recognition from the Barbados National Oil Company, where a 10 per cent increase was granted in April, came in straight away and asked for 30 per cent instantly on a zero increase in inflation rate. We must strike a balance. There is nobody in Barbados who can deny that we want better conditions of service, including good rates of pay for people who have to work, but we also have to remember that in the scheme of things we can drive ourselves out of the competitive market when we are not productive.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: No matter what you say Senator Greaves, the point is that we must look at our competitive edge, and the union has a responsibility, like the rest of the people in the community, including the Government and business sector, to ensure that we can produce at competitive levels in every field of endeavour if we really want to push this country forward.

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, 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 — 6 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. C. A. GRIFFITH, the Bill was reported as having passed the 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.

MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 10 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. Deputy President, I do not think that this should engender any debate. It is just a very simple amendment under the Act, where the intention is to remove the expression "Minister" in one section of the Act.

The reason for this is that in the Act "Minister" means "Minister responsible for Trade" and the objective is to delete this reference, because from time to time the ministerial responsibilities change. For example, recently,

before June 15, the responsibility for miscellaneous controls fell under the Minister of Food and Consumer Affairs. Now it goes to the Minister of Commerce, Industry and Consumer Affairs. So the amendment is really necessary so that we would not have to keep changing the title of the Minister from time to time.
5.35 p.m.

It is a very simple amendment, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in relation to Clause 2 I think that the Leader of the Senate's explanation does not seem to accord with what seems to be stated here. He mentioned deleting "Minister" wherever it appears, while Section 2 only related to deleting the definition of "Minister" as it appears in Section 2. I am wondering if there is any other explanation that Senator Griffith can give us.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Please clarify your point.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I understood Senator Griffith as saying that the effect of the amendment was to delete the word "Minister" wherever it appeared in the Act, while the amendment here is suggesting an amendment to Section 2 deleting the definition of "Minister". But when you go through the Act, you may see reference to "Minister" that might remain undefined.

I am saying that your explanation is not on all fours with what seems to be here.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: The objective is not to have the specific title of the Minister spelt out. Instead of saying "Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs", the objective is to have the definition take its meaning from the assignment of responsibility under the Constitution. That is the specific objective rather than just having "Minister of Commerce" or so. I think that this brief is wrong. I understand the point you are making.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think we are all agreed that there is nothing wrong with the Bill, there was just a slight incoherence in the explanation given in the introduction.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put to the Senate and agreed to.

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

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BLACK BESS, ST. PETER

Order No. 11 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Black Bess, St. Peter for recreational facilities.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Mr. Deputy President, by this Resolution Government is seeking to acquire a parcel of land which is owned by Dowding Estates. It is some 4.8 hectares or 11.68 acres at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Item 11, Senator Williams.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I am so sorry, Mr. Deputy President.

This Resolution seeks to compulsorily acquire a parcel of land at Black Bess, St. Peter. It is really some 2.986 acres of land and it is for the provision of recreational facilities.
5.45 p.m.

Recently, we have put in certain infrastructural developments in certain parts of Black Bess, the Mangrove section, and for quite a long time there was need for a proper playing field at Black Bess. Over the years Black Bess has produced a number of sportsmen of the ilk of people like Gordon Greenidge. One of the most outstanding sportsmen at the CARIFTA Games indeed came from the Black Bess area in the person of Trevor Small. The Victoria Youth Group has won the BCL knock-Out Competition, and that group also hails from the Black Bess area.

This proposed development of the Black Bess area involves the extension of the existing playing field adjacent to the Black Bess School. The existing playing field is already utilised by the residents of this district

and it accommodates cricket competitions, in spite of its very small size and irregular gradient. The proposal would provide an opportunity for an appropriately sized playing area to accommodate various sporting and recreational activities. It is also expected that the National Sports Council will commence developmental work on this site very shortly.

The Resolution, therefore, seeks for the compulsory acquisition of the said parcel of land so that acquisition proceedings may be finalized and the owners duly compensated.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GIBBONS, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 12 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Gibbons, Christ Church, for the provision of recreational facilities.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: This Resolution, like the previous one, seeks parliamentary approval for the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land of some eight acres at Gibbons, Christ Church, for the provision of recreational facilities for the residents in the immediate areas and its environs. Proceedings have already been started with respect to the acquisition of land and the relevant notices, as required by the Land Acquisition Act, have already been published in the *Official Gazette*.

Gibbons area has a sizeable population and at present there are no established playing facilities in that area; the nearest ones are at Providence and Wotton. An area previously used as a playing field at Gall Hill – I think reference was made to that today – has recently been converted for the use of housing development under the Government's sites and services programme. It is therefore felt that recreational facilities are desirable for the Gibbons area.

The land at Gibbons which has been selected for this purpose is relatively flat and requires very little preparation in order to develop it into the necessary playing field. The area will be developed to accommodate two cricket pitches, a joint community centre changing facilities complex and we are looking at the construction of hard court facilities as well. It is considered that such facilities will adequately serve the three existing clubs in the area, the sporting needs of the residents in the immediate areas and those at Thornbury Hill, Wilcox, Pilgrim Road, Parish Land and St. Bartholomew.

The National Sports Council has already commenced clearing and levelling of the land with the owner's approval, and Government seeks permission by way of this Resolution.

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

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Before I put the motion, I note that Senator Williams refers to the area of these various lots in acres. The actual text of the Bill has it in metric, in hectares or square metres and it would be useful, to tidy up the whole business, if you mention it in the two so that we would know we are talking about the same area.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy President. It is 3.2526 hectares or the equivalent of eight acres.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT PARKINSON AND GRAZETTES ROADS, ST. MICHAEL, FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Order No. 13 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Parkinson and Grazettes Roads, St. Michael, for the purpose of Housing Development.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, this Resolution should not engender much debate or contention because you know that honourable Senators are tired and anxious to get out of here. Since this area is contiguous to St. Michael North, I would want to talk a lot about it, but since I recognize the ennui that has overcome this Honourable Chamber, given the long day, I will just briefly provide some information so that the Senate might appreciate the need for the Resolution.

This has to do with the Government's policy of providing sites and services where people who are in dire need of house spots can purchase them, and what the Government has been doing in its sites and services programme, through the Ministry of Housing and Lands, is to put in the infrastructural developments, such as water, roads and light, and then cut up the land into lots and offer them for sale to people. There is a lot of interest in this. Since the programme started, people have been applying and those who have the money have been trying to gobble up the spots. It demonstrates clearly that the Government's policy in this direction is a well thought out one, one that is working in the interest of the people.

We cannot get the sites prepared fast enough for people, they are just grabbing them.

5.55 p.m.

We are moving in several different areas to ensure that the Ministry of Housing and Lands can continue this very important programme. I know the area that is being talked about very well. It involves three parcels of land which are under separate private ownership and comprises a total of 9 877 square metres, I think. The Ministry of Housing and Lands has already laid out the area for 22 lots, which have been approved by the Chief Town Planner, and as I have gathered from one of the residents who has recently moved into the area of St. Michael West Central, work on the construction of the necessary roads is underway. We expect, of course, that this would relieve some congestion and satisfy the demand for house spots in the heavily populated Black Rock, Fairfield and Belfield districts.

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

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, an honourable Member is asking if I am going to declare an interest. I do not own any land in St. Michael West Central, so I need not declare an interest. I, however, know the area quite well, and I travel there on my way to and from home everyday, having just moved back into the constituency. Senator Jemmott, when he was told that I was living in Grazettes Terrace, said "Oh, he is from down there. He has gone back." I am not like the prodigal son, I did not spend my time in riotous living. I have been making a contribution, and a very meaningful one at that, and now that I have gone back to the constituency, let me say that I must confess that a Resolution like this is worthy of my comments.

When I left here to go to England in 1960 in pursuit of a cricketing career, my address was 31 Brecon Road, Grazettes Housing Area. The fact now that it is 37 Grazettes Terrace means it is only a few metres away as the crow flies; but as they say in Laventille, it is just as if you live in Laventille over the bridge and live in Belmont the other way. I do feel that there are others in here like me.

The Honourable Leader of the Senate, let me say now that I am very pleased to see his elevation to such a prestigious position. I must say that although we are of different political persuasions or are in different corners, I cannot but look at the progress of someone with beginnings like mine, and as such I believe that it would be amiss of me if I did not congratulate him. Let me say that in this very august Chamber I stood at this spot and predicted that he would be a Minister, and lo and behold he became a Minister. I knew that before the late Prime Minister, I knew he was going to become a Minister before him. I also said during the debate on the

Estimates, you may well recall, that I give bouquets where they are due, but I also give kicks when they are due and you have to take them. I am very careful in complimenting people on that side because I do not want it to be misplaced, so therefore let me give it where it is due.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, with all due respect to the compliments, is that the matter before the Honourable Senate?

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think he is establishing the preamble to his speech.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: The fact that I was congratulating the Leader of the House will obviously upset Senator Trotman. It will irritate him, because while I have watched the elevation of Senator Griffith, I have seen the slow demise of the other honourable Member. It has not culminated into its finality yet, but it is on the cards, it looks to me, so do not let him upset me about that again.

I said that I was impressed with the way Senator Griffith had handled the Estimates Debate, because he had given honourable Members in this Chamber an opportunity to evaluate the points that he had made at the onset and it has set a pattern for meaningful debate. I also said that it augured well for the future, and — who knows? Maybe we will see in the very near future some continuance of his elevation. That is why I have said that, but Senator Trotman would not understand when one builds up to a crescendo.

There are at least two other Senators, Senator Jemmott and Senator Griffith, who also know the area quite well, and I am quite sure that they would be very happy to see the embarkation of the massive housing programme that the Minister mentioned in the earlier land acquisition that we passed here today. However, even though I am satisfied that a Government would seek to have the necessary improvements for the people of the country, I believe in total representation, and I believe in representation of all the people.

I want to express the fears of people living in this area, where we find that although you have roads being built, you have a situation where, without any dialogue, without any consultation, you find that they are put in the area without people having anything to do with them. In this same Parkinson area, although we are now seeking to acquire the land, roads have already been put into this area. I have actually witnessed debates in this Chamber where we found that an acquisition like the one in Maxwell, when they were widening the road where there was a blind corner, simple I suppose, and another one just to make the point, in Halls Road by the

round-about, where there was a little piece left over there and it had to be tidied up, took place and the legislation came into force.

With respect to this land at Parkinson, the Minister said that people are in dire need of house spots and things like this. I believe that he understands that when he says "people" he means all the people. I do not expect that, in order to get this land, one must be of any particular persuasion. The people of the area are a little worried that they will not get a fair chance of being able to acquire some of these spots, and that is a fear all around Grazettes, all around Parkinson and all around Fairfield. People who have been living there for many years have not been able to buy their own piece of land, but they do not wish to leave the area. They would like to think that they would be able to qualify, and to do so it would be qualifying by virtue of the fact that if they are eligible, they would be able to have a good chance of getting the land. They do not believe that you should think in terms of their political persuasion which would qualify them first and foremost for this land.

Whereas the people of St. Michael West Central have seen roads being built in that constituency, I am sure some honourable Members in here who would like to think that they themselves in their particular constituencies were as well served. I am sure that if we are honest with ourselves, we would have to openly admit that, and I feel that it alienates you, because it means that if you do not get the type of representation that you need, the people will rebel.

Let me tell you what I am saying. You have a situation up there where they are building roads or they have built roads. The owner of the land, a Mr. Jordan, as can be seen in the Resolution, poor gentleman, has been in the hospital all this time. Rumour has it that he is so upset over the fact that nobody has told him anything about acquiring his land but have just come and put down the roads like that, that the poor man has become ill. He has just come out of hospital. The fact of the matter is that this land — you all know it well — is nice agricultural land, canes on it for one hundred years, I suppose, pear trees, all sorts of lovely mango trees, but it has made way, and one must go in the name of progress. We understand this, but we have to have a little heart, we have to have a little humanity. We have to let people understand that you care for them, however small they are. As a matter of fact, it does not matter if you are small or big.

6.05 p.m.

Right there in Grazettes, you have a situation where you are building a road, you have to widen it, and everyone in this Chamber knows that you have to have a bridge over the Rogers' quarry. Even though this is some undertaking, it is ridiculous to have to state that no sort

of discussion, no dialogue at all has gone on about this. I think it is wrong. That is not what is expected of people in high places. I am putting it to you that the gentleman who owns that land understands quite clearly that when the bridge goes in, the house where he had previously lived and which now still stands there will probably have to go, because the road would go too close to the house. That would have to be acquired too, and no dialogue at all has been involved in this undertaking. I feel that whether you are a large land owner or whether you are a small land owner, the decent thing to do is to let people understand what is going on.

Up there in Fairfield, they have begun a road and they have taken as much as five feet; I repeat, five feet; they cut off your land to make this road. We understand that there is a price to pay, we understand that we have to make way for progress, we know that roads must go in for the benefit of all. But if you have to take off five feet of anybody's land, you should at least have some consultation on. It is all right for people to come and take up your fencing, throw it one side and start building a road. I admit that the odds are that the fencing would be replaced after the road is built, but a little consultation would have gone a long way. I feel that people, big and small, do not like the idea of people coming in and seemingly taking over everything and there will come a time when people will not take that standing up; and they will not take it lying down either. I can call one West Indian territory and a few others that will not stand for that. I think it happened in Jamaica.

We need to understand that we cannot do these things. Only last week, I think it was, or the week before, the representatives of the owners of the land came with solicitors and stopped them from building the road. I am saying that if you are building a road and you are taking about five feet of land from off the people's holdings in the area, you need to have discussed that with the owners of the land so that they would understand what is happening.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: On a point of order: Did the Senator say that we did not communicate with Mr. Jordan? I got the impression that he said that Mr. Jordan was in the hospital.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I said that the road I am talking about is now being built. It is filled with marl fill. The Jordan roads are in already, as the Senator well knows. In the adjoining piece of land, in the same Fairfield — you would not know what I am talking about....

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was listening carefully and I thought the

Senator was saying that we did not communicate with Mr. Jordan. The Record would show that. Senator the Rev. Canon Jones is nodding his head in approval that he did say Jordan.

There is a reason why we did not circulate Mr. Jordan. According to my note, Mr. Jordan is no longer at this estate. He has passed on to the other Holy Place. It says here carefully.

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Your point is, I think, established.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: You might wish him dead. But he is not.

The roads around the Parkinsons are in. Let us take a trip to Fairfield. Let us scrutinize the area, let us look at it for ourselves. Those roads are in and we are now coming in here talking about a Resolution for acquisition of the land. Just adjacent, there is a road going in now. It is only not finished, I suppose, because of the intervention of the solicitors of the interested parties. At the corner no less than five feet have been taken off, without consultation. If you want me to give you the name of the owner of the land, I could tell you.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Jordan?)

SENATOR W. W. HALL: No, not Jordan. Do not premeditate. The land I am talking about is where the five feet of land have come off the people's land and there was no consultation at all. It is not the Jordan land. It is the land adjacent; I think people call it Sealy Land. I am not getting into any semantics with the Minister, I am saying exactly what I know to be true. He does not know the area, and if he wants me to go down there and show him, I will show him. Whether his name is Jordan or Mormon, if you are going to cut up his land, I say, you should consult him. There is a road going in now, all like now, today, June 26, at 6.14 p.m. Barbados. The building of the road was curtailed when a representative, a solicitor, acting in the interest of interested parties came up and stopped them from building. I am saying that you have to make sure that people have been apprised of what is going on, that if a road is going in, they would understand exactly what is happening, even if they might have to lose two feet, three feet or ten feet of their land. 6.15 p.m.

Mr. Rogers told me that he has not been consulted. He said that there is a big shed on his land and nobody has said anything about it. If you want to, go and ask Mr. Rogers, do not go to Mr. Jordan. Mr. Rogers told me that is the situation let the Minister deny that.

If you are going to have success at any price, that is wrong, because success at any price is overpriced in my

book. I feel that you have to treat these people with some respect. You have to let them know exactly that they are human beings and I feel that there is no way that we should use our offices and treat people in such a ridiculous manner.

I am not here on any ego trip to boost my image; far from it. Let the Minister know that. I am here on the people's business, and people like me do not have to go on ego trips. People like me of necessity sometimes have to have a low profile. We have to come off the mountain tops and go into the valleys. I preach the betterment of all Barbadians wherever I go. I do not go on any Government trips. I do not have to go on a ministerial sojourn and that is the extent of my travels. I have done it willingly on behalf of all Barbadians.

When we are talking in terms of having house spots, and things like that, or jobs for that matter, you should not have to resort to the archaic method of political persuasion and things like that. It should never happen in a country in the 20th century. I hope that now that I have spoken, the people of the Fairfield area, Grazettes, Parkinson Area and the environs who are desirous of a house spot, who are renting now but who would love to live in the same area, will feel very confident that they can get a fair share, an equal hearing, in their pursuit of a better way of life, and that is in getting a good piece of good land from where they can launch off.

I know all interested Senators who know the area well, and they will know probably from their background, from having been brought up in areas adjacent to there, when they pass through there wonder what is happening. I am a believer in improvement for all Barbadians. I really feel that as long as the small people out there know that they can easily qualify for these lands and have a good chance for doing so, all will be okay. The minute they feel that they have no chance because of their political persuasion — and I speak with a lot of assurance on that

Asides.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I am very happy to see Senator Yearwood back in his seat. All of us are not happy, Sir, but I am sure I am happy. I am glad now that you have come back from canvassing. You were right to go and canvass for the two hours and make sure that you win this race. Do what I tell you!

Asides.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy President, I really was not canvassing.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I recognize that you will never get an output unless you have an input, and I have made my input.

Asides

SENATOR W. W. HALL: Sir, I do not understand this Mickey Mouse situation. If the light is on, it means that my decency prevails and I must sit down. I am not like you who do not respect the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR W. W. HALL: I hope that what I have had to say has not fallen on deaf ears. I know that it concerns the people of the area who are crying out about the wrong things, which, having talked about them in this Chamber, I hope will be at least on the path of being put right.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Hall has my total support when he says that people should be publicly consulted. I believe in that as well. But that was the burden of his campaign speech, because we have got to call a "shovel a spade". The problem with Senator Hall — let us take off all the coat tails and get down to the real problem with him — is that he believes that this development is going to keep him in this place, and keep the Member for St. Michael West Central in his place in the Other Place. That is the burden of his contention. So all this talk we are getting this evening about who will get the spots and would not get the spots, and you have to be of one persuasion to get the spots, has to do with his fear of being kept permanently in this House.

People in that corner should be the last to talk about persuasion. I met a young lady who works in the School Meals Department — I was canvassing — and she said, "You do not have to worry. The one thing I will never do in my life is vote for the Democratic Labour Party. That party made me sign and join the party before they gave me a job, and I hate them for it". So they know about that. They know about how "Sleepy" Smith put on 92 people to work in the School Meals Department all from his constituency — in the month of August! People were taken on in the month of August, because election was going to be in September 1976. The only people who went to school in August were the School Meals Workers from Martindales Road and Halls Road under "Sleepy" Smith, the then Minister of Education. But he comes in here with one big innocent thing about people of persuasion and who is going to get patronage and who is not going to get patronage. He cannot bring that to us. Look in your own party, man!

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: I want to clear up two points in relation to Senator Hall. One has to do with the spot of land and Mr. Jordan. He is quite right that I know out there well; as a matter of fact, I am still an owner of a piece of land in the area. This spot of land was left by the present owner, Mr. Jordan, whose father died. I know he was asking the Government for a good while, he even approached the Government, about

purchasing the land. Hearsay, as Senator Hall would know, is a very bad thing. To say that Mr. Jordan was sick because of the treatment that was meted out to him in relation to his land is not nice. I do not think it is true because I know Mr. Jordan very well. Mr. Jordan was ill awhile ago. He suffers from his stomach, and his sickness has nothing to do with any treatment by the Government.

The second point is in relation to Mr. Rogers' house. Mr. Rogers abandoned that house about three years ago because it was near his quarry. The quarry has gone out of existence, to the extent that some houses that were around that quarry a couple of months ago dropped in to the quarry. As a matter of fact, what is being done now will more or less enhance the property, because it will make it much more secure.

I am very glad as a former resident of that district, to see that the Ministry has found it possible to make housing there as such. I hope that Senator Hall would compliment the Ministry for the work. From his talk, he seems to think he is scared of the allocations. The Democratic Labour Party should be the last persons to talk about the allocation of house spots and houses. When I went into National Housing to work, people who were known as being other than Democratic Labour Party could not even get a shingle, rather than a house. If Senator Hall or his colleague wants to know, let them go and see the application forms. They had a chairman there by the name of Mr. Deighton Griffith who did all the allocations himself, and you had to let him know the party which you supported.

6.25 p.m.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Deputy President, in rising to support the Resolution, there are two matters which I would like to direct attention to, and perhaps ask for a little information in relation to one of them.

The first relates to the size of the lots. I am not certain if you indicated what size these lots would be, but the point I would like to make in relation to that is that in providing these various sites and services, the lots associated therewith should not be too small, although you are aiming at the low income bracket. I believe the lots should be of a size where you anticipate that the people who start off in the low income bracket might not remain there all the time or might want to reside there all the time, or perhaps their children, and so the sites should be sufficiently large to accommodate a house which in time might become a fairly substantial house.

The second point I would like to make is one which arose out of a comment from a caller to Guttaperk,

whether or not it was possible for persons to obtain such lots on a lease/purchase basis. The point was that some people at the moment were not sufficiently well endowed with cash to be able to buy a site and then proceed with the building immediately, and if you had an arrangement where they could probably lease the land and go ahead with the construction and later on pay for the land, this would facilitate a lot of poor people. I must say that I agree with that suggestion.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I did not have any intention of getting into the debate. I thought that some people got a little indecent exposure which was not good for them.

In response to Senator McClean's question about the size of the lots, I think there is a minimum of 500 square feet intended. The point is well made about the future of the sites. We feel that we are just giving the people at the low income end of the scale an opportunity to start something, with the understanding that once they want to improve on their own housing, they would be able to do so, and therefore a minimum of 3 500 square feet has been determined.

The other point that ought to be borne in mind is that we could not really provide lots which would be too far above the striking range as far as income capability is concerned. Hence one may find that it would cost about \$10 000 for one of the lots, which is considerably cheap in these days. The important thing is that the programme is structured in such a way that only the cost of the infrastructural development is recovered. The National Housing Corporation must not be the holder of any mortgages on these properties.

In relation to Mr. Rogers, I was very glad that Senator Jemmott was able to make a few points of clarification, because the impression is given that the Government walks around and takes or buys people's land without consultation. While we could not consult with Mr. James Jordan, who is deceased, his son, we are glad to hear, was prepared to let the Government take the land for the purpose of improving the site. I was very convinced when I heard Senator Hall speaking with feeling and gusto, as he used to bowl, though it is no longer pace with fire.

On the question of that area, I was surprised that Mr. Rogers was concerned, because where Mr. Rogers' house is, is a hazardous place and the Government is cognisant of the fact that Mr. Rogers' quarries are no longer in use and ought to be filled. There were two houses in which people almost lost their lives, where a cave exists in that area, and the house is vacant and almost falling apart. I know that house very well. What the Government is planning to do in that very area is to start by building a bridge right across Rogers' quarry, this

is now being looked at by the Planning and Priorities Committee, and to use a lot of the rubble from the excavation from the industrial access road to fill that quarry in.

I have known that area from the time I was about seven years old, and I know the dangers of that quarry and the other one across Grazettes Road quite close to where Senator Hall now lives, which was owned by the family of the late Norman Ellis. These quarries in that area are posing some problems, and it is the intention of the Government to try to rectify them. I do not think that Mr. Rogers would be opposed to the idea of having that quarry filled, because, as it stands, it represents a hazard not only to the people who live around there, but to me it has always been a danger to motorists coming from Grazettes who have to drive through there and try to avoid going into that quarry.

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

COMPULSORY-ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WAVELL AVENUE, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 14 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, St. Michael for the purpose of housing development.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: I took these Resolutions because I think there are a few of us who know these areas very well. I did not do it to be arrogant or arbitrary, I just wanted to ensure that those of us who do not know would get a better explanation of what the area is like. Senator McClean, I dare say, Senator Hall, Senator Jemmott, Senator Cooke and I know the area very well.

This is an acquisition for housing development. The property in question at Wavell Avenue is owned by Miss Dorothy King, a Barbadian living in Canada, and it has a timber and stone building. The building is in very poor condition and is unoccupied, so there cannot really be any contention that we are taking it over without the consent of the owner. The rear section of the land is occupied by two timber houses which are owned by two tenants renting house spots, so it constitutes a tenantry as far as we are concerned.

Miss King made an offer to the Government of the property for the purpose of housing development. We have looked at the land for two reasons, that we can develop it into six fully serviced lots for purchase or rental, because rental is a problem in the community, or alternatively to facilitate the location of houses affected by the Airport/West Coast Highway.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.
6.35 p.m.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER

Order No. 15 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for providing a playing field for the Alexandra School.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: This Resolution seeks approval for the compulsory acquisition of two parcels of land containing some 602.6 square metres and 2006.8 square metres respectively for the development of a playing field for Alexandra School, St. Peter.

In 1980, some 8283 hectares of land at Mango Lane, St. Peter, was compulsorily acquired for the extension of the Alexandra School and for road improvement. However, a large portion of this land was used in the construction of the Speightstown Bypass Road and a portion of the existing playing field at the school was also lost as a consequence of the construction of the extension to the school. These developments have reduced considerably, the area of land which remains to the school, and therefore, have rendered the present land inadequate to meet the needs of this school in terms of a playing area. Having regard to the fact that the extension to the school will increase the enrolment by some 250 pupils, and since it is proposed to introduce co-education at the school in the near future, it has become necessary to provide additional land for the school for the use as a playing field.

The two parcels of land situated in the Mango Lane area contain a total of 2 609.4 square metres or .64 acres and were identified for acquisition for the purpose to which I alluded before. The two parcels of land are contiguous and adjoins to the northern boundary of the area already purchased for the school. Approval is being sought by way of the Resolution so that the legal process for the compulsory acquisition of the two parcels of land may be finalized and, indeed, the owners duly compensated.

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

SENATOR J. E. JORDAN: Mr. Deputy President, I wish to support the Resolution. Since it is the trend for Honourable Senators who have declared an interest in certain political constituencies to make a plug here for their own constituencies, I feel constrained to beg, as it were, for increased recreational facilities at the new West Terrace Primary School. Currently, there is a tent, one that was previously used as part of the Carifesta

Village, and this tent is south of the new West Terrace Primary, I wish to urge the Ministry of Education, or Government, to acquire this property to be used by the students at the West Terrace Primary School.

It seems to be the vein this evening that all Senators are making a plug, and I felt constrained to do the same.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That is a very distant plug. It has nothing to do with the Alexandra School.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am not making a plug for anything as such, but in the area of improved facilities for schools and making contact with the reference to the new West Terrace School, in driving along Husbands/Oxnards Road before school hours and shortly after, it has struck me that there is a dire need for a sidewalk along that area. I do not think the designers of the road had envisaged that so many small school children would be walking up and down that road in the midst of traffic. When we are relating to further sidewalk development and improved conditions for school children, perhaps that is something to consider.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CRAB HILL, ST. LUCY

Order No. 16 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Crab Hill, St. Lucy, for the purpose of providing recreational facilities.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: This particular Resolution has come about as a result of Government wanting to provide recreational facilities at Archers Bay, St. Lucy. The proposed development of Archers Bay will involve the provision of recreational facilities to serve the residents, and it is expected that the residents of Crab Hill, Stroude Bay, Grape Hall, Coves Cave and the surrounding areas would also be able to use these facilities.

The areas to be served by the proposed recreational facilities are densely populated areas and presently devoid of adequate facilities. There is a small playing field at Selah Primary School, but the Director of the Sports Council has indicated that it is indeed inadequate, owing to its small size, and the field is not considered to be very functional for sporting facilities. The other available playing fields are at Rockfield and Checker Hall, St. Lucy, but they are considered too distant and therefore

inaccessible by the residents of these areas to which I alluded to before.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Security and Sport proposes in the initial stages to develop the land in order to provide a playing field to accommodate various games, particularly cricket and football. It is also envisaged that provision will, in due course, be made for the construction of a community centre and a pavilion on the same land.

It may also be noted that consideration is being given to the acquisition of a further 5.2 hectares of land at Archers Bay for recreational purposes for future integration into the proposed national park system.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: During the 1970s, during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party, I had made a proposal that efforts should be made to establish playing and recreational facilities for the residents of Crab Hill, because I recognized that it was an area that was growing fairly rapidly in population and, as a result, ought to be provided with this kind of facility. Unfortunately, in 1976 the Democratic Labour Party lost the elections and did not have the opportunity to put into place the kind of development which I had proposed for that particular area. Nevertheless, I relentlessly pursued this particular idea of development for this area, and it was in May 1977 that I introduced the following Resolution in the House of Assembly, which Resolution was passed on the 17th May, 1977:

"Whereas Archers Bay, St. Lucy is recognised and appreciated by Barbadians for the natural beauty and attraction which it offers:

And Whereas the area of land which is presently used by the public at Archers Bay is privately owned:

And Whereas it is in the interest of the nation that the amenities of that area should be permanently available to the community:

Be it resolved that this House urge the Government to consider such steps as might be appropriate to convert and develop Archers Bay, St. Lucy, into a national park." 6.45 p.m.

I said that this Resolution was given notice of on the 3rd May, 1977 and it was passed on 17th May, 1977, but, interestingly enough, before it was passed, or around the time that it was passed, the mere text of this Resolution forced the Government to issue a ministerial statement in which the then Minister responsible for Lands indicated that, far from developing Archers Bay in

the way in which I had suggested, the Government would be declaring from Archers Bay in St. Lucy to Ragged Point in St. Philip as an area for national park development, so that the entire area going north-east would be earmarked for that particular development.

One would see this development now, the acquisition of this area of land, as a direct consequence of the suggestions and indeed the urgings which I made in those days, and which I continue to make on behalf of the people who live in that particular area. As a matter of fact, the owner of Crab Hill plantation, who owns this particular area of land, was told from way back in 1977 that the Government would be acquiring this area of land going back right into Archers Bay for developmental purposes. He has really been left in no man's land for that entire period since 1977, eight years, so I am glad to see that, finally, the Government has come around to acquiring the area with a proposal for further acquisition, as indicated by Senator Williams, when this measure was introduced. More particularly, I am happy to see that an area of land, in the first instance, will be acquired for the use by the youngsters in that particular area and certainly I welcome this Resolution. It has my total and complete support.

Senator Williams in introducing the Resolution did indicate that there is a playing field of some sort attached to Selah Primary School, and it was really in no proper condition for the pursuance of sporting activities in the way that one would like to see activities pursued, because that area of land is really very uneven and there is a kind of watercourse flowing through it which sometimes can cause more problems. But I believe that some effort should still be made to level it since it is attached to Selah Primary School. It could still be of some use not only to the school children but also to the residents of the area, and this would be an additional facility for people who live in that area. Indeed, I can very well recall that I had urged a former Minister of Education to ensure that it be levelled in order to upgrade the facilities there.

Senator Williams also made reference to the Rockfield Community Centre which also exists in St. Lucy. Once more I will draw to the attention of the Government that I think people would be better served if an attempt were made to level that area and at the same time extend it so that there could be developed a variety of sporting activities in that particular area. I do not think that it is too late for this to be done, and I certainly look forward to the Government responding positively to these genuine requests which I have made.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Greaves has absolutely no shame. He confessed that while his party was in power he sought to have the land acquired for recreational purposes. He should have known

better, because I have said on more than one occasion in this Chamber that all the community centres in this country were either constructed before 1961 or after 1976. His party has a shameful record of not doing anything in terms of sporting facilities for the young people of this country, and he should have known better than to ask his party to set up any recreational centre in Archers Bay, because he knew it would not be done. So when our party came to power, he got in the Other Place and moved a Resolution, which was passed. And you cannot pass a Resolution by a minority, it was supported by the Government, so the Government took the point that the people of St. Lucy needed recreational facilities at Archers Bay. We agreed with that and we are going to give it to them. It has nothing to do with Senator Greaves. Senator Greaves' Resolution was passed because we believe that young people in Barbados should have proper recreational facilities, and wherever it is possible and wherever it is suitable to have parks, playing fields and community centres in this country, we shall provide them.

He also said that he forced the Government Minister into making a statement that the entire area from Archers Bay up to Ragged Point would be a national park development area. He has some nerve. At that time there were seven of them down the Other Place, but he is saying that the seven of them forced the two-thirds on the other side to make a statement about something. Senator Greaves, you really just are not with it!
6.55 p.m.

It is our policy that we intend to develop the east coast of this country. The only reason why the development is slow is because of financial constraints on the Government. But we intend to develop the entire East Coast into proper parks, and it has absolutely nothing to do with Senator Greaves. The whole question about the use of Archer's Bay was reactivated because of a gentleman called Mr. Roy Brathwaite, who, as I understand it, is the representative for St. Lucy in the Other Place. So let Senator Greaves get it in his head, it has nothing to do with him. Do not come in here trying to get any small point about you raised a Resolution in the Other Place. Any time you get in any Chamber and raise your point which has to do with recreational facilities for young people, or any meaningful development for the people of Barbados, the Government will support it — it has nothing to do with you.

He called for an extension of Rockfield Playing Centre to try to get some mileage. He is wrong again, because the Minister of Sport, I am sure, is in consultation with the representative for St. Lucy, and if Rockfield needs to be extended, it shall be extended. If it wants improved facilities, it shall have improved facilities. That is our philosophy for our young people.

They are cursing us up and down St. Thomas and saying that all we do is provide recreational facilities. We believe in providing recreational facilities, we shall continue to provide recreational facilities. We do not want to hear Senator Greaves with any foolishness about he is calling for extended playing facilities at Rockfield. If it is desirable, the people of St. Lucy will get it, not because of Senator Greaves, but because of the philosophy of the Barbados Labour Party.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: I rise to support this Resolution, not only because I see it as a very worthwhile Resolution, but also because quite recently, I have had occasion to visit the parish of St. Lucy to look at the provision of facilities in the area of Archer's Bay, River Bay, Cove Bay and Maycock's Bay. I tried at the time to find Mr. Greaves to see if he would have accompanied me, but I could not get hold of him. But I was accompanied by the representative for the area, Mr. Roy Brathwaite. I am serious about that, very serious about that.

Laughter

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Roy Brathwaite accompanied me to River Bay, and as a result of our visit there, I can inform Senator Greaves that a contract has been awarded to Mr. Neville Drakes of Neville Drakes Construction, who is also from St. Lucy, to erect a facility at River Bay, St. Lucy. I believe that he will commence construction of that on July 1. This is being done under the aegis of the National Conservation Commission, and as a direct result of approaches which we received from Mr. Roy Brathwaite, M.P., who is acting on behalf of the fishermen of that area.

As a result of further approaches made by Mr. Roy Brathwaite, the said M.P., we visited Archer's Bay, another part of St. Lucy, right up to Foster's Funland. Immediately after my visits to those areas, the part of the area which has been designated to be in the proposed national park, I had an audience with the Minister for the Environment, Mr. Aaron Truss, M.P. and he asked me to provide the costing with regard to the development of that area with specific reference to the portion falling within St. Lucy, although I propose, as I have said in here before, to start at two ends — I propose to start at Ragged Point and St. Lucy simultaneously with the development.

Laughter.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: The whole point is that I did tell the Minister that we ought to look at this development as part of the tourist infrastructure, that is, the National Park, Foster's Funland and Graeme Hall Swamp, we should really get expert advice on them and we should get enough money to develop the three of them simultaneously, and he has agreed with me, in principle.

However, I must say one thing about the proposed National Park. Mr. Pennington, an expert who we had here — he was funded by one of the British funding agencies, Mr. Pennington — provided a report for us. It is a very comprehensive report, and it is a very interesting report, too, because his report can be implemented in stages. He suggested that we put trails in certain parks and rather than acquiring the lands, we pay royalties to some of the owners, in the same way that we pay royalties to the persons on whose land oil wells are dug, and he noted that we could carry out that activity without changing too drastically the existing use of the land, although we may have to curtail any further extensive development of the land.

Mr. Roy Brathwaite has some very good ideas for implementing Mr. Pennington's proposals in a piecemeal fashion. The National Conservation are having a meeting, I think it is scheduled for the 4 July or 5 July, to which we have invited Mr. Roy Brathwaite to give us his views regarding the development of this area in the parish of St. Lucy. The people in St. Lucy have been consulting with him and he has ideas. He is assisting us with the development of this area.

Maycock's Bay and Cove Bay are badly in need of roads. The roads need to be repaired and refurbished, and we have already approached the Arawak Cement Plant for assistance. This is the National Conservation Commission, and we are not in the road building business, but the M.P. is so eager to have the job done that we cannot wait on anybody, so we have approached the Arawak Cement Plant on behalf of Mr. Roy Brathwaite, M.P. and

Laughter.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: the Arawak Cement Plant has quite kindly agreed to give us some cement with which we will make concrete to repair the roads leading to Maycock's Bay and Cove Bay, St. Lucy.

We at the National Conservation Commission, are always willing to entertain requests from Members of Parliament with regards to the implementation of the wishes of their constituencies. To this end, we have tried our best to satisfy the requests of Mr. Roy Brathwaite, M.P. I regret to say that, to date, I have been on the Commission for eight years, and I have never had a request from Senator Greaves of this Chamber on behalf of the residents of St. Lucy, or even Cave Hill where he lives.

Laughter.

(SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Licks today!)

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER, FOR THE SPEIGHTSTOWN BOYS' SCHOOL

Order No. 17 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of providing a playing field and an agricultural science plot for the Speightstown Boys' School.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: The Government again is seeking approval for the acquisition of three parcels of land at Speightstown for the provision of a playing field and an agricultural science plot for the Speightstown Boys School. The necessary Acquisition Notices have already been published in the *Official Gazette* and in the Press. The lands in question are owned by Mr. Oriel Gill, and that is an area of 419 square metres, by Venesta Stoute, 104 square metres, and by Gloria Jordan, 5663 square metres.

It was during a visit to the Speightstown Boys School in 1984 that the Minister became particularly aware of the cramped conditions at the school and of the absence of adequate recreational facilities for the pupils. A decision was taken that everything should be put in trend to alleviate the situation.
7.05 p.m.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I believe that when efforts are made to provide facilities at schools, particularly for recreational purposes, and at the same time provision is being made for the acquisition of land for the promotion of Agricultural Science within a school setting, that is something which ought to be encouraged, and certainly one would not have any objection with the general principles and intention of this particular Resolution.

However, since this relates to Speightstown Boys School, I am wondering if the Government would not give some serious consideration to resiting this particular school. If you know the area, the school, for all practical purposes, is built on the main road. In fact, it is a bit in the road, and if you walk along that road on the side of the school, with the traffic travelling in that direction, you will have to lay against the wall if two people were passing. I believe that some effort should be made to resite the school into a more congenial atmosphere.

Furthermore, the area is noisy and affected by traffic, which passes there on a continuous basis, and I do

not think that the atmosphere is the kind of atmosphere which would induce the kind of study that one would look forward to in the school setting. Whereas, as I said, I agree with the general principles of this particular Resolution, I would like to urge the government to look at the possibility of an alternative siting of the school. It is not sited in the best place and there are a number of problems associated with this particular school which could be ironed out if it was in a different environment.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Senator Greaves cannot come in now and ask about resiting the Speightstown Boys School. He is out of order. His party was in power for 15 years. They did absolutely nothing about repairing or constructing new primary schools in this country. When it comes to building new primary schools, you have got to give the credit to a young lady called Miss Billie Miller. It has nothing to do with his party. He was in power for 15 years. He did not know then that schools should be resited. He did not know then that schools wanted repairs. He did not know then that schools wanted recreational facilities. They did absolutely nothing in 15 years for primary schools in this country.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. Deputy President, I am not going to take that one.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I did not hear that.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: You did not hear it, but Senator Griffith heard it though. Senator McClean heard it.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: I am not going to repeat it for Hansard, I will deal with him outside.

The Barbados Labour Party Administration has consistently been repairing primary schools, giving better facilities for the children in the primary schools, building new schools, restoring schools that could be restored and, in some cases, amalgamating some schools. Senator Greaves' party for 15 years did none of this work. I give the Senate the assurance that all primary schools in this country will be examined as to whether they at present serve the purpose they should be serving and whether or not they are properly sited, and whether or not new schools are required. This is Government's programme, and if Speightstown Boys School needs a new school, that will be taken care of. The church owns most of the school buildings, and we are in the process of handing back these buildings to the church. We intend to put up

buildings which are designed for proper teaching and not the open hall arrangement which the church handed to us over the last century.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HAGGATT HALL, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 18 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall for the purpose of relocating the Headquarters of the Transport Board.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: Government is seeking approval for the acquisition of a parcel of land some 4.8 hectares or 11.86 acres at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael for the construction of new headquarters for the Transport Board. The question of a suitable site for the relocation of the Transport Board was something which engaged the attention of the Ministry of Transport and Works for quite a long time, and as a result of the nationalization of the bus service in 1978, the facilities at Weymouth have become totally inadequate.

A committee was appointed in 1979 to locate a suitable site on which facilities such as an administrative block, mechanical work shop, training centre, playing fields, an area for parking buses overnight and an area for testing drivers where those could be accommodated. A number of sites were looked at in the past; places like Clermont, Husbands, the Pine, Lower Estate, and all were found to be unsuitable. The Chief Town Planner, therefore, was asked to identify a suitable site for the building of a new headquarters, and he was the person who recommended this parcel of land at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael.

7.15 p.m.

This land is owned by the Estate of C. A. Dowding. The Chief Town Planner advised that, because of a number of considerations, he felt it was the most appropriate place. He considered that the Transport Board provides a public service for the benefit of the entire community, and he considered that particular location as particularly critical. He also suggested that most of the area would remain open, but, more importantly, the access would be obtainable from an improved highway system. Officials from the Ministry of Transport and Works visited the site and the area was considered appropriate for the construction of the new headquarters.

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

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I do not intend to at this stage, get into a full scale debate of the Transport Board, because I believe that would take a whole day — there are so many things which seem to be going wrong at the Transport Board. Nevertheless, I think that many people would welcome the move, finally, by the Government to establish a new headquarters for the Transport Board, because it is clear that the Roebuck Street headquarters is very congested and does not allow for the proper development of facilities there, and indeed for the handling of the buses and the services which are required if we are going to move towards establishing an efficient service in this country. The problem, however, is that getting the new headquarters is not going to solve the problems at the Transport Board, because I believe that a lot of the problems at the Transport Board have to do with the bad management which is in place in that institution. It is my view that the personnel policies pursued at the Board are really a disincentive to production. There is a lot of dissatisfaction existing amongst the employees and the Board about the way in which personnel matters are handled. I do not want to call names at this stage, as I said I do not want to launch into a full scale debate on the Transport Board, but I am certainly identifying some areas which I consider ought to be looked at very quickly.

If we are going to be running a service like the Transport Board, one which we all recognise is vital for the public, and certainly vital for our whole social and economic development, since the Transport Board is charged with the responsibility of moving people to and from work, and also in other activities, then we ought to be thinking in terms of providing the most efficient service, and Government ought to recognise that this can only be provided if the people who have to provide this service at all levels, whether they are mechanics, conductors, drivers, supervisors, all the people who are involved, are happy, or reasonably so. The whole question, as I said, of the personnel policies, recruitment and promotion leaves a lot to be desired and has led to a very serious deterioration in relationships at the Transport Board. Getting a new headquarters may very well partly solve one of the problems confronting the Transport Board, we have to look beyond that. There is no point going into a spanking new headquarters with the same old approaches, with the same out of date approaches, and indeed with the lack of a clear and distinct policy, particularly in the area of personnel. This is one of the very serious problems confronting the Transport Board.

The other point relates to the equipment which is owned by the Board, very valuable equipment, but it would seem to me the systems are not in place to service it as effectively and as efficiently as it ought to be serviced. You have a situation where at the

moment the servicing of buses over the weekend has been discontinued. The argument which has been advanced is that it is too expensive to pay people overtime to call out mechanics on the weekend, because they would have to be paid overtime, but I believe that consideration other than that particular approach ought to be given to the proper handling and servicing of equipment which, in the final analysis, has to be paid for by the taxpayers of this country. I believe that a proper system ought to be put in place which would ensure that if something goes wrong with a bus on a Saturday or Sunday, it would be serviced and put back in working order rather than having to wait until Monday, or Tuesday, for that matter, for that to be done. Because when you pursue that kind of policy, the experience has been, and still is, that you get a situation where on Mondays there are a number of buses which ought to be running but they cannot go on the road because of the fact that they are not in working order. I would certainly like to think that something could be done about that.

I happen to know that one of the proposals which the Board has made in this particular regard is that they would want mechanics at the Transport Board to rotate and to work for five days out of seven, working Saturdays and Sundays as normal days. That is a proposal which has been rejected a long time ago. The Sanitation Service Authority tried it and it just did not work. The Port Authority is trying it and the Government Corporations seem to be pursuing it, and it would seem as if it is a policy of the Government that they would like to introduce a system where the people should work five out of seven as normal time rather than Monday to Friday, and if then any work has to be done on Saturday or Sunday this would be paid for at premiums rates. But this has not proven to be acceptable and I dare say will not prove to be acceptable, and I think, therefore, in the interest of ensuring that the equipment is not allowed to deteriorate, or indeed to lie idle during the period when it may very well be needed, or needed to be ready in time for the start of the rush period, Monday to Friday, that the Board ought to return to a situation where the servicing of equipment and the hiring of mechanics on the Saturday and the Sunday is re-introduced.

7.25 p.m.

I believe that one has got to look at the deficit losses or the subsidy, for that matter, of the Transport Board. It can be looked at in a number of ways. The subsidy is provided by the taxpayers. The fact of the matter

is that, in the final analysis, to a large extent, taxpayers are responsible for keeping the Transport Board going. I believe that there are a lot of inefficiencies in the Transport Board, but a proper management structure in place, people who know about transport, about labour management relations and proper personnel management relations and, generally speaking, persons who are capable of making the whole system function efficiently, would go a far way in reducing the subsidy and losses which one sees piling up from the Transport Board on a continuous basis.

I think that the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the Board is run as efficiently as possible but this can only be done if the Board is allowed to function as a Board and not to be manipulated, if persons who are given the responsibility to look after the day to day management and functioning of the operations are allowed to manage the operations without interference. I am saying the new headquarters is welcomed but, having said that, one must recognize that there are matters which would concern members of the public about the Transport Board, and we would also want to see a considerable improvement in the whole management and operation of the Board so that we would not have to be pouring out the millions of dollars that we pour out every year to keep the Transport Board going. We want to see it running in an efficient manner and we believe that the provision of a new headquarters would assist, to some extent, in improving the efficiency of that organization.

As I said, there are lots more that I could say about the Transport Board.....

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please do not say it now, because I think we have wandered far enough from the acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: You would appreciate that on the acquisition of land for headquarters, one would want to talk in terms of the headquarters of the Transport Board.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think you have already done that.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Yes, and at the same time one would want also to make some reference to the general operations of the Transport Board, because it is not just land and a headquarters in a vacuum.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: And you have done that, too.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I was winding down. I certainly welcome this, and I hope that when the Transport Board moves on to its new headquarters, it would move with a new approach and that we would see some efficiencies introduced in that operation.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: This arrangement is long overdue, because it has been many years since the location at Roebuck Street has been inadequate for the purposes of the Transport Board.

Going beyond that, however, I note that Senator Greaves has indicated that there will be continual resistance to the suggestion that you should have working arrangements where you have five days out of seven without identifying Monday to Friday as the five normal working days. I think that it is most unfortunate that the union is taking this position because it is not in the interest of Barbados, it is not in the interest of the workers. It is a rather constraining practice in terms of the development of this country and, indeed, to the well-being of the workers to have that kind of arrangement anywhere, especially in places like the Transport Board where you know you must operate seven days a week. By its nature that must operate seven days and I do not see how you can suggest that you can have five working days out of seven for a statutory corporation.

Having said that, I must disclose that that measure was introduced at a time when I was on the Transport Board, very much against my advice at the time. I do not think that it would be a breach of anything to indicate that it came on rather suddenly and was agreed to by people who did not perceive that they were agreeing to something which was a real dramatic change in employment arrangements which would be to the detriment of the Transport Board and to the country generally, and despite my indication that they should not accept, they accepted there and then, without one moment's reflection, or without even prior warning. Anyhow, I would not elaborate on that anymore, but the essential point is that that is a burden which we must get off the backs of the people of this country.

This also relates to the Sanitation workers. I know that the union is concerned about enhancing the pay packets of the workers. If that is so, face it squarely on. Let us do the arithmetic and see how much people should be paid by way of compensation for the new arrangements so that the worker would get the same amount of money to take home. If you do that, you would find that the workers, therefore, would have higher basic wages, higher insurable income and their position would be enhanced. You are talking about a 40-hour week. Every week they must work overtime. This is a normal condition that should not be for any worker. Talk about enhancing the wages all around and bring it into a sane situation. Discontinuity between the cost of employing people on Saturdays and Sundays as opposed to other ways is such that no commercial enterprise would do it, and I do not think we should expect Government to do it either. It would not pay people really to have a situation where if you want to work on Sundays, you would pay twice as much as on any other

day, when you are normally required to work every Sunday as any other day.

Getting back to the problems of the Transport Board, I do agree that there is considerable room for improvement of the management of the Transport Board and the management of all public corporations. This has been the major failure not only of this Government, but the management of public corporations. I happened to be involved with two Boards over the last twelve years. With the first one, after about two years I resigned, because I was in the midst of a set of Board members who had no intentions of acting without the sanction of the Ministry, so the Transport Board in those days was just merely an extension of the Ministry of Transport and Works, as it was at the time, and because of that, there were considerable difficulties in recruiting staff, and doing anything constructive. There came a point, when I recognised it was just an exercise in futility, and I resigned.

I was on another Board; the Board was doing things and I was removed. The moral of that story is that when the Boards do nothing they seem to be in accordance with what the politicians want them to do — nothing. When they do something, it seems as though they might be giving offence to the wrong people.
7.35 p.m.

In terms of the present impression we get about the Transport Board, the type of statement we get from recent Ministers of Transport come across very much as though the Minister perceives himself as almost in the nature of the Chairman of the Board, as though he is there to shape the details of policy in the way that the Board is supposed to function. My feeling is that that is not right. The primary responsibility of the Minister is to get a proper Board in place, give it general directions, let them do the work and look around; and if they are not functioning, get an entirely new Board in place. Do not try to control the Board and get them to do the things that you want them to do and that kind of thing, and if they do not do it you chase away half and keep half and that kind of stuff, and bring in another half whom you know in that situation can only but go along with the half he retained, which might have been making wrong decisions. Also, when you get beyond that and you look at the appointments in terms of the senior management staff, you find that there seems to be too much satisfaction with people who quite evidently cannot be competent, and an inclination to disbelieve the competence of people who are quite evidently competent. These kinds of problems will get you nowhere in terms of improving the performance of public corporations.

SENATOR J. E. JORDAN: I rise to support the Resolution with respect to the acquisition of the property at Haggatt Hall for the construction of a new head-

quarters. I should indicate that I am a member of this Board, as I was of the last one. For a long time now complaints have been made about the poor accommodation being offered at Weymouth. It is perhaps ironic that when hurricanes are threatening, buses are relocated at Combermere, the same school that was once located at Weymouth. Fear too have been expressed about the way the buses have been parked. They are a bit too close and the view was expressed that one little incident could perhaps spark a whole chain reaction.

Senator Greaves talked earlier about the trimming, I think, of the mechanics on week-ends and the unavailability of adequate units on Mondays to service the routes. As far as I know, instructions were given that overtime should be reduced, but that there is some skeleton staff available to do some of the repairs over the week-end.

One point I would like to make, and it is related to something that Senator Hall had said earlier with respect to minibus operators, why are they not allowed to carry passengers standing, and secondly why are they not allowed to own as many minibuses as they like, is that we must appreciate that the minibus operation has some impact on the profitability or otherwise of the Transport Board. So I think that this is one of the reasons why the Ministry may have been contemplating the idea of restricting the number of minibuses to be owned by one particular operator.

We also recognise that the Roebuck Street location is certainly not the best. It causes a lot of congestion in Roebuck Street and the area is prone to flooding. A new and modern headquarters is in keeping with my Government's concept of mass transportation in this country. We have only to look at the new Fairchild Street bus terminal. We have a terminal planned for Speightstown, we have been modernising our bus fleet and certainly we would need to have modern facilities to service our new Mercedes buses. We need to ensure that the people who work with the Board are comfortable in the environment in which they work. I much regret to say that at this point in time we have a medical unit set up in an old bus in the headquarters at Weymouth. I think all of us would agree that that is not the best place for a medical unit to be located.

We have recently acquired a coin counter, a very sophisticated piece of equipment and we have had to make some temporary arrangements to accommodate that piece of equipment. If we were in our new headquarters, that equipment could be better located to enhance the operation of the Board. My hope is that the finished product will not take too long to be delivered. We are only going through the first phase, the acquisition of the land on which the headquarters are to be built, but I hope that in the not too distant future we too will see

our new plush modern headquarters of the Transport Board.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: I rise to support this Resolution. As a former Chairman of the Transport Board, I have good knowledge of the surroundings in which this organisation was housed for many years. I have no doubt that the Government is now very aware that this organisation should have been moved from the present headquarters for some time now. In fact, during my term of office at the Transport Board that was one of the suggestions which was made. Certainly the headquarters of the Transport Board need, in my view, to be removed from the almost centre of the city, and this is one of the areas where the Transport Board could be housed. As you are aware, the present site is a low area, it is prone to flooding and there is no way that the Transport Board should be allowed to remain there, and a move will help to relieve the congestion which has always been at the Transport Board there in Weymouth. For too long I think the Transport Board has been housed in too cramped an area. Even the offices at the Transport Board are very bad. Up to recently the offices were cracking. There were times when engineers had to be brought in to see if the buildings were really safe for staff to work in, and I am sure that these new headquarters will make a very great difference to the morale of the staff, it will make a difference to the morale of everybody associated with the system.

The transport system in this country is still about the best you can find anywhere certainly in the Caribbean. It is one of the best, in my view, in any part of the world, and I have seen the transport system in many countries. I think the Government, in spite of the criticisms which we get of the Transport Board can still be proud that they have one of the best transport systems in the world. I have no doubt that with the acquisition of this land to improve the facilities for the Transport Board, we would have done something very good for this country. I think we just have to look at the new bus terminal. I have not been there myself, but I have been told that it really is a first class building and something of which everybody can be proud. It is there for everybody to see; people go in there day in and day out, and I am told that it is really a very beautiful place, something which, of course, might not be very good for the members of the Opposition, because they realize that people are quite aware of how their funds are being spent. I only hope that with the acquisition of this land for the new terminal, something would be built which would be just as great as what is existing now in the Fairchild Street bus stand. I have no doubt that we will see a good headquarters for the Transport Board in the near future.

7.45 p.m.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I believe that the majority of points raised by honourable Senators were indeed answered. Nevertheless, I take the point made by Senator McClean with respect to the five days out of seven. I take his point. I must admit that I held slightly different views some time ago, but have come around to the realization that, to be quite honest, we have to look.....

(SENATOR W. W. HALL: You have changed now?)

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS:.....at this whole question of a work week.

Senator Greaves, in his own inimitable style was suggesting that there is manipulation at the Transport Board and persons not being allowed to function. I believe I am quoting him correctly.

I really could not sit down and allow the Resolution to be passed and to accept that kind of allegation from Senator Greaves. We totally object to the statements made by Senator Greaves suggesting that there has been interference in the Transport Board. I recognize that when persons have to work in conditions that are not the best, there can be certain difficulties. But there is no deliberate attempt on the part of the Board of the Transport Board, or for that matter anybody in the Ministry of Transport and Works, to interfere with the smooth running and the management of the Board at the Transport Board itself.

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

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: Mr. Deputy President, this has been a long and indeed eventful day, and I am deeply grateful for the support on all sides.

I think the debate did get out of hand at some points, but we did have a very fruitful day. Those who did suffer some dislocation may be able to go and lick their wounds.

I beg to move that the Senate do now stand adjourned until July 10, 1985 at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.

7.50 p.m.

CONTENTS**MESSAGES****Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT 804**

Messages re absence of Governor-General; Sir
Arnott Cato acting.

Message re vacant Senate seat, once held by
Mr. D. A. C. Simmons.

ANNOUNCEMENTS**Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT 805**

Re Senator C. A. Griffith as Leader of Senate.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS**SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH 805**

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise
Receipts for 11 months ended 31st January,
1985.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise
Receipts for 10 months ended 28th February,
1985.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of
Accounts of the Transport Board for the year
ended 31st March, 1982.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of
Accounts of the Transport Board for the year
ended 31st March, 1983.

The Annual Report and Audited Statement of
Accounts of the Transport Board for the year
1980-81.

List of amendments to the Economic Report
1984.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 5)
Order, 1985.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Ex-
emption) Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2)
Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) Order,
1985.

The Land Development Duty (Rate of Duty)
(No. 2) Order, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 3)
Order, 1985.

The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Ex-
emption) (No. 2) Order, 1985.

The Land Development Duty (Amendment)
Regulations, 1985.

The Service Tax (Amendment) Order, 1985.

The Land Surveyors' Rules, 1985.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6)
Order, 1985.

Report of the Family Law Council for the
year 1984.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling
Allowances Regulations, 1985.

The Defence (Rate of Pay and Allowances)
(Amendment) Regulations, 1985.

Report and Financial Statements of the
Barbados Port Authority for the year ended
31st December, 1984.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 45(2) 806**INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH 806**

A Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax
on the proceeds of sale of minerals mined in a
quarry.

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act,
Cap. 114.

PUBLIC BUSINESS**RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION NO. 49
OF 1969 806**

Senator Trotman, 806, 807; Senator Lynch,
806.

**VESTING IN NHC OF LAND AT GALL HILL,
CHRIST CHURCH 807**

Senator Trotman, 807.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CLAPHAM, CHRIST CHURCH. 807**

Senator Griffith, 807, 815; Senator Greaves, 808; Senator McClean, 810; Senator Linton, 810; Senator Yearwood, 813; Senator Seale, 814.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CHANCERY LANE, ST. MICHAEL FOR
HOUSING 819**

Senator Trotman, 819.

**OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1985. 819**

Senator Trotman, 819; Senator Greaves, 820.

**WIDOWS AND CHILDREN PENSIONS (AMEND-
MENT) ACT 1985 821**

Senator Trotman, 821.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985 822

Senator Griffith, 822, 826; Senator Hall, 822;
Senator Greaves, 824; Senator Linton, 825.

**PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS)
ACT, 1985. 827**

Senator Trotman, 827, 829, 835; Senator
Greaves, 828, 829, 830, 836; Senator Williams,
832; Senator McClean, 833; Senator Hall,
833; Senator Jones, 834.

**INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES (EX-
EMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1985 837**

Senator Griffith, 837, 840; Senator Greaves,
838; Senator Linton, 839.

**MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT),
ACT, 1985. 841**

Senator Griffith, 841, 842; Senator McClean,
842.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BLACK BESS ST. PETER RE RECREA-
TIONAL FACILITIES 842**

Senator Williams, 842.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
GIBBONS, CHRIST CHURCH FOR RECREA-
TIONAL FACILITIES 843**

Senator Williams, 843.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
PARKINSON AND GRAZETTES ROAD, ST.
MICHAEL FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT .. 843**

Senator Griffith, 843, 848; Senator Hall,
844; Senator Trotman, 847; Senator Jemmott,
847; Senator McClean, 847.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
WAVELL AVENUE, ST. MICHAEL FOR
HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. 848**

Senator Griffith, 848.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER RE PLAYING
FIELD FOR ALEXANDRA SCHOOL 849**

Senator Williams, 849; Senator Jordan, 849;
Senator McClean, 849.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CRAB
HILL, ST. LUCY RE RECREATIONAL
FACILITIES 849**

Senator Williams, 849; Senator Greaves, 850;
Senator Trotman, 850; Senator Linton, 851.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN RE PLAYING FIELD AND
AGRI-SCIENCE PLOT FOR SPEIGHTSTOWN
BOYS SCHOOL 852**

Senator Williams, 852; Senator Greaves, 852;
Senator Trotman, 853.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
HAGGATT HALL RE NEW HEAD-
QUARTERS FOR TRANSPORT BOARD. 853**

Senator Williams, 853, 857; Senator Greaves,
854; Senator McClean, 855; Senator Jordan,
856; Senator Yearwood, 857.

SUSPENSION. 819

ADJOURNMENT 857

Senator Griffith, 857.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

GRIFFITH, Hon. C. A.
GREAVES, E. E.
HALL, W. W.
JEMMOTT, C. E.
JONES, Canon I. McK.
JORDAN, J. E.
LINTON, H. R.
LYNCH, Mrs. E. M.
McCLEAN, A. W. A.
SEALE, C. D.
TROTMAN, Hon. O'B.
WICKHAM, His Honour J. C. W.
WILLIAMS, J. E. D.
YEARWOOD, H. E.