

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1986-91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, 11th February, 1987.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, February 11, 1987, at 11.10 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator F. L. Walcott, O.B.E., (President)

His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State, Public Service)

Senator A. Morrison

Senator F. G. Smith, Q.C.

Senator D. A. Comissiong

Senator V. C. Fraser

Senator G. L. Eastmond

Senator A. J. N. Phillips

Senator T. A. Prescod

Senator B. A. Miller

Senator L. R. Tull, Q.C.

Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones

Senator P. Y. Forde

Senator J. S. Goddard

and

Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey.

Prayers were led by Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, this is the first meeting of this august Chamber since December 17, 1986, and I now crave your leave, Sir, and permission of yourself and the Honourable Senate, to pay a tribute to

the Leader of this House, Sir James Tudor, who was honoured by Her Majesty The Queen in her New Year's Honours List, 1987.

Sir James, as he prefers to be called, and quite rightly so, since it commemorates and reminds us of the contribution of his father to the working classes of this country, is well known to the entire island of Barbados. His contribution in so many spheres of activities is also well known, and his education and training would have surprised us, had he not thrown in his lot for the working classes of this country. He brought to himself and the island the distinction of being the first black President of the Oxford Union. In fact, only a few years ago I was talking to some old Oxford graduate, and he assured me that even among those who had the privilege of attending Oxford with Sir James, the speech which he made is still talked about at Oxford.

I had the privilege and pleasure of forming the Democratic Labour Party with Sir James Tudor. I believe his contribution, a calm, diplomatic approach and simplicity, contributed in no small measure to the success of that party, which formed the Government from 1961 – 1976 and from 1986 to the present moment. I was the first chairman, and – I am not praising myself – that gave me an opportunity to assess the sterling qualities and the character of the Leader of this Honourable Senate, whom I am asking the Chamber to appreciate.

On an occasion like this, when one is so well known to a community and already so many weeks have passed after that distinction was so graciously conferred on him, what more can you say except that Sir James will bear this new honour along with the numerous honours that he has achieved, with the same simplicity, unassuming attitude, affability and charm that has characterized everything that he has done. The honour is well deserved. The honour is one which by his contribution, dedication, and service to his community is just an appreciation by Her Majesty, who is head of this country still, and I hope she remains that way, who has conferred this honour on him.

There is very little more I could say, except I hope and pray that Sir James will long be spared, whether in politics or out of politics, to continue to make the sterling contributions that he has made to the advancement of his community. Whether there are further honours for Sir James or not lie in the laps of the Gods. But whatever future honour may come to him, then I am sure he will bear it with the same degree of dignity and charm which has characterized his behaviour and political career up to now.

I should like to say how very pleased I am that in our society, from time to time recognition is given to those whose contributions are outstanding. Sir James' contributions — Ambassador and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Representative to the United Nations, in all of the activities — have all been outstanding. He has served his country well and long may he be spared to continue.

I thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I very much wish to add my own congratulations to Sir James. In my time, I have heard of and known him to be a distinguished teacher, politician, diplomat, strategist, and some have said a gourmet as well.

11.20 a.m.

In fact, it has very recently come to my attention that the Clerk sat in the first class that Sir James would have taught at Combermere. That says a great deal for the Clerk.

As a teacher, Mr. President, as a politician and a diplomat, it is my understanding that for great service to his country, to our country, Sir James has been knighted. I did not come under his tutelage as a student, but certainly as a politician, in all contact with him, he has shown me nothing but the highest courtesy. That cannot be said of all the politicians with whom I have come in contact in this place and another, but of Sir James I can say that on all sides and to all sexes he has shown unfailing courtesy. I believe that is one of the first hallmarks of a great knight. In times gone, that, in fact, was a prerequisite for a great knight.

As a politician, perhaps the kind of politician that Sir James has been and is still today, he has no equal, and as a political strategist in particular, certainly no equal.

He has served his country long in Government and in Opposition, and, as we have heard from Senator Smith, he was one of the founding members of his party. There have been difficult days for him but he has behaved in an exemplary fashion. I have never heard or seen reported in Hansard anything to suggest that Sir James was one of those politicians who offered fisticuffs in the Other Place

or in this Place. I have never heard that as a diplomat Sir James was ever involved in unsavoury incidences to do with dogs or human beings, as some other diplomats have been, and not brought grace and favour to our country. On the contrary, all reports of the service that he gave as a diplomat outside of Barbados are spoken of, even today, in the highest and the most complimentary terms.

Some reference has been made to his command of the English language, his eloquence and his charm. I, too, wish to attest to all that. It is something that younger politicians might aspire to. It is possible to be combative and to be firm in one's stand without necessarily being abusive and downright ill-mannered, as we have seen not only in our Parliament, but I regret to say, in other Commonwealth Parliaments as well. When one reads reports certainly from the Parliaments in the United Kingdom and Australia, I sometimes despair of the quality of debate.

Sir James Tudor has always, to my knowledge, behaved as a parliamentarian should, in the best traditions of a parliamentarian. He has a respect for his honourable institution of Parliament, and in the few months in which he has led Government Business in this Chamber, I think that all of those qualities have now been made known to us, and, I would like to take the opportunity to say, Mr. President, are much appreciated, I am sure, by all of us.

I would want, too, to wish Sir James a long and happy life as the knight, Sir James Tudor. Rumour has it, Mr. President, that a reshuffle or a shake up of some kind was or is in the offing. I hope that what we are doing here will not amount to a political obituary. In fact, like Senator Smith, I hope that there may be other honours yet to be heaped upon the head of our distinguished Leader of the Senate.

There is a body of opinion in this country which feels that national honours are not compatible with a still relatively newly independent, Third World state, such as Barbados is. I am not one of that body of opinion, Mr. President. I do believe, and I have said it in the Other Place, that we must find a way of honouring our heroes and those who have served our country well, those who have set decent, good, God-fearing law-abiding examples. I should like to think that that attitude would encourage us, too, to be gracious where other countries, other people, other nations seek to honour Barbadians, so I am not one who has any particular difficulty about the fact that this knighthood was bestowed by Her Majesty the Queen. Is there really any good reason, Mr. President, why the Head of any other country, particularly countries in this western hemisphere region in which we live, where there are different political systems, should not want to bestow honours on Barbadians who may have served

those countries well, or who may have so inspired them by the quality of service they have offered to our own country? I cannot think of any reason why we ought not to. It is part of civilised society, it is part of civilised intercourse between nations.

I want to congratulate Sir James Tudor very warmly upon the bestowal of this knighthood upon him, in the secure knowledge that he is going to conduct himself, as he always has done, in the best manner, so that he will continue to be an inspiration to those of us who sit in this Chamber and perhaps those who sit elsewhere. I wish him a long and glorious enjoyment of his honour.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. M. deL. JORDAN: Mr. President, it would be very remiss of me if I allowed an occasion such as this to pass without recording my own personal congratulations to Sir James.

I remember when, as a student in the Acton Club in the Sixth Form of Harrison College, we would wait, and we would in fact use Sir James' presence to improve the attendance at our meetings. We all stood in awe in those days. That was a long, long time ago, but I can still remember how we would try to get him to come and address us if we wanted to have something else on the agenda which we did not think that the boys particularly wanted to hear about. So you can see that he has indeed been a great inspiring force for a long, long time.

I should like to say that I had the honour of knowing Sir James very well when I was a boy, because I happen to know the family very well. In fact, I knew his sisters much better than I knew Sir James, because it was only on the odd occasion that we, the younger ones, got the opportunity to see him — he would be in and out of the island. What impressed us most was the fact that it did not matter how insignificant a person might seem to be, he always had time to pay attention to the humblest of persons, to spend some time with the old folk in the district, whether he happened to have been visiting Barbados or if he were going to stay for a little while. That impressed me.

11.30 a.m.

I did not very often have much of an opportunity to talk with him for long, because very often, he would soon be gone again. But when we did have such an opportunity, he certainly was very interesting and, what is more, very understanding. I remember an occasion when he showed such understanding, and such compassion to a young person who came with problems, that I wondered how he had the time to attend to so many problems. He was equally appreciative of the problems of the elderly. To us, that was the sign of a great man.

As I said, that was a long, long time ago and there is really very little which I can add to what has already been said by the previous two speakers, other than that I have had the opportunity in later life to get to know the man and no greater tribute could have been paid him than the one which has recently been bestowed upon him by Her Majesty the Queen.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. President, I can only speak at this time to support, as warmly as I can, the tributes paid to Sir James Tudor on the occasion of the award to him of the honour of knighthood.

Sir James, like that other noble spirit, has done the state some service, and when in our speeches we his deeds relate, we need only speak of him as he is, nothing extenuating or set down all in malice then must we speak of one that loved both wisely and well.

Mr. President, I make so bold that I can claim some acquaintance with Sir James ever since those now distant and receding days when he adorned the Classical Six at Harrison College. I, a fledgling, hovering hesitantly on the fringe of such stalwart scholarship as dwelt in the company of the Stuarts, the Burtons and the Marshalls, was in ear-shot of the conversations that flowered in that company. It was there that I first made acquaintance with the Tudor felicity of language, which grew in later years to adorn Oxford and other more august halls. But I do not wish to speak of these triumphs which are already well known. I wish to speak of another, and, in my opinion, greater virtue.

Tribute has been paid to Sir James as a teacher, and those who have been fortunate enough to, as Barbadians say, taste his hand, attest to his supremacy as a wielder of the cou-cou stick. But honour has come to him in his role as a politician.

Politicians come, as we know, in all shapes, forms and sizes. They flourish in the most unlikely places, in cricket teams, in board rooms, barrack rooms, at street corners, rum shops and on the beaches, but the one thing they share is the precariousness of their existence. Politics is, especially in the Caribbean, a hazardous business, and the career politician is at the mercy of a very fickle popularity. One moment he is in, and the next, he is hopelessly out. If he is to retain his morale and his equanimity, he must follow the Kipling advice and walk with Kings or lose the common touch, I say, from my seat on the sidelines as I watch the comings and the goings, the entrances and exits in the corridors of power, that Sir James' success is owing in no small measure to his ability to walk with Kings without losing the common touch.

I join with Senators in offering my personal felicitations to our newest knight.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, I am happy to join with other Senators in offering congratulations to Sir James on the distinction given to him. I do not wish to repeat what others have already said, and said possibly better than I could do, but I would feel uncomfortable if I allow an opportunity like this to pass without seeking to add some small tribute to the many encomiums which have already been paid to Sir James.

I am fortunate in that, however tenuous the link, I am among that relatively small band of persons who were actually at school with Sir James, though he was, at that time, one of the senior persons and I was even more junior than Senator Wickham. Of course, in those days that meant that there was literally a vast gulf, almost unbridgeable, between the two groups of persons, so one could only look up and admire.

Sir, my first real personal contact, certainly my first contact as an adult, with Sir James was when I returned to Barbados and, in 1966, when he was then Minister of Education, was appointed to the then Board of Education. I served for a short time before subsequently leaving the island.

What I have always remembered of him, and I do not even know if he remembers this himself, is that on one occasion we were talking and he told me words to the effect that 'I see words in colour. I see language in colour.' This has always remained with me, because he is one of the persons from whom I have benefitted a very great deal in trying to master the skill of using the language appropriately, to say precisely what one wishes, hopefully nothing more, and hopefully nothing less. That he has served the country well is not in question at all, but that he has served it very well indeed is beyond dispute.

I can only hope, Sir, that during the continuation, and I share Senator Miller's hope that that will long continue in this Senate, we will benefit from that excellence in use of language which few achieve, and which, perhaps, even fewer seek to achieve, and therein hangs its own tale. I can only hope that we will be given the tremendous opportunity to hear a flowering of language, if I may put it that way, which gives us, and hopefully, members of the public, an opportunity to sense and experience at first hand how arguments can be couched in other than the mundane language of day-to-day usage when people do not have a chance to think more seriously about what they are doing.

11.40 a.m.

It seems to me that this would be a wonderful opportunity for our Senate to seek to recapture something of the days in which people took pride in the quality of language they used. I am not seeking to imply that the members of this Honourable Chamber do not take pride in the content of what they are saying, but I am suggesting that perhaps we need to pay a little more attention to the choice of language in which these views and ideas are expressed.

Sir, I join with other members of this Honourable Chamber in wishing Sir James many many opportunities, and very many years of service to this Senate, and to this country, in particular. May he continue to serve our country as well in the future as he has done in the past.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, this is clearly one of the occasions when I ought to start by saying "unaccustomed as I am to public speaking", because the overflow of goodwill and good feeling which is coming in my direction on this occasion is far too overwhelming. All of the Senators who have spoken about me have done in terms which I fully, very warmly appreciate, and each of them, although some of them would not believe this, is held in very high regard by me.

I have wintered and summered with Senator Smith, both in politics and in close family relationships. I had the honour, soon after I became Minister this second time, to help in the selection of his brother to represent our country in the very responsible position of High Commissioner. I held that position and was therefore able to gauge the challenges of the office, and thought him entirely suited for it.

Senator Miller has been more than kind. I want her to know that I appreciate her compliments, because when we are in politics we do not always remember that, in a small country like this, there are personal relationships which do not overflow into public life, but are there nonetheless. My most poignant memory of her is at her mother's funeral, probably about 30 years ago, and remarking to myself how a young girl in her early teens could bear the shock of that particular loss and assume the headship together with her father, of a family which consisted of younger brothers and sister. This, to me, at that time marked her out for leadership, and I have noticed, in following her career, that she subsequently became Minister of Education, which is a political hot-house, if there ever was one. That she has escaped it unscathed, as I did, is a testimony to her powers and durability, and, of course, her capacity to ignore and to rise above all the difficulties of that most exacting office, as the Senator who sits next to her will himself attest.

Senator Jordan is not unknown to me, and I thank him. I would not like to think that, in the secrecy of his

bed, he has been ordered to do this. But I wonder whether he has done it really out of revenge, because at his wedding, when I had to say something on behalf of the then bridal couple, I made mention of what I had thought was the difficulty which he had in succeeding in getting his present wife to marry him, and I said it was a case of labour ended, sorry vanquished, Jordan passed.

Senator Wickham goes back with me a long way. Again there is a very close family connection. One of my earliest memories of that family is, of course, the Sunday afternoon conversations in my father's house where, except when Thomas Jefferson dined alone, I do not think there was such wealth of grace and distinction ever gathered in a single drawing room, and Clennel Wickham, I think, supplied 90 per cent of that. So I have heard with particular warmth and graciousness his tribute to me, and I thank him for it.

I recently had occasion to speak with Senator Shorey on a professional matter. We talked about education and everything that goes with it, of what it costs to make it a good system, of scholarship and dollarship, so to speak. Again I was impressed by the warmth of his feeling towards me, and I was able to impress upon him — I do not think I needed to do that very much — that I did very much honour and respect the contribution which he makes to this society, not always held in the very popular regard, but certainly doing for the rest of us in a particularly difficult field what we do not manage to do for ourselves. I really want to commend him to the general public, that they should listen to him much more carefully than they do, because he probably, of all the people who write and speak about education in this Island, is not only among the most knowledgeable less than half a dozen of them, but feels his subject more keenly than most.

I am very grateful that he has been associated in this tribute to me and I thank all of them.

I should just like to make some general brief comments about myself. I do not often speak about myself, because it would be, as one English poet would describe it "the short and simple annals of the poor." But I should like to say that to the extent that any of you or people outside this country, both inside and outside of politics, have found anything in me worthy of note, I wish you to know that you have made it so. It is the width of contacts I have had, not only in my own political party but outside of it, the numbers of people who have taught me so much, much more than I could ever have taught myself, that I wish to pay tribute to, and I would wish them to share this honour.

11.50 a.m.

I am by nature a consensus politician. I believe that the constitutional system which we have inherited, while it may not in some theoretical minds be the best of all

possible systems, is not the worst in that it is better than most. Therefore, everything I have done in politics I have tried to strengthen and preserve it, not always, of course, in a manner which is easily seen. I take my battles quite seriously.

I was particularly gratified at a recent social function which both Senator Tull and I attended, in which he very kindly said of me that I am a fierce opponent, but a different kind of victim. That, to me, is a compliment, and I hope that it is true, because I have absolutely no rancour in my politics. I am quite happy when we are out of Government that other people should govern, although I make it my business to shorten their time.

Laughter.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: But I am equally happy when I am in Government to hear other people's views of us and to marvel at their cleverness in getting under our skins, and perhaps at the way that we should prevent this. This is all right.

There is something else I want to say, and I say this in public, because there is a misconception about the relationship between Prime Minister Errol Barrow and me. We have known each other for almost all of our lives. It is very difficult when you have grown up with some person not to be able to read them through and through, and it is perhaps that experience of mine with him which makes it so easy for us to have this very close and very long amount of political allegiance to each other, although there are large areas of public policy, I think, in which we do not share the same ideas. However, I should like to say this morning that he did not need to confer this honour on me for the strength of my affection or my respect for him to be sustained. That would have been independent of this. I have been happy to share the Government with him.

In case Senators feel that I am saying farewell, just let me say that when he called me and asked me on May 29, last year whether I would like to share his Government with him again, I said to him, "For how long?" And in his very brusque, offhand way, he said, "You got somewhere to go?" So I take it that the rumours which are circulating have a certain palpable exaggeration about them and that he will tell me when I have somewhere to go.

I took it upon myself to convey my humble duty to Her Majesty and thank her for having acceded to the Prime Minister's request in respect of myself. I thank the Queen because, and I say this in no spirit of boasting, I have had the very great honour and distinction of being able to speak with Her Majesty on several occasions and to know the depth and strength of her feeling for this country and its people.

One does not ordinarily say what the Queen says or recount one's experiences, but I can recount this particular one, because it illustrates the depth of her feeling for Barbados and Barbadians. When she was about to come here on a visit in 1975, I had something to do with the preparations for the visit. I was very astonished on one occasion when — I was in England then — a request came from the palace as to where Sir Garfield Sobers was born. I felt it very strange, but I complied, and I explained to them that it was an area in Barbados which we normally call the Bay Estate, but that, for ease of reference, for people who visit the country and who would like to be more familiar with the general layout of the Bridgetown area, it was within walking distance of the Garrison Savannah. About a week after, Her Majesty's Private Secretary got in touch with me and asked whether people who knew Mr. Sobers, who had seen him grow up as a child, would welcome seeing him knighted in public. I could not answer it, except in a personal way. It was something with which I had to consult the Prime Minister about and I shot the enquiry off. He replied that he thought that the people of Barbados would be very happy to have this done. Then the reply came back to us that she had decided not only to confer the Knighthood on him, *coram populo*, but that she was particularly doing it because she thought that old ladies, and the older folk generally, in the area in which he was born would be delighted to come within walking distance to witness that on his behalf. I was further told that she proposed to confer the knighthood on him using her father's sword, which she regarded as a great treasure, and I believe that Her Majesty has never used that sword since. Now you do not have to be a monarchist to see the significance of that kind of gesture, but, to me, it indicates the strength and generosity of the graciousness of her feelings for Barbadians. Therefore, I was very grateful of the gesture, grateful to all of you now who have shared it with me.

Whatever I have achieved in public life, I think I owe it first of all to my parents, and particularly to my father, because, he, as I understand now — I did not quite understand it even when he was alive — wanted to achieve through me a lot of his ambitions, which were denied him because he was born in a day when educational opportunities were not perhaps what they are now. He, therefore, in a sense, without my knowing it at the time, centred a sort of ambition vicariously in me. I am very, very sorry that the passage of time took him away from us, but I believe that where he is now, in Paradise, he will enjoy it perhaps much more than I can.

Secondly, I would not like this occasion to pass without saying how much I owe to the people of St. Lucy, who, for 17 years, kept and nurtured me and made me their representative. That, to me — and I hope that Her Majesty and the Prime Minister will not take me amiss in this — is the highest honour which has ever been bestowed on me. It has been an honour because it has given me the experience

of sitting in the House of Assembly for 17 years articulating the concerns of a people, with none of whom I have never had a word in anger. Those of us who have had the honour to have been elected and to be representing people know how difficult it can be sometimes in constituencies when people who do not support us do not understand always that we are still their representatives. I should like to say that my experience with the people of St. Lucy has been wholly a good one, and I thank them for making it possible for me to enjoy this distinction. The honour is really theirs and I am happy to be sharing it with them.

Applause.

12.00 noon.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This debate is symptomatic of the honour that has been paid to our colleague, Senator the Honourable Sir James Tudor. I would like to join all of the Senators who have spoken, and on behalf of the entire Senate, wish Sir James complete happiness and success on this distinguished honour that has been conferred on him. I hope that he will live for many years to enjoy all of the benefits that have been conferred on him.

Everyone has spoken very highly of him, and he deserves all that has been said. I do not wish to gild the lilly. All I can say is that he showed these indications a long time ago. I knew him as a youngster before he left school, and he was a politician before he left school. His hunting ground was just opposite this place, out there on the cenotaph.

I wish Sir James every success, and I feel that this is the complete acclamation not only of this Senate but of the public of Barbados.

Applause

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

The 11th Annual Report of the National Housing Corporation (NHC) for the year 1983–1984.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 9) Order, 1986.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for months ended September, October and November, 1986.

The 17th Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1985–86.

The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Guarantee by the Minister of Finance to grant all benefits and exemptions under section 32(1) of Exempt Insurance Act 1983 to Motors Mechanical Reinsurance Company Ltd.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 2, asked by Senator B. A. Miller.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I am asking leave of the Senate for Senator Lewis to take charge of Item No. 1, which stands in my name.

BORROWING OF US \$1 924 500 FROM THE VENEZUELAN INVESTMENT FUND (F.I.V.)

Order No. 1 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of the sum of US \$1 924 500 from the Venezuelan Investment Fund (F.I.V.) for the purpose of assisting in the financing of petroleum exploration and development operations of the Barbados National Oil Company Ltd.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Resolution seeks approval for the Government to borrow an amount of US \$1 924 500 from the Venezuelan Investment Fund for the purpose of assisting with the financing of activities of the Barbados National Oil Company Ltd.

The background to this Resolution lies in an arrangement and a decision taken by the Government of the day in November 1983 to enter into a loan agreement under the Venezuelan Investment Fund for a sum of \$38 632 500 bolivars, which funds were deposited with the Central Bank of Barbados, so that they may be used by the Barbados National Oil Company Ltd. in executing the project for exploration of oil in Barbados. This project relating to the development of oil drilling activities continued into 1984. Since then there has been a reduction in the oil drilling activities at Woodbourne.

The arrangements under the agreement were that the Barbados National Oil Company would purchase equipment and supplies from Venezuelan sources and the funds would be utilized to pay for that equipment and materials. At the time of the signing of the loan agreement, the exchange rate for the bolivar was US\$1.00 equivalent to 4.2925 bolivars. However, in March 1984 there was a devaluation of the bolivar. The exchange rate

changed so that US\$1.00 became equivalent to 7.4925 bolivars. In consequence, the amount of money made available to the Government of Barbados under the loan agreement was substantially reduced, and whereas it was anticipated that some US\$9 million would have been available, the new amount which could be used to facilitate the purchase of these materials and equipment was reduced to US\$5.1 million. In consequence of all of that, the Government of Barbados, with the assistance of the Central Bank, approached the Venezuelan Investment Fund, and it was possible to negotiate for further financial assistance. Hence this Resolution coming before us is to enable us to guarantee the loan of US\$1 924 500 to continue the programme of purchasing materials and supplies from Venezuelan sources to assist with the continuing development of the oil field activities at Woodbourne in St. Philip.

12.10 p.m.

The rate of interest on the loan is 2% per annum payable bi-annually, the term of the loan, the maturity date is the year 1999 and there is a grace period ending on December 30, 1987. Repayments of the loan will be made by 25 bi-annual instalments beginning after December 30, 1987.

They are only extracting oil from existing wells and retrieving natural gas at the same time. This Resolution is presented to the Senate in order to allow that work to continue.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, undoubtedly one of the significant successes in the Barbados economy over the past decade or so has been the success of the National Petroleum Corporation and the Barbados National Oil Company. The whole energy programme that has been devised and was being implemented during the last decade has been a matter of some satisfaction in this country.

The problems of 1973, the result of the international oil crisis, threw a tremendous burden on many countries, not least the developing countries, and in this particular case, Barbados, to be able to meet the demands of foreign reserve expenditures in relation to the oil needs. The formation of the Barbados National Oil Company in 1983 was a significant step in harnessing the hydro-carbon resources of Barbados, and the Government set about, as a deliberate policy, to attract the assistance of developed friendly countries in its oil exploration efforts. I remember that in 1982 the Canadians, through Petro-Canada International, gave millions of dollars of assistance, and indeed further technical assistance, for the purposes of exploration and for the training and preparation of people to meet the new demands of an energy sector in Barbados.

The Minister, in introducing this Bill, made reference to the assistance that has been granted under the San Jose Accord, and more directly through the Venezuela Investment Fund, which is a direct result of this Accord. The Accord was for Mexico and Venezuela to give assistance to a number of countries in this hemisphere, more specifically in the Caribbean, to meet the very heavy demand on foreign exchange in the purchasing of energy products in this country. It has always been the policy therefore, Mr. President, for Government to have as its policy the maximising of the indigenous energy resources in Barbados. This has been substantially achieved in the last few years as a direct result of the efforts of the Barbados National Oil Company.

I have some figures to suggest that the increase, for instance, in the volume of the sales of crude oil in the last four years has almost quadrupled from 201.2 barrels in 1981 to 704.9 in 1985, and at the same time there has been a substantial decline in the value of crude and reformat imports into Barbados. In 1985 we imported about half of what we imported in 1981, and that speaks for itself.

It is also important for us, Mr. President, to look at the whole situation of energy internationally and see how it can impact on the resources of Barbados and see how our own oil industry can fit into that international pattern. Only this morning I saw that the price of oil is going back down again, although not by much. Everyone knows that, in the last two months, the OPEC countries have forced up the price of oil artificially by agreement to cut back on production, and the price of oil went up to just over \$18 a barrel in the last few weeks.

I cannot, inexperienced as I am in these matters, forecast what is likely to happen in the next few months, but we need to have an energy policy by Government that takes into consideration the expected and continuing volatility of the international oil industry. In other words, we cannot be shifting a policy in import areas from month to month, or from one quarter to the other, without any clear projection of what our likely policy will be in the long term or in the medium term.

I know it is not easy, Mr. President. I am not calling on the Government to come out with any policy that can be rendered foolish because of extra-ordinary movements in the international oil situation, but when one considers that the cost of viability of the National Oil Corporation of Barbados is a production cost — I understand that the production cost in Barbados is about \$20 a barrel, any time the price of oil is below \$20 a barrel, then obviously the National Oil Company will lose some money — we have to take into consideration the other complimentary or ancillary factors in devising a policy.

I have already mentioned that there has been a very significant decline in the imports of crude and reformat

as a result of the development of the operations of the Barbados National Oil Company. That has to be taken into consideration. We also have to take into consideration the point I have already made, Sir, that we are selling more, a considerably higher amount more to Mobil than we were selling five or six years ago. There is need for consideration of those three factors before coming up with a serious policy on energy. Those three factors I repeat, Sir, are the decline in our imports as a result of this oil company, the increase in sales as a result of the setting up of the oil company and the production cost of oil in Barbados.

I understand that very recently the Minister responsible for energy has given word that the Government intends to step up the production of oil in Barbados. Less than a year ago, there was a deliberate policy, because of the steep decline in the cost of a barrel of oil in the international market, to cut back production, because the loss that was being incurred by continuing operation was of such a nature as to render continual drilling a heavy financial burden to this country. The Minister has said that in view of the fact that the price has gone up in the last two months, to over \$18 a barrel, it is an appropriate time to again start increased production of oil in this country. But we cannot make decisions on a week-to-week or month-to-month basis in respect of an industry that has millions of dollars invested in it.
12.20. p.m.

I believe, Sir, that there are over 100 wells in Barbados. At one point, a year or two ago, there were about 70. I believe there are about 100 active wells in Barbados, and that a number of these wells have not been operative for the reasons we have just stated. But there is a cost in keeping the wells there, whether they are operating or not, there is also a cost in keeping the equipment available, even if it is not being used and there is a cost involved in keeping staff in place. Therefore, in the light of these considerations it is necessary to come out with a policy that suggests some continuity in the operation.

I would also like to raise the point, perhaps, the Minister could answer it — which relates to the policy that was already stated about privatisation and the selling off of Government's economic assets to the private sector. I would like the Minister to tell me at some time during this debate whether the Government now has changed its mind about selling off the assets of the oil company in Barbados to private buyers. If that is the intention, we have to look at our continuing relationships with the donors of foreign technical assistance, more specifically the Canadians and the Venezuelans. I believe that these would be of a very important consideration if the Government decides that it will still continue to pursue its policy of selling off the assets of the oil company to private interests which may be around. The debate would have been better directed if that important factor

had been mentioned, because that would tell us which direction to go. As it is, I am trying to go down the middle, because I am not sure whether the oil company is going to be sold later this year, or next year, or whether the assets will continue to be owned by the people of Barbados.

I want further, Mr. President, to raise the matter of the effects of the increase in the rise of price on the international market on the domestic situation and the benefits that might be derived therefrom for the average consumer in Barbados. Not many months ago, there was a great song and dance about the benefits that were being given to the average consumer, principally at the pump, because of the decline in the price of oil internationally. Every time there is an opportunity to give the people of this country some benefits over and above the ones they currently enjoy, I am with it. I have no quarrel with the principle, but I hope that the Government is not saying one thing in the morning and something else in the evening, and just as a drop in the price of oil from just over \$20 a barrel to just under \$10 a barrel was an occasion to give relief, as they say, at the pump for consumers, I want to know from the Government now whether this new increase, this rise in the vicinity of \$18, will result in the outburst of the action that was taken a few months ago. After all, there is virtue in consistency, and I do not think the Government will have anything to be ashamed about if they are consistent. But I have heard other noises, and, indeed, other protestations, and it is for this reason that I am anxious to find out whether the Minister can, in the course of this debate, guide us as to the direction the Government will take in this matter.

We on this side are supporting the Resolution. We have no problem with it. It is a matter that has arisen out of commitments made by the previous Government of Barbados. The details set out by the Minister are correct and the Resolution before us has everything to do with the fact that there was a considerable change in the value of bolivars and, therefore, the amount from which we would have benefitted has changed, also considerably, as a result of the devaluation in Venezuela. So we have no quarrel in supporting the Resolution, but we wish that we could get an articulation of a coherent energy policy by the Government, because the industry has far too much invested in it and has far too much importance to the consuming public of Barbados for us to have to rely on the switches and changes in policy, month after month, or three or four times a year, which renders not only difficulties for the consumer, but have those involved in the industry at a loss as to how they can plan for future development.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I wish to add my words of support to this Resolution. As has been said by both previous speakers, this is a loan

negotiated at the time of the Barbados Labour Party Government with the Venezuelans which was overtaken by the devaluation of the bolivar. Where we thought, as we negotiated in the first instance, that we would be in receipt of some \$9 million, the devaluation of the bolivar, in fact, would have realized no more than just in excess of \$5 million, and we are asked here in this Resolution to make up the difference, a very instructive lesson in devaluation in the first instance. So this is really the continuation of the Barbados Labour Party loan negotiation.

But I, too wish to ask a question, Mr. President, not unrelated to the question asked by my distinguished colleague. We are living in very contemptuous post-OPEC times, that is how I like to put it, many years since the black Christmas of 1974.
12.30 p.m.

The Barbados Labour Party's policy on energy was planned and well articulated. Reference was made, and I do not need to repeat it, to the doubling, tripling, quadrupling of oil production in this country, and of the degree of self-sufficiency that we have achieved. Reference has already been made by both previous speakers as well to the vagaries and fluctuations in the price of oil, and herein lies the difference in the actual policy of the Barbados Labour Party and what appears to be the policy of the Democratic Labour Party. We did not in our time in Government pass on to the consumer, at what is called "the pump," the benefits which may have derived from fluctuations or movements in the price of petroleum products in the same way that we saw it happen in July of last year. There was a special fund created. The hog's share of the benefits were passed to the Barbados Light and Power Company so that we saw a downward movement of the fuel charge. In fact, we are still seeing that downward movement today. We felt that the greater public would have been the immediate beneficiary of those downward movements in the international price of oil, that the electricity consuming public was a larger public than the travelling public, and that is still the case, because it is not only the domestic consuming public, but the industrial electricity consuming public as well.

And so, I am forced to ask the question in my turn. We saw the price of oil spiral down last year and we saw a cut in the price of gasoline — I am looking here at Statutory Instrument No. 99 — in diesel and in fuel oil. We have not seen any movement down in the price of kerosene, which is still the fuel of the poorest classes in this country. Mind you, we saw an increase in the Consumption Tax on kerosene. That is another indicator of the basic difference in energy policy in respect of petroleum products between the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party. Although the price of kerosene did not go down, the Consumption Tax on

kerosene went up. Of course, you know, Mr. Minister, we are awaiting now for the Budget to see what will happen to consumption taxes. We are all waiting to see how the Minister of Finance is going to respond to the advice given by the World Bank in very recent days.

The question is, now that the price of oil is spiralling again, do we go back to the pump so that we see an increase in the price of gasoline? How is the "disbenefit," if I may use that word, going to be distributed? It was very popular, everybody loved it. I loved it when the price of gasoline went down; but now that the price of oil is spiralling back up, moving, as we have heard, from \$10 a barrel to some \$18 today, how are we going to accommodate this movement at the level of the pump? What are we going to tell the consumer?

We cannot talk about saving money to put in the oil company to keep it going. We did that as part of our policy. What we have seen is the beginning of a stopping and starting operation at the oil field. I am made to understand that production of oil in Barbados is viable when the price of a barrel ranges between \$15 and \$20. Today the price is roughly \$18. I cannot tell you today, February 11, exactly what it is, but we are moving now in the region of \$18, so it is viable for us to be producing again, and it is not surprising to us on this side that we are hearing that drilling operations are to resume. But when this money has been borrowed from the Venezuelan Investment Fund and when drilling operations are revived, and, we would hope, expanded, to what use will the benefit of that operation be put? Are we going to see an on-going investment, not only in oil but in natural gas development? Are we going to see at every minor fluctuation a constant having to go back to the consumer at the pump? Are we going to see any further downward adjustment in respect of the fuel charge at the Light and Power Company? These are the questions. Are we in the next Budget going to see any further consumption taxes levied on petroleum products?

Mr. PRESIDENT: The honourable Senator has covered a fairly wide area. The purpose of the Resolution has been explained to you repeatedly. Do not get so wide that you are covering the Middle East and all over to deal with the specific area of repaying the loan that has been arranged. The question should be whether you agree that this loan should be taken up. Do not let us spread so much elastic in this debate that we cannot get back to the germain issue. Let us get back to the debate. Do not let us carry it too far.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am not in the Middle East yet, Mr. President. I thank you for warning me not to go out there, because I am of the opinion that this debate will allow me to go to the Middle East, but I am firmly in Barbados. The wording here on the Order Paper states that the loan is being made "for the purpose of assisting in the

financing of petroleum exploration and development operations of the Barbados National Oil Company."

Mr. PRESIDENT: The explanation was given that it was for the repayment of a loan that your colleague has agreed to, and I take it that that was acceptable to you.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Not the repayment of a loan, this is the borrowing of funds.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The borrowing of funds. This was done, not by this Government. This is a commitment, as he said, so it is not breaking new ground. It is a commitment, and I take it that if this is a commitment, you would expect the Government to carry out the commitment.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Not necessarily so, Sir. Since the devaluation of the bolivar, it was within the power of the Government to decide that they would not proceed with this. But the Government has decided to proceed with it. What I have difficulty with, and what my colleague has difficulty with, has to do with the use to which the money will be put, this whole business of financing petroleum exploration and the development operations of the BNOC. We really want to know what is going to be the future of the BNOC. Is this going to be one of the statutory corporations that is going to be privatised? My colleague has asked that question. We do not know. The World Bank has said that privatisation is to be pursued. Does it mean the Transport Board is going to be privatised? Does it mean that the Arawak Cement Plant is going to be privatised? Does it mean that the BNOC is going to be privatised?

I am firmly in Barbados, Sir. But this could, if we wish, be developed into a full scale debate on energy policy in this country, and particularly on the future of the BNOC in respect of, as it says very plainly here, Sir, petroleum exploration and development operations. It is key and critical to us.

We are heavy consumers of energy in this country, and the Barbados Labour Party articulated and pursued a policy. We gave such importance to this whole question of energy that a Ministry in its own right, an administrative department of Government, was established to deal with these matters. That is still the case. If we are talking about increased industrialization in this country, if we are talking, as I hear Dr. Worrell at the Central Bank is talking, about increased productivity, doubling and tripling shifts, if we are talking about increased exports, we are talking about energy as well. Whether or not we are going to resume drilling, and to what extent we are going to resume drilling exploration and other developmental operations by the BNOC, is critical to all of this. It has very serious implications for all of this. It has serious implications as to whether we are not going to become like other islands in the Caribbean where we are going to be experiencing outages on a regular basis. It has implications for whether

industry can depend on a reliable supply of fuel oils, and I am still very firmly in Barbados. Those are the questions we have to ask.

12.40 p.m.

We in the Barbados Labour Party were clear about how this borrowed money from the Venezuelan Investment Fund was going to be invested and about exactly what the middle and long term development plans were going to be for BNOC. We are not at all clear about these matters in respect of the policies of the new Government. We have seen a certain departure from our policies in July, as I have pointed out. We know that a Budget is coming, we know that drilling proceedings are of the stop and go nature. But that does not add up to a policy, and we cannot be sure exactly in what position it is leading us. To borrow the money is one thing. But to what end now? Is this going to be used to prop up a failing operation that we do not yet know about?

I think we are entitled to ask these questions, and I hope that, before the day is over, the Minister is going to be able to have the information sufficiently at his finger tips so that he can answer some of these questions that he is posed. I do not expect him to be anticipating the Budget. Naturally, we have to wait to see what is going to happen with petroleum products when the Budget comes. I mean, it is clear to me the direction in which the spiral is going to move when the Budget comes. It is only a question, in my view, of by how much. But this debate on this Resolution entitles us to ask and to be told the answer to these questions. What is the immediate, for that matter, middle and long-term planning policy in respect of BNOC when it comes to exploration and the general development of this oil company? We are entitled to know, and I really hope that we are not going to be fogged off with any easy answers. We know what we are prepared to hear in the Budget, but I am talking about a much wider policy development now. Where is the Government going on the question of energy and of petroleum energy in particular? That is the question.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. President, I have no difficulty in supporting the Resolution to borrow funds to finance petroleum exploration and development operations. But I would like to support the appeal made by Senator Tull and Senator Miller for a clear statement about energy policy. I think such a statement should be comprehensive, in that I believe our resources of oil and natural gas to be limited. They may last for many more years, but they are not renewable.

I would think such a policy should take into account alternate sources of energy. I am referring, in particular, to solar, wind and wave energy, and even the possibility of using sugar cane to produce alcohol, which can be used as an alternate source of energy. As you know, in many countries of South America, the majority of cars use either pure alcohol or a mixture of alcohol and petroleum.

I am only asking that the Government, in preparing its policy, prepare a very comprehensive plan to include other than just the hydro-carbons, the alternate sources of energy that I have mentioned.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, none of the questions asked is beyond my capacity to respond. But I will certainly not attempt to make any policy statement, because I believe the Minister with responsibility for Energy will, in the fullness of time, possibly by the time he is ready to present his Budget, make the sort of statement which members on the other side are seeking.

I believe I would be doing a disservice if I did not indicate that between July and now, there has not only been a reduction in the cost of gasoline at the pump, there has been a reduction in the cost of light bills, and whereas some people may not have benefitted, it is because they are more conspicuous in their consumption of electricity. They probably spend more time at home now than they were spending before.

Laughter.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Those of us whose lifestyles have not changed, we still spend about the same amount of time at home, will be certain that our electricity bills have been reduced, and our water bills. These were goodies which the people looked forward to and welcomed with open arms. Let us all rejoice in them.

The effects of the drilling programme over the last four or five years have impacted in the way that Members on the other side have said. There were enhanced recoveries of crude from Woodbourne, hence increased sales to Mobil. The effect was that there was a reduction in foreign exchange outflows for crude and associated products. There was a reduction in the imports of reformat and crude, as Senator Tull said, and there was a stepping up in production of oil over the period of time, until the price of crude fell dramatically. When the world price of crude fell dramatically, it became a very difficult situation for the Barbados National Oil Company. They were forced to reduce, and then completely withdraw, their expansion programme in terms of developing new wells.

Existing wells have however, continued to be maintained, they have been worked over, and maximum recoveries are being made from those wells for sale to Mobil. At the same time, there has been a continuing recovery of natural gas associated with the recovery of crude. Also, because of the shutdown of the new well drilling programme, there was a corresponding reduction

in staff, so there are no staff excesses at Barbados Oil Company anymore.

As far as I am aware, no plans have been made to restart the abandoned drilling programme, but, obviously, if the price of crude returns to a level which makes it an economic proposition, the Board of Directors of the company, will, in consultation with the appropriate Minister, take whatever decision they consider to be right in the interest of the country, because Barbados is what we are interested in, not individuals.

In respect of the privatisation policy of Government, even if some people read into it the sale of Barbados National Oil Company, I would be very surprised if there is any intent for the National Petroleum Corporation and the Barbados National Oil Company to fall within the grasp of this privatisation policy, for the simple reason that the Government, as a matter of policy, has decided, and even the former Government had examined this, to proceed with replacement of the pipeline from Woodbourne to the Belle, and also the spur from the Belle which leads to the Light and Power Company, to enable substantially larger quantities of natural gas to be harnessed for supply to the citizens of Barbados. So the National Petroleum Corporation is proceeding to plan for an expanded programme of the supply of natural gas not only to individual consumers but also to the Light and Power Company.
12.50 p.m.

In addition, negotiations have been completed between the Barbados National Oil Company, CIDA and Petro-Canada International for supply of development and technical assistance to enable them to proceed with the long-considered plant.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I said that it was started in your time. I was the person doing the negotiations in the Ministry, so I would know. The fact is that I regard what we are doing as a continuation of what you were doing in the interest of the people of this country, no praise to you any more than it is to us to have the foresight to recognize the usefulness of it and to proceed with it at pace.

This development will possibly at last realize the construction of a plant for the bottling of LPG. This has been thought about, contemplated; examined and turned down, and then examined again. It seems that, now with the assistance of CIDA and PCI, it will be realized. I am sure that when that comes, even the critics on the other side will applaud the fact that it is coming.

Aside.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: But you are criticizing it now. If one seeks to give praise where it is due, they are not even willing to accept the praise that they made some contribution towards this development.

With regard to the other questions relating to this policy — I think it would be rude of me to attempt to answer for the Minister. When the times comes and his Budget is being debated, I believe that the appropriate policy statement will be made.

Mr. President, I know how to avoid certain bait.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, this might be a convenient moment for us to recess, I think. I beg your pardon.

(*Aside:* SENATOR L. R. TULL: Recess is the norm.)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Yes, it is but we still need it.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Senate be suspended for an hour.

The question that the Senate be suspended for one hour was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly.
1.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: Before we revert to Public Business, I would like to inform the Senate that we will go to Questions to Ministers.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, Question No. 2 reads as follows:

"To ask the Leader of the Senate: Will the Minister state the date at which the National Population Task Force is expected to submit its draft national population policy to him and what steps are intended to be taken by Government to implement the policy?"

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, the Reply is as follows:

"The Population Task Force is continuing its work but is unable to give a firm date for the submission of a report and draft national population policy. Action to be taken by the Government will be dependent on recommendations submitted."

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, a supplementary question. Is the Minister prepared to set a deadline to the Population Task Force in light of the fact that there are National Population Task Forces in the majority of the other countries of the English speaking Caribbean, which task forces have already reported to their Ministers, who have made recommendations before their Cabinets, and, in one instance, before the House of Assembly? Is the Minister in Barbados disposed or prepared to set a deadline to the National Population Task Force?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: The answer, quite frankly, to that, Sir, must be no. I am not prepared, but I should like to draw to the Senator's attention the fact that this is a task force with tremendous terms of reference. As I see here from the file, it has got to review and assess existing population policies, review and assess the country's past and present practices of population control, to look at all the laws, to determine population size compatible with the social and economic development, analyse the key issues identified with the national leadership and to make the necessary recommendations to the Minister on these matters.

I would think — and I speak subject to what the Ministry of Health may be doing on this — that each of these items is large enough to engage it, if it is going to do its work thoroughly, but I would imagine that it is expediting its work, and I would say within the next few short months may be in a position to report. That is all I think I can say on this at the moment.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Second supplementary, Mr. President. I am fully aware of what the Leader has said. I am also aware of the fact that, at the request of the CARICOM Ministers, the CARICOM Secretariat has provided an office and an officer whose job it has been to assist the various member countries of CARICOM with the formulation of population policy. In fact there has been a series of workshops and seminars, the last of which was held right here in Barbados, at Paradise, in July.

They have actually framed out a draft national population policy for this country. As far as my information leads me, I believe, in conversation with the Minister some months ago, that the next meeting for the task force here was scheduled for November. I believe that meeting did, in fact, come off, if not in November then in December. I shudder to think that it will take more months.

This is a matter critical to the whole planning process. The relatedness of population to development process cannot be over stressed. It has serious implications for the Ministry of Health, which is now expanding services in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the polyclinic services are being reviewed. It has serious implications for the Ministry of Education, which is reviewing the second World Bank project. It has serious implications for the Ministry of Agriculture, which is expected to feed us and to make us self-sufficient in many areas of food. It has serious implications for the Minister of Employment.

The question is

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but is this a statement of the Leader of the Opposition or is this a question?

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am simply trying to establish the urgency. This warranted an editorial in the Barbados Advocate some days ago.

The question is, if there is no deadline going to be set, what other action is the Minister then disposed to take to bring the deliberations of this task force to completion? They have been meeting and the work has been substantially done. I would not like to think that, for lack of some administrative action, it just has not been brought to a point where we can be the beneficiaries of whatever advice is coming to us. It is a matter of national urgency. Are there other plans? The question then is, is there some other way in which the task force's job, terms of reference, whatever, can allow the Minister to bring its deliberations to a conclusion?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I think that all Senators would share the Minister's concern that the deliberations of this task force should be completed as expeditiously as possible. My understanding is that this body has convened six meetings, and I believe one of the recent meetings would have been the one held towards the end of the year, that they have done a draft statement of policy, this is currently being studied and reviewed, that they need to undertake further analysis of the relevant data — I do not know how far on they are with that — and that they have deliberately not proceeded with undue haste because of implicit population policies contained in the Five Year Development Plan.

I am also advised that it is not convenient for them to schedule meetings more regularly than they do, because some of their members are working full time with other commitments, but they are trying to be as expeditious as they possibly can. So, without being able to commit the Ministry to a specific date, I think that they are very near the end of their work.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: A question, Sir. Mr. President, bearing in mind that no serious development plan can be formulated unless it is predicated on a serious population policy, will the Minister tell us what other alternative he has got for an input of population if this task force does not report by the time they are ready to put together a new development plan?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I have reason to believe that the task force itself will know how to proceed in that matter. The Ministry may feel it wishes a fuller appreciation of a development plan in order to set out its own policy, but the task force, I believe, should be able to get on with its own specific duties anyhow. I do not think we need feel afraid that that will prevent us.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: My third question, Mr. President. Is the Minister in a position to tell us if the Opposition is represented on the National Population Task Force as it was in the time of the previous Administration?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: To be honest with you, I do not know. I would suspect that it is so, but I do not know, and I would not like to commit myself in this regard, because I have not studied that aspect of it.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Will the Minister say whether the Task Force set up under the last Administration has been changed? If not, it would be obvious that the Opposition would be represented on it, if not have the majority members on it.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: No, I see nothing on the file to suggest that. It is a task force which, as far as I can see, has been working since 1984.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We will revert then to the Order Paper. Item No. 2
2.15 p.m.

PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE OF
ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF
LAND AT SIX MEN'S, ST. PETER

Order No. 2 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the publication in the Official Gazette of a notification of the abandonment of the acquisition of land at Six Men's, St. Peter.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, before we discuss the matters arising out of this Resolution, I would like to make some general statements of principle on this whole matter of land acquisition in several phases.

I think all of us will agree that it is the right of the Crown, established by law, to acquire property for public interest purposes. We also, I think, generally agree with the principle that that right should never be oppressive or unconscionable and that there should always be, in all of these cases, the principle of fair negotiations.

I think we would also subscribe to the view that all land acquisition matters are not of the same kind and, occasionally, there are some of them which have not a lot to do with a public policy, although there is something to do with that, but they exist because it is necessary for the Government or the Crown to secure title to land which it wants, for whatever purpose.

I think we also all agree that the Crown has a right to abandon, with fair compensation for any inconvenience caused, any acquisition which it negotiated and to make the compensation, or whatever it has to do in respect of abandonment, promptly, with a minimum of bad faith or with a minimum of inconvenience to the owners concerned, and that, of course, it is the duty of the Government always to keep its transactions as clearly as possible, in the light of public scrutiny.

I make those statements because I rather we deal with individual issues arising out of these Resolutions rather than have to repeat or rebut the same acceptance or rejection of principles, as the case may be. I think what I have said in a general way would find common ground among us.

This Resolution has to do with an abandonment of land at St. Peter known as the Six Men's Tenantry. It appears that, some time early in 1986, the Cabinet concluded that about nearly 20 acres of land at Six Men's Tenantry should be acquired under the provision of the Land Acquisition Act. But about one year and a half before that, the Cabinet concluded that the tenantry, or a portion of it, should be designated for the purposes of the Tenancies Development Act of 1980, and in the light of that decision, it made the Tenancies Development (Designation of Six Men's Tenantry) Order in 1984, on or about November, or as near to that date as possible. It seems, however, that the relevant designation notice, for whatever reason, was not confirmed, and, therefore an objection was made by the owners against the intended designation in accordance with whatever rights and privileges they had under Section 8(1) of the provisions of the Tenancies Development Act. In the meantime, of course, while this matter of designation of the tenantry for specific purposes, probably arising out of the flood, was proceeding, general procedures for completing the purchase of the whole bit of land went ahead, and the land was vested in the Crown on March 10, 1986. Again, no agreement was reached on compensation for the property.

All of this was overtaken by events which enabled the Minister of Housing and Lands to review the earlier decision, that is to say, to review the decision of 1984 and the decision of early 1986. He did so review it and recommended to the Cabinet that the acquisition should be abandoned, since he was prepared to recommend to the Cabinet a change of policy with respect to that Six Men's area and that the Cabinet should give him permission to introduce the necessary Resolution in Parliament, in accordance with whatever section it was which governed abandonment. The Cabinet so gave permission, and consequently Parliament has been asked to give its approval to the abandonment of the acquisition. This Chamber is now being asked to concur with the decision so taken in the other Chamber three or four weeks ago.

Members, I think, may have by now seen the text of the debate in the Other Place and will be in a position, of course, to contribute to this debate, perhaps more adequately than was the case in the Other House, because they had nothing to look at, except what they were saying when they were making their speeches. But I would like to emphasize that the Minister did say that he had an alternate policy, he did say, with some emphasis, what that policy was and he explained that he was going to use another development, the details of which we are to debate and approve, to meet the requirements of the people, or some of the people, for which the original acquisition now to be abandoned was sought. He said that he had already got, or was likely to get, nearly 30 acres of land in the Golden Mile area and that he proposed to institute this shift of policy in respect of that and make these people comfortable there.

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

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, this Resolution calls upon us to approve the abandonment of the acquisition of some 29.6 acres of land at Six Men's in St. Peter. This issue has a contentious history. Since the stark flood at Speightstown, or the flood which did considerable damage at Speightstown a few years ago, the then Government developed land, some 112 lots, at what is known as Golden Mile in order to resite flood victims, and to help relieve a certain urban congestion which is evident in Speightstown.

Although we are a small country and our towns and our cities are really very small compared to others, in all of them there is considerable urban congestion. It was true at Oistins, until the development of Oistins brought relief in that area. It is true in Bridgetown, and the stoppage of the Pondsides project, to my great sorrow and regret, does nothing to relieve urban congestion in Bridgetown. The development at Golden Mile was partly designed to relieve urban congestion in Speightstown, generally.

Well before May of last year the infrastructure for the development was put in, roads and water. No work has been undertaken since May of 1986. The new Minister of Housing announced to us all at one point that he did, in fact, envisage a change of policy, and that what he envisaged for that developed area down at Golden Mile was a West Terrace-type development. I gather that the Minister of Housing has since gone back on that. We are now not sure at all what the situation is in respect of this land at Speightstown.

Mr. President, the Leader of the House is perfectly right when he says that we would have looked at an earlier debate on this whole matter. I have looked at it, and I see that the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Prime Minister, in that earlier debate in another place opposed the development of the alternative location for the resiting of persons. He said that we had built a so-called industrial estate at Colleton and that the roads and the other infrastructure had gone in, but not one single industry had gone up, and if we really wanted somewhere to resite the people which was within walking distance of Six Men's Bay, Colleton was the place to do it. Of course, that would have been a terrible signal to send to industrialists in Barbados, but the fact is that the land at Colleton is still there. I have not heard anything from the Minister of Housing to suggest that he has either read or refreshed his memory in respect of this earlier debate and has taken up his now Prime Minister on this suggestion. I am not sure at all what is going to be the consequence of the abandonment of the acquisition of the land at Six Men's in St. Peter. Has it got something to do with the fact that the representative for St. Peter does not sit on the Government benches? I would really hate to think that political considerations of that kind would inform the Minister in a matter in which people are seriously disadvantaged.

Six Men's is not the only place on the west coast of this island where serious erosion has taken place, but it can be seen from the road, and at some point in time the people who live on the beach side at Six Men's are going to have to be resited, and an alternative location is going to have to be found for them. This West Terrace-type development which was envisaged at one point by the Minister since May of last year, as I understand it, did not stretch to resiting of the Six Men's residents, and I am perfectly confused now by the new Government as to what plans and proposals they are making for these people who are living in very tenuous and, in some cases, hazardous circumstances on the beach side at Six Men's in St. Peter.

The people who live there themselves constantly make the point that they are fisher folk and that it is more than housing resiting and housing relocation which has to be considered when they are moved. They do not want to be moved, in other words, very far away from

where their fishing grounds are, they do not wish to be too far away from where their boats are berthed and beached, and all these are special considerations for that community. Merely to abandon the acquisition of the land simply tells us that the people who live on the beach side are not going to be relocated on this particular 30 acres. The question is, where are they going to be relocated? Where is it planned or proposed by the Ministry of Housing and Lands that these people would be relocated, because they are going to have to be in some parts of Six Men's? They may be experiencing some recession in the erosion process, but I assure you that it is not true for all of Six Men's and that it would only be a temporary thing. The day is going to have to come.

It is not only that. As Highway I is widened, as it moves off the Spring Garden Highway and moves through St. James and St. Peter right through to St. Lucy, the whole road widening process as is already taking place as a result of the Speightstown By-pass, what is going to be their position when it actually gets to Six Men's? I really need to be reassured, in order that the residents at Six Men's might be reassured, as to what the consequences of this abandonment of the acquisition of the land at Six Men's is going to mean for them, because what was going to happen was very clear to them, more than the writing was on the wall. The roads were in, the water, the electricity was all in and the infrastructure was all prepared for the resiting of these people, and now they are told that the acquisition of the additional 30 acres of land, which would have accommodated them all comfortably in an area where they were accustomed to living and which was convenient and comfortable for them, is not to be any more. What is going to happen? That is the question I really wish to ask of the Minister.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, let me first address one or two points of principle which I gather have been raised by the honourable Senator. She asked whether what we are doing now has any possible connection with the fact that the honourable Member for St. Peter in the Other Place is no longer on Government benches. I think I can answer that categorically, 'No, it has not!' No Government of which I am a member would be persuaded to operate that way. As a matter of fact, if I can just say this now, and I do not wish on this day of all days to enter into contentious areas, one of the reasons why perhaps we had a change of Government was that the sort of thing you say you fear was the sort of thing that you yourself were guilty of. For instance, your own supporters who lived in the constituencies represented by our people did not get very much done for them. They perceived that because they were represented by our people, nothing much was forthcoming, and perhaps they might have turned the tide

considerably if you had considered that your own people lived in all constituencies.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: No, it is not on the Order Paper.
2.35 p.m.

The honourable Member from St. Peter's political reversal or change of status has nothing at all to do with this. Let me add to this by saying that we safely can give a reassurance to the residents that the change of policy is not, and I repeat, not politically motivated but it comes about from the desire of the Minister really, to do the best thing for all concerned.

I drew attention to the speech made in the Other Place on this. I was not thinking of the speech made before, I mean in the recent Parliament, I was thinking of the speech made on January 20 in the Other Place, in which the Minister himself said, "We are going to resite those persons on the seaward side of Six Men's at Golden Mile." He was talking, of course, of the people who got flooded out, but the principle still holds good. What he is, in fact, saying is that everybody who has a problem, in all the areas which need attention, including these in the Six Men's tenantry, will be assisted at Golden Mile.

I cannot say in detail whether they are going to be terraced houses. As a matter of fact, I have no mandate on that. As a matter of fact, I did not even think about it in order to refresh my mind on it. But the willingness of the Minister, in the debate in the Other Place, to say that he was taking into account alternative accommodation for these people tells me that he was also, without possibly spelling it out saying to these people that he regarded their contention that they wanted to be kept together as a unit not to be disturbed in their livelihood, living together or in their community activities, and that in order to do this, he would have, by inference, to have more time to think out what the alternatives would be.

It comes down to this — and I believe both Senators have had this experience — do you believe the Minister's assurances or do you not? You have been Ministers and you have had to give assurances in cases where all of your policies were not worked out, you had to look at certain other aspects of matters, but on general principles you felt that you had to say, 'Do not matter what appears to be now, our intention is that no one should suffer.' This is what, I gather, the Minister has been saying in respect of these people. He has not only got people in the Six Men's Tenantry, he has got the other people whose houses are now rotting, as we hear, in Spring Hall in St. Lucy. Accommodation will have to be found for them, and quite quickly. There has got to be a wholesale recovery of their property and a resettlement for them. So that while you

may think that in respect of this one issue we are shoving it behind us, so to speak, what I gather from the policy of the Ministry is that there is a certain amount of comprehensiveness in this, and the abandonment of this acquisition is only one step towards the fuller appreciation of, and the fuller attendance to, the whole problem. I cannot put it any differently than this.

I really want to emphasize that there is no short changing the people of St. Peter. There is no attempt to make them pay for the way they may be perceived to have voted. That is certainly far from our intention. Whether they are at Golden Mile, as I think they may be, or whether some other arrangement is made for them, there is every intention that the fishing community should be preserved, however it is done, and that the sense of community which these people have with each other will still be there, although they may not necessarily be living on the foreshore.

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

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of the parcel of land situate at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, to be developed by the National Housing Corporation for housing purposes.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, what we are aiming at here is to vest in the National Housing Corporation about 15 000 square metres of land at Six Roads in St. Philip.

It appears that in 1980 parliamentary approval was given to acquire about two hectares of this land. The Crown obtained possession of that portion of land on September 25, 1980. Some of this land was afterwards offered to the Ministry of Legal Affairs. It appears that they wanted to build a fire station in the area so that they could provide fire prevention coverage and protection to that part of Barbados surrounding this land.

In respect of the remainder, the National Housing Corporation wants to develop it and to be able to sell this land in individual lots. But in order to do this, of course the corporation must first have a clear title, and that is why Parliament – in our case, this Chamber – is now being asked to vest this land in the Corporation so that it can expedite its own plans for housing development in that area.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, Sir, the Leader of the House made reference a moment ago to the fact that a fire station in St. Philip was under contemplation. This land was acquired in 1980 more specifically for

that purpose. My recollection, Sir, is that the housing development was only incidental to the construction of a fire station.

A fire station is badly needed in St. Philip, for a number of reasons. One is because the Fire Service people tell us that they need a back-up fire station for Grantley Adams Airport. Secondly, there is need for a fire station because of the oil wells in the Woodbourne area. One can reasonably expect that, over some period of time, there will be a fire and a serious fire in that area. The third reason, Sir, is because Six Roads is developing into a major industrial area. It would be useful to have a fire station in the immediate vicinity, because it is quite possible, and conceivable, that at some time there will be a fire in the industrial complex.

According to the Resolution, this land is to be vested in the National Housing Corporation. That tells me, Mr. President, that there is an abandonment of the portion of the land that was intended for the construction of a fire station. In other words, you do not vest land in the National Housing Corporation if you are going to build a fire station – that remains in the ownership of the central Government. My question, therefore, Sir, is, is the Government, in its orgy of abandonments, abandoning the plan for the construction of a fire station in that part of St. Philip which is required for the very critical and important reasons that I have already outlined?
2.45 p.m.

I also want to know in relation to this parcel of land that is being vested, whether there is not, in fact, a switch in the policy we have been hearing about. I am not re-opening anything that has been passed, I am arguing by analogy. Is the abandonment of one project not being substituted therefore in another area? In short, is the project to be done in St. Peter at Six Men's being replaced by a housing project in St. Philip, the constituency of the Minister of Housing? I am asking the question, because the priority on that piece of land was for the building of a fire station. Do not blame me, Sir, if the two things happen to coincide, that at 2:30 p.m. on one day you abandon a housing project in St. Peter and at 2:45 p.m. on the same day you proceed to vest land in the National Housing Corporation to start a housing project in the constituency of the Minister of Housing.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Now I hear some asides.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not mind the asides. You are addressing the Chair.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Sir, the asides are always an inspiration for action. I like them, Sir. They set the adrenaline going.

This is a legitimate question. If the Minister gets up and give an answer that satisfies me, that is the end of the matter. If he does not, we will keep talking about it at other times and in other places.

There is one other point I want to make in respect of this. The World Bank and the Government of Barbados entered into an agreement for US \$10 million for the construction of low income housing in Barbados. The World Bank people came down to Barbados, met with the people in the National Housing Corporation, the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Housing and Lands and identified two areas, one in Westbury Road and one at Six Men's in St. Peter, as suitable sites, taking all things into consideration, for the pilot project. That was agreed to by the World Bank. We have borrowed their money and they agreed that the pilot project should be Westbury Road and Six Men's. Now, after you have agreed to borrow their money and they agreed with you that you would start construction of the pilot project at these two places, you change it.

I am not questioning the right of Government to change policy. It is a matter for them. But, equally, I have a right to ask for the justification of the change, and that is all I am asking for. Of course, when I say that I have a right to ask for the justification of the change, I mean we Barbadians have a right to ask for the justification. We want to hear one. I do not know about the debate and the direction in which it went. I learnt from long experience, Sir, that when you read many of these debates and try to put a solid argument on the basis of what you read, you often find yourself in difficulty.

Certainly the position taken in respect of housing policies were set out in the Development Plan 1983 — 1988 and advanced planning had already taken place. This is the point you have to bear in mind, Sir, that there are places where the plans are at an advanced stage and ready for construction. In this particular one at Six Cross Roads, we are going to be vesting, and if it is a substitute for something, my projection, from my experience in Government, is that the Minister will start construction in about two year's time. From the time you invest in the National Housing and then do prefeasibility studies and internal planning — what do you call it, Sir? — the Central Planning Committee, I think they call it, Sir — and some public officers get into it, and then you put these things out to tender, you are talking about two years. So this is another point I want to raise. If you want to abandon the beginning of construction under that World Bank Project, with the plans advanced and you are ready to start, and you are substituting new projects which, in my view, could take about two years to start, are you not in fact frustrating the very purpose of the loan?

It is imperative, Mr. President that I mention that one of the critical problems in Barbados of people of low income groups is finding house spots for home building. There are a lot of reasons for it. I hear a lot about one of them, but as people who have any experience in Government will realize, everytime you make a policy, it brings joy to some people and it brings sorrow to others. You cannot come out with any policy in Government that finds favour with everybody. I have never had that experience in Government. But one of the pressing things, Mr. President, is the need for house spots, and although the National Housing Corporation has got large numbers of tracts of land vested in it, it is still extremely difficult for a person who wants to build a modest chattel house to find a spot on which to build that house. I believe that bears serious consideration at this time.

I read of how much savings there are in the banks in the last year, which means that things were not so bad after all. And I hear about all the big spending that took place sometime late in the year, which also means that things really were not so bad after all. I do not believe — you are going to smirk away. Sir, he smirked! that these things change overnight. A poor man does not get rich overnight unless he wins a lottery, and if things are bad, they do not suddenly get better in a month, two or three. It takes time.

From my own personal experience, I know that there are a number of people, particularly young people, who want to build a chattel house, or indeed, in some cases, to buy them, because you can buy them from some of the construction companies that specialize in that area, as Senator Phillips would know. I hope that this is one of the few occasions when he will support me, because it seems that we have a confluence of interest at this point. The need for house spots is critical, but the vesting of land in the National Housing Corporation has not resulted in a proliferation of house spots available for hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of people across Barbados. In the spirit of the times, Mr. President, I am not making any critical speech, I am not on to the Government. I am just making a very sincere plea for people who genuinely are in need and who feel that putting their money in banks, or buying a lot of furniture, even though it may give a needed shot in the arm of the furniture industry in Barbados, does not result in the long term kind of investment that young Barbadian people want. They want a house.

I am going to classify it as an insipid repetition of certain arguments that you hear everytime this thing is mentioned, all you are hearing something about the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: No, no, Sir! I would never say that the Leader of the House speaks anything insipid. I

would not say that. I would have thought that the moment I used the word "insipid" he would know that it was not in reference to him.

The Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, which really took by the scruff of the neck a number of things, including the rather iniquitous Tenancies Control Development Act of 1965, which the Leader of the House knows a lot about. The word is that that Act was hurriedly put together one night by the late Erskine Ward to meet a particular need at the time. I believe that if you jog the memory of the Leader of the House, he will probably remember. That Act was not a very good Act, and as those of us who had to practise law and deal with these things before the courts would know, it opened a minefield of difficulties. The problem with legislation is that you cannot always plug every hole at the first shot, and, therefore, an attempt was made to do a rationalisation of the law respecting tenancies. So I am not interested in any insipid comments that may be uttered by anyone over the change in the law about preventing people from passing on their land to their children to build a house and this kind of thing.

2.55 p.m.

This is not to disarm people who want to make this point, but on the other hand the Act was born out of a genuine commitment by the then Minister, and he prevailed on his colleagues to go along with him, that there was need for security of tenure for people who live on house spots and had chattel houses. In other words, it was not meant to penalise the owner of a piece of land so, as you hear in common parlance, the daughter and the son could not get what the father had. On the contrary I like how the Leader of the House puts these things. You have to understand that is the difference between the Leader of the House and perhaps a lot of other people. He has been in Government a long time and he understands how Government works, and that they are not a bunch of people at any given time who are wicked and spiteful and want to introduce measures that are against the interest of the people. When you hear some people talk you feel that there are people in Government from time to time who sit down and say, 'Ah! Let us see how we are going to get them.'

The reason for that particular measure, Mr. President, was to give security of tenure to thousands of people who had chattel houses across Barbados and who were renting a piece of land. Only this morning I opened the newspaper and I saw on the front page of one of them that a woman

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: You can talk about succession and regression and all that. I am not dealing with that.

I have seen, Mr. President, in today's newspaper on the front page — because these things are big news — the plight of poor people is always big news — where a lady had her house taken down by the Marshals of the court at Good Intent in St. George and scattered across the playing field at Ellerton. Her crime is that she did not have any place to move her house. Of course, she got the notice from the landlord.

They serve the notice to quit first and then the notice of intention to recover possession, then you prepare a complaint to go into the Magistrate's Court and the Magistrate's Court gives her some time in which to move the house, but by the time the date set by the Magistrate arrived, she had not yet found a house spot, because they are in short supply in Barbados. But there is no mercy in these things, especially when you are poor, so early one morning, like the police do with search warrants, early morning, fore-day morning before you get your senses, they come and swoop down like a raven, knock down your house, take it up, beds, pots and pans and everything, and they dump it on Ellerton pasture. I have no doubt that all like now the house has disappeared, because you cannot put people's houses on a pasture in a village and think they will stay there for long. All like now I would imagine the house has disappeared, so the woman has lost everything.

All I am trying to do, Mr. President, is to put a case for these people. The need for house spots is a critical need, it is a very critical need. Therefore, I never have any quarrel when Government vests more land in the National Housing Corporation, and I hope that there will be a delivery of this land, not all of it, because obviously the National Housing Corporation will build some houses of their own. They have vast tracts of land, and I am hoping that they will move with expedition to provide a number of house spots for the poor people of this country who are very badly in need of a place to perch their small chattel house.

That is my contribution to this matter.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, I rise to support the Resolution, which is for the acquisition of 2.023 hectares of land at Six Cross Roads. This land is equivalent to some 4.6 acres.

Before I get into the meat of what I have to say in relation to this Resolution, I would like to express some disappointment in the last Senator who sat, because, either purposely or otherwise, he tried to misdirect the Senate as to the usage of the land as set out in the Resolution. I should like to point out, Sir, that the amount of land allocated for the construction of the fire station amounts to approximately 12 000 square feet of the 4.6 acres, which, in a quick calculation, leaves something

like 180 000 square feet, so it does leave an adequate amount of land in that area for the provision of lots.

I must agree with the Senator who sat just now though, in that he emphasised, as I would emphasise, that one of the greatest needs in this country is for the provision of house spots. I believe that that even supercedes the provision of houses, because I know, being in the construction business myself, that my sales could be one hundredfold provided there was the availability of land, particularly for chattel housing. I therefore feel that Government has to put serious emphasis on providing lots of land throughout the 27 constituencies of this island. Obviously the constituencies in St. Michael, which are already more thickly populated, would of necessity need more lots than, say, the areas in the country.

In the country the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act obviously has taken care of a number of people, but as the Senator who just sat said, any good legislation always has with it some flaws which may cause problems to people at some time. Although he has tried to put us on the defensive as far as the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act is concerned, I would still say that this party agrees that the principle of the Act is correct. We have no qualms as to the principle, we feel that the intentions were good, but obviously there are some flaws which will cause some problems. The main problem is that people who own land are reluctant to rent, or make available to even friends, lots of land which they now own because of the chances of this Act being enacted on them, which will obviously dispossess their children of the land.

Again, I would like to emphasise that this party has agreed in principle with the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. We are not now changing our voices as far as that is concerned, but we do know that there are a number of areas which still need some sort of window dressing, if you might put it that way, in order to make the thing rather more palatable. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Housing has indicated that the Government will be putting its emphasis on stone houses. I have no quarrel with this, because it is my knowledge that the value of a stone house only exceeds the value of a wooden house by about 20%. I feel that this emphasis on stone houses is the correct one, because we all know that the longevity of a stone house far exceeds that of a wooden house. So it is good to see that Government is thinking along those lines. 3.05 p.m.

However, I think it is imperative that Government should have a declared housing policy that all of us, whether we are in the Senate or in the House, or whether we are ordinary citizens of this country, should know the exact direction in which Government is dealing with the matter of housing. I would say that, outside of unemployment, the housing needs is the greatest problem facing Government today, and it is high time we all know the

policy. I believe that before this first year of the session of the Democratic Labour Party is out, the party owes it to the public to produce a housing policy that we can all understand, and that there should be some debate even from the general public as to the enactment of the policy in order that the whole policy would be to the satisfaction of all.

I believe, Sir, that a further look at stone houses now that we have the Arawak Cement Plant would add some impetus to that plant. That plant is possibly the worst investment the Government has in this country today. I believe another occasion will arise when I will have a lot to say about the Arawak Cement Plant. I will not say much this evening, other than that it is still to the benefit of the plant if more stone construction was carried out, because of the usage of the cement.

I believe, Sir, that this Resolution should pass very easily in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, it was a Resolution which is dated 1980, Resolution 26, which meant that it had already gained the approval of the Barbados Labour Party, in which case I think that they obviously agreed with the intent of the Resolution. They obviously wanted to make sure that there would be the provision of a fire station in the St. Philip area.

I have heard reliably, there is a planned development for that whole Six Roads area, it includes a roundabout, increased shopping facilities and increased health care facilities. It is already near to the Industrial Development Park, so there is a total development plan for Six Roads which, I hope, could be implemented very shortly.

With those few words, Mr. President, I endorse this Resolution.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. President, I would just like to add a few brief comments, and in particular to pick up on one of the points made by Senator Phillips.

I, too, think that it is unfortunate that housing could become something of a political football in Barbados and we see this, in fact, in the position today. We have Senator Tull and Senator Miller expressing reservations as to whether the Six Men's Project was abandoned for political reasons, because the representative for St. Peter is a member of the Barbados Labour Party.

Asides.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Perhaps, it came from Senator Miller.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Order.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: We also hear either one or the two of them expressing reservations as to whether the commencement of the Six Roads Project is done for political reasons. At the same time, in the Other Place we had the Minister making similar comments. The Minister, for example, in his contribution to the debate wondered whether the lack of a Six Cross Roads housing project was not due to the fact that St. Philip was represented by DLP parliamentarians, and similarly he wondered whether the presence of a Six Men's was not for similar reasons because the representative was from the Barbados Labour Party.

The whole point is that it is unfortunate that we are in this type of position, and I think that we would not be in this type of position if there was available detailed, scientific information, perhaps the type of information that Senator Miller is so concerned about with the Population Task Force. I think it would be good if that kind of detailed, scientific information relating to the whole island, in terms of population and housing needs, was available so that the kind of detailed, long range and far-sighted housing programme that Senator Phillips spoke about could be a reality, and that we would have something with which to assess and judge the housing programme of the Government of the day to determine whether the particular housing projects that are being given priority are based on the real needs of the people of Barbados as opposed to political considerations. I would really like to support Senator Phillips on that point, that housing being such a fundamental human need and the lack of housing being such a great social problem in Barbados, I would urge upon our Minister of Housing to seek to put together such a long term housing programme as Senator Phillips spoke about.

Mr. President, I think that it would be remiss of us if we did not defend the Minister of Housing somewhat on both the Six Men's and the Golden Mile Projects. This ties in here because an allegation was raised that perhaps Six Men's was done away with to give priority to Six Cross Roads and that political considerations were involved. I think it is fair to say that when the Minister made his contribution in the Other Place, he made it clear that he saw problems with the Six Men's project. He saw problems with the old acquisition procedure and the price that was being offered for the land. He also saw problems with the cost of the whole project, and, indeed, he believed that when looking at the total housing needs of Barbados, it was in the best interest of the people of Barbados that the Six Men's project be ceased and priority be given to Golden Mile. He did say that the Golden Mile location would take care of the rehousing of the people of Six Men's, would also be used for the flood victims and that it would also be used as a measure to combat the present congestion at Speightstown. I think if you read the debate clearly, he did say that the 112 lots that would be provided at

Golden Mile would be used (1) for rehousing the Six Men's people, (2) for the flood victims, and, in addition to that, some of the present congestion at Speightstown would be accommodated at Golden Mile. I think we owe it to the Minister to point out that and to make that clarification.

There is one other clarification I would like to make, and that is in response to Senator Tull. I think there is a lot of fuzzy thinking on the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. I have not had much to do with the Act other than one or two conveyances for former tenants. I think that where people see problems with the Act is not so much with the traditional plantation tenantry. I think that most of us are of the view that that part of the Act is a good measure, where you give the opportunity to people who have lived on traditional plantation tenancies over the years to acquire the property. I think where people see the problems coming in is in that part of the Act which I think says — as I said I do not know much about the Act — that where there are two chattel houses on a particular spot of land, that land can be designated a tenantry and the tenants of those chattel houses can acquire rights to purchase the land from the owner of the land.

3.15 p.m.

I think it is that section of the Act that is really causing the problems and I do not think we should confuse the two. There is no real problem with the traditional plantation tenantry, it is just that section. Apparently there are a lot of small land owners in Barbados who, prior to the Act, had no qualms about allowing people to rent land from them, but since the Act has been passed, those same small land owners are now a lot more tentative about allowing people to rent land. I think a number of commentators have said that this is the cause of some of the said housing problems, the lack of house spots that Senator Tull spoke about. That is one of the problems, but I agree with the general point that housing is one of the major social concerns. The gravamen of my contribution here is that we should approach it in a manner where we take it out of the combative political realm, where we are forever accusing one another of having tainted political motives in giving priority to one housing development as opposed to another.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I feel I must rise to say something about Six Roads. There seems to be some misunderstanding, verging on mythology, about Six Roads. I am hearing now, as I heard the Minister of Finance in Washington speak about things, which are past events, as though they are going to be future events, or, in some cases, as though they are present events. Six Roads, as Your Honour will remember, was thought to have been a suitable site for the Federal Capital way back in the late Fifties when we had hoped that Barbados might be the federal capital of the West Indies. I know Your Honour

will remember those days. When the Federal Capital did not come to Barbados, secondary thinking was that Six Roads would be developed as a sub-town. That has always been part of the general development planned for Barbados.

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, it was to be the Federal Capital! There are certain political neophytes among us who would not know that, but Your Honour knows it. He is disseminating a little history at the top of the table. When you were born into it the way that I am, it comes to you and you know it. But the fact is that the secondary thinking was that Six Roads would have been developed as a sub-town, and that was part of the core of the national housing policy as far as the Opposition is concerned, and it continues to be so. I remember Senator Smith in another place laughing at us. Perhaps he is still laughing at the whole concept of the sub-town.

I like to go on repeating this *ad nauseam*. I believe I have said it in here already, Mr. President, but, with your indulgence, I will say it again: this is one of the cardinal areas of difference between the Government and the Opposition in respect of general policy. People like to say that there is no philosophical difference between us. We are both socialist democratic parties, that is true. There is another view. Some of us are further right of centre and so on, and this is the whole point. They are following conservative-type policies. As we are being told here on my left rather vociferously, Sir, they are into privatisation and they become very monetarist in their approach.

My major area of difference always has been to do with the way in which the Democratic Labour Party, which is now the Government, are great centralist. They go for centralisation-type policies whereas the Barbados Labour Party, now in Opposition, are the great decentralisers. It was we who conceptualised the sub-towns. It was we who conceptualised the network of polyclinics, who worked on health centres in the Fifties, which became a network of polyclinics in the Seventies and Eighties. It was the Barbados Labour Party which conceptualised the whole decentralised style of development which has not brought to the fore the kind of urban drift which we see in so many other developing countries and Third World countries.

So, Mr. President, Six Roads was perhaps the first idea for a sub-town. In those days the redevelopment of Oistins was still a twinkle in the eye of Bernard St. John. In those days Speightstown had shrunken. It ceased to be a place where people wanted to live. The urban landscape was nothing like what we have come to see in the last ten to 15 years at Speightstown. Holetown was literally a hole in the ground until the development of Sandy Lane and the Sunset Crest development gave rebirth, to an

urban community in Holetown as it used to be way back in the days when I was born.

At Six Roads, the health centre, which is now upgraded virtually into a polyclinic, the Princess Margaret School, which was expanded during the course of the last three years, the industrial estate, even the plan for the fire service station already referred to, and the housing estate were all part of a design created way back in the 1950s. I feel I must put this in proper perspective. We are hearing now about a development for Six Roads as though Six Roads is the hinterland, is the rural outback of Barbados, and that a plan is being devised now to bring it into the 20th Century. That is not true at all. Of course, I do not expect that Senator Phillips would know Six Roads in the same way that he would know Speightstown. I know that Your Honour knows Speightstown, and that You Honour must be itching in the Chair today when you hear the talk about Six Men's and Golden Mile, because many years of your life were given to the representation of that part of the country, and perhaps you, better than any of us in this Chamber today, are best able to judge.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I do not think I need to take the debate much further, except to emphasize one or two points. The first is that, without being in any way offensive, I should just like to say that some of these debates, perhaps most of them, are enjoyable and are not to be taken seriously. I really mean no offence. I sometimes think, you know, and here again I really do not mean to be offensive, that I am probably the most fervent believer in Jimmy Swaggart, in that I can see in our politics very definite signs of his conservative potential. He has turned the Barbados Labour Party into saints, and they are now saying that the things they used to do, they do them no more!

Asides

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Well, that is true. The people have stopped them!
3.25 p.m.

Laughter

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Seriously, Sir, just let me say that — and I want to emphasize it — there is no abandonment of the decision in respect of the fire station. Senator Tull's point is very well taken, that in an area where petroleum development is now so great an aspect of economic life, not to have a fire station as early as possible will, of course, be a great dereliction of duty.

The land under reference at Six Roads was especially acquired for housing development and the Legal Affairs people asked for permission to put a fire station on some of it. This permission was given to them by the Ministry of Housing and they were allocated, I believe, about 4 000 square metres of the land for that purpose. So they will get ahead with that. But the bulk of the land still remains for housing purposes. Really, what we are asked to do here is to vest it in the National Housing Corporation, because it is by vesting it that you allow their work in housing to proceed.

I think that what we need in this country, apart from the carrying out of suggestions made about acquiring land so that people can have house spots, is to have a register of land, because not all the land in this country is non-contentious land — a lot of it is contentious land in a sense that clear title, even to people who think they own it, is not always in existence or forthcoming. Perhaps we would see a greater availability of land for housing if all the land that could be for housing, or that part of it for which titles are not clear, could be made clear so that people who have that kind of land available, and who would make it available for housing, could be encouraged to do so in the easiest possible way.

I think also, generally and specifically speaking, that all of us who are in politics, and who wish to keep this free society going and to maintain democratic institutions in this country, will have to pull together to get the Government out of landlordism. I think that this has to be faced. No Government, except in very rare cases, ought to be in a position of renting houses and renting land. You want people to own their own houses and their own lands where they can, because the safest guarantee for the preservation of democracy, I think, is the ownership by individuals of their own properties. We have to aim at this.

Aside

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I know it is a conservative point of view, but it will preserve a society. I have no apology to make for it, because I have always felt that way, that everybody should be encouraged to own their own land and their own houses where this is possible.

Aside

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Of course! Senator Eastmond reminds me that that would encourage a certain amount of personal and social pride.

I notice that everybody who says that my belief that people should own their own land and houses is a conservative point of view, it is always said to me by con-

servatives — people who already own theirs. Well, I am only saying that everybody should be like them.

Laughter

Asides

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: If we are making political points, let me make a substantial one, that it is better to be under one's own vine and fig tree than under a Government's. That is all.

(Aside: SENATOR L. R. TULL: And if you cannot get under one, stay in the gutter?)

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I think, therefore, that everybody has contributed to a certain aspect of thinking on this, and when you shake all our opinions together, we are probably not so far divided from one another, except that, as I say, Jimmy Swaggart seems to have done wonders with the Barbados Labour Party. He has converted them completely. I listened with admiration, and I wonder if this is the same sort of people that only a year ago were telling us different things.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WALKERS, ST. GEORGE

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Walkers, St. George, for the purpose of augmenting and facilitating the relocation programme arising from the Glebe Development Project.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, what we wish to do here is to buy about 2.5 hectares of land at Walkers from a Mr. Davis. I believe that we will hear a lot that will enlighten you over there. This is because we want to extend and expedite the resettlement work which is connected with the Glebe Development Project.

In 1980, the Government of Barbados, as then constituted, purchased a portion of land at Walkers. This portion of land, as I understand it, included the larger area which was subsequently used for the construction of the new St. George's Primary School. What is left of the land is much too inadequate for house spots, since it is only large enough to settle comfortably about 14 houses and it is necessary to take about twice that many.

The land we are talking about is to the south of the part where the housing allocation is now going on. It

seems to be a suitable portion for houses, since, being near to the present site, it can easily mesh with it. That is my understanding. It already has planning authority for residential use and the owner does not seem to mind selling it to the Crown for this purpose. In fact, certain sections of the Land Acquisition Act are already in force. What we want to do is to expedite the transaction and pay the owner his money without delay.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, this land at Walkers is an interesting social development. The Glebe land in St. George is a large area, with hundreds of houses in the Glebe Tenantry, and some years ago, the Government got together with the church and tried to work out a plan for a total development of the Glebe to provide, generally, for an improvement in the living conditions of the people of that area.

We hear about sub-town projects. Central St. George has been identified by the Barbados Labour Party in Manifestoes as far back as, I think, 1966 as a very suitable area for the development of a sub-town, and the Glebe Project was going to be an integral part of that development. Unfortunately, Mr. President, church politics got into it. The people in the church began to take sides. It was such a good project, and was so pregnant with possibilities, that a few padres of the other side decided that they would cause problems in the councils of the church. I have called the names on a number of occasions, and I do not propose to do so now, Sir, because I shall stay within the four corners of the Standing Orders.

(*Aside:* SENATOR F. G. SMITH: He is running again for St. George.)

Laughter.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Unfortunately, none of the priests of the Anglican Church who were hostile to this particular development is from St. George.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am safe. I am not going to make any comment on the other point that he has made. All I know, Sir, is that the pension is coming up. I just saw his cheque. I will look forward to mine.

There was a quarrelling inside the church as to the level of co-operation they should give the Government on this development. That has, to a very large extent, retarded the development of the project.
3.35 p.m.

But many things have happened since. Around the whole Charles Rowe Bridge area and near and around the

St. George Church, we have seen significant development within the last few years. A police station is to be constructed in what was the old St. George Girl's School which is about 100 yards west of the post office in the church bottom. The money is in these Estimates, 1986-87, to start that particular project of the police station and the court. A new primary school was built to replace the old St. George Boy's School and the St. George Girl's School, which were housed in buildings that had long since outlived their usefulness. I feel a certain pride in this, Sir, because I authored it. I encouraged the members of the then Government to purchase the land from this Mr. Davis to construct the primary school and also to leave an amount of land for house spots for people who badly needed them, some for people who were being relocated from the Glebe, to widen the road and straighten it and to do a proper sites and services, and have other spots for people from the surrounding area who were desperately in need for spots to put their chattel houses.

I am agreeing with the Resolution, Sir. It is a matter that was initiated by the last Government and wisely and sensibly pursued by the present Government.

Asides.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: A lot of problems? Well, we will talk about these lots of problems.

One of the things is that the land that we bought for the school and the spots had another area adjacent to it. Obviously, that was traditionally over the years planted in canes. But you would appreciate, Mr. President, that if you build a new primary school and have a few house spots right adjacent to the piece left over, there is no point planting canes. So we had decided that we would buy the additional piece of land from this Mr. Davis to provide additional spots.

One of the joys of passing through that part of St. George is to see the nature of the development. I have heard some people, who are ill-informed, making some complaints that are on a bad basis. I know for a fact that at the time there were a number of meetings of the people who live in the Glebe when they were advised of the plan for the development and relocation, and they were invited to express their opinions as to how they felt the development should go.

Mr. President, in the days of classical Greece, Athens was the mother of democracy. They would convene a meeting of all the adult citizens of Athens, would put a matter out and they all voted on it. The numbers were sufficiently small that you could do that. I get the feeling at times in Barbados that we would do well to copy some of the traditions of the mother of democracy, Athens. When we got these people together, we were giving them a stake in their own destiny. We feel that any

serious social planning must be based on the understanding that the people for whom you are planning must have a word in it. That is why we feel a little resentment about Six Men's.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I did not hear that, Sir.

The people met, Sir, and in a number of town hall meetings, or church hall meetings, or whatever, they were told about the plans. The plans included a police station, a court, an extension of a playing field and a new road, the development of a polyclinic, development of a new primary school and so on. The primary school has been built and the polyclinic has been completed, and is a beautiful job, Sir except that, having spent about \$1.7 million constructing it — it is a beautiful site as you drive pass — the present Government for some reason best known to itself, decides to let it remain closed.

(Aside: What is this?)

SENATOR L. R. TULL: The polyclinic. You spent \$1.7 million or \$1.8 million to build a polyclinic, you have completed it, and then you leave this beautiful building there locked up and paying watchmen to look after it!

I have tried to find out, as a citizen of that part of St. George, when they will open the polyclinic, because after all, I want to avail myself of the services. I have not been able to get any information from the Ministry of Health as to what exactly is the problem. I do not want to speculate, because when I speculate, one will say that I am unnecessarily partisan, which, of course, does not unduly bother me. I am very partisan — I am extremely partisan, just like the Leader of the House is very partisan. It does not matter.

(Aside: SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: I can hide mine.)

Laughter

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I understand that the representative for that part of the island makes out a case that the polyclinic should not be open until you build a sidewalk going up the rectory hill so that the old people would be safe when they are walking up the street and would not come to any grief. Now I have not heard any argument as stupid as that in all of my years, because there has been a clinic just down the hill, for almost as long as I have been alive, which has been used by the same people who have to pass the same road everyday, and I have never heard that there has been any problem. As a matter of fact, the old clinic down the hill was open today, as it is every day, I have heard no argu-

ment about you must build a sidewalk before you can use a \$1.8 million clinic. I think that sometimes it is better for people who do not know what to say to keep quiet than to just get up and show how ignorant they are. I have not seen any plans or any works going on to build any sidewalk, so I suspect now that the polyclinic will be closed for a year or more, knowing the pace at which the MTW people work.

I want, Mr. President, to make another point in respect of this development. The Leader of the Senate, I believe facetiously, earlier made reference to people wanting to be under their own vine or something. It is very easy to make these comments when one has not got a chance to reply. The point I am making in respect of ownership of housing in Barbados is that I am in total agreement that everybody should be encouraged to own their own homes. I have no quarrel with that. If I made a comment, it related to the fact that to have this aspiration of universal house ownership remains an aspiration, because there is always going to be a number of people who fall through the safety net and who will never be in a position, however utopian certain members of the Government benches may be, to own their own homes, and Government has an overriding responsibility, as an important part of its social policy, to provide accommodation for those unfortunate ones who will never own their own homes.

The Leader of the House said that, perhaps when you shake everything up, we are not really so far apart, and may be that was in his contemplation, except that he did not say it. Do not fool ourselves about this. You have a lot of people in Barbados who are not working, and a lot of people who are working for very little. Do not ever expect that in the foreseeable future they are going to own homes. Government cannot get out of its social responsibility of finding housing for those people in the lower economic group in Barbados who will never be able to own homes. 3.45 p.m.

It is important to note that shortly after the Leader of the Senate spoke with such conviction about his feeling of universal house ownership and the aspirations of Barbadians, with which nobody disagrees, he comes with a Resolution for land for people to rent. When he was speaking earlier, he was speaking on a Resolution that was vesting land in the National Housing Corporation to rent to people, and while he has come with a Resolution for land for people to rent, he is espousing this very noble sentiment that universal house ownership is what he is interested in.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Oh, as an ideal! Well, we are interested in practical politics. At the age of Senator Comissiong, he can be an idealist. I have been, like the Leader of the House, beating out on the anvil, and therefore I know, and I am sure the Leader of the House knows,

that idealism really has not got much part in practical politics.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am sorry. That is my view, Sir, it is not the view of the Leader of the House.

Enlightened pragmatism should be the hallmark of Government in countries such as Barbados where resources are limited, means are short, the priorities are long and we cannot meet all the priorities at the same time. In those circumstances, to be idealist is to really miss the boat. Enlightened pragmatism, I am suggesting, should be what we are trying to get.

Finally, Sir, on this question of the acquisition at Walkers in St. George, I am back to consideration of the future of what we will do with agricultural land. One of the reasons why there is a shortage of house spots in rural Barbados, places like St. George, is because there has been a policy by successive Governments — the Democratic Labour Party Government before and the Barbados Labour Party Government after — that agriculture was very important to the economy of Barbados and that it would be short-sighted to take good arable land out of cultivation and use it for housing and recreation.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Well, that was the ideal; their ideal was to do that. I am reminded by Senator Miller the performance fell short of the promise. The pragmatism prevailed.

The policy of successive Governments, which I think is a sensible policy, is generally not to take good arable land out of agriculture and put it into housing and to other purposes, because agriculture was and still is, important to the well-being of this community. The result of that policy, however, has been that the urban and the suburban areas of Barbados could get the things that the people in the rural areas could not get. There were no plantations in 98% of St. Michael and there was no plantation in a substantial part of Christ Church, and therefore the people who live in those areas could get the land for housing, for playing fields and for all of that, but the people who work hard in the fields in the rural constituencies, the ones who went out there and cut the canes and weeded the fields and got their backs bent over in the sun and the rain, they were told, 'Well, you cannot get these facilities that the fellows in town can get because the land all around you is arable land and we cannot take this arable land out of cultivation and put it to the things you say you want.'

This acquisition here, Sir, like the one that preceded it, is a welcome departure from the strictness of

that previous policy, because they are, in fact, taking land out of sugar and providing a school and places for people to live and to widen the road. I am not asking that it be a policy that abandons the previous one and allows reckless building all across the canefields in Barbados. That is not what I am saying. I am saying that in a country like Barbados that can have so many acres of arable land lying fallow for years on end and could allow agricultural land to be cut up in two and four acre lots and sold to middle class people who, to a large extent, know only how to grow grass, they know nothing about agriculture, those people who have \$200 000 houses, as was the policy during the period of the previous Democratic Labour Party regime, it is equally important that you take only a tiny percentage of that kind of land that they gave to the big shot, middle class, with the big dogs and fences, and allow the agricultural workers to have a small share for their own use for housing and the like.

Aside.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: The man knows not what he speaks of, Sir!

I believe I have made my point, and I believe that if the decisions of Government are informed by the considerations that I have articulated, then we are well on our way, Sir, Jimmy Swaggart or no Jimmy Swaggart.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, I will not be too long, I just want to reply to two points made by Senator Tull, because they struck me very forcibly. When I hear him pleading for the poor women in the fields, whose backs are being broken in the sun, I remember that his party is the same party which criticised the Prime Minister of this country who expressed the hope and the wish that the economy of this country would have reached the point when we would not have to see those same poor women with their backs broken in the sun, these poor women that he is now in this debate pleading for and coming up with a sob story. His party is the one which said that the Prime Minister said "not a cane blade" for the very reason which he has just expressed, because we should not have these poor women in the midday sun weeding between the cane rows. He is now pleading for them in these days.

Number two. Who cut up Sandy Lane that the poor Barbadian with the big dog and the fences, but the Barbados Labour Party? They did not give them two acres, they gave them four. Sandy Lane was developed during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party. There a poor man cannot buy a house for sale, because they are being sold at US\$750 000 and \$800 000, with about four or five acres. The Barbados Labour Party cut up Sandy Lane, not the Democratic Labour Party. So what is he preaching about now, about cutting up in two acres, when they gave

Americans and Englishmen and other foreigners four and a half acres?

When you get this sort of talk, it has to be answered. We hear the cane blade talk in which he is pleading and begging for the poor women now with their backs broken in the midday sun. When the Prime Minister of this country expressed a hope that by his policies this country would have reached the point by development, industrial and otherwise that these same poor women would not have to do that, he wanted to mash up the sugar industry. In and out of election campaign, 'Barrow say no cane blade,' foolishness, and he is now the same one crying for those poor women in the canefield, those poor women without toilet facilities, those women in the midday sun. But a Prime Minister's aspirations for his poor people — that was a criticism from elections in the Sixties right up to 1986!

I just wanted to answer those two points. I support the Resolution, but I do not want him to get away with this sort of pleading and begging for poor people when he has criticised the Prime Minister for expressing his hope and wish. That is why he won the election in 1986, because he is a man who feels for the same poor women in the field whose back is being broken in the midday sun.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, all of that is for the gallery.

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, it is for the gallery!

But, Mr. President.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: I hope that you are addressing the Chair now.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, Mr. President, I am. Do not mind the asides, Sir.
3.55 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have to.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You cannot say that all of that was for the gallery.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: All of that harangue was for the gallery.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have to bring this to order. You cannot describe the honourable member's speech as a harangue. He made no personal attack on the honourable member, so I do not wish you to, in your reply, describe his statement as a harangue. Get down to parliamentary language.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I rise, Sir, because I am distressed that the honourable member who just sat should seek to mislead the Senate. The rationale behind the cane blade speech does not have anything to do with women in the back-breaking sun. The rationale behind the cane blade speech has something to do with the changing face of the economy of this country.

It is all right to say that you do not want to see a cane blade. What will you plant in the ground? We are telling the farmers today when they go into non-sugar agriculture, including cotton — I am hearing it now from the ADC, as I heard before from the ADC — it is not anything new — about the problems of soil erosion. We also hear about the danger for redeployment in the agricultural industry if the sugar industry were to come to an end.

The cane blade speech had something to do with the advent of tourism as a major sector in the economy. It had to do with the rise of the industrial sector in our economy. It did not have anything to do with the woman out there, because the woman out there, if she is not going to break her back cutting cane, she is going to break her back chopping cotton or digging up cabbages. So all of that emulsion was for the Press gallery, not for right thinking members around here, or you, Mr. President. That kind of outburst has to do, perhaps, with sour grapes, because he could not afford to buy a lot in Sandy Lane at the time. Of course, he is a big justice now, not that you would know it from his behaviour in here.

He needs to understand that it is not as easy to move from sugar to non-sugar agriculture as the Prime Minister would have people believe. Non-sugar agriculture has been earning more in this country than sugar agriculture over the past five years. I do not know if Senator Smith is aware of that.

The whole policy of diversification started at the time of the Democratic Labour Party, continued right through the ten years of Barbados Labour Party Government, and will continue to be so. Life is going to be difficult for us.

Aside.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: That is true. My colleague reminds me that diversification really started in the 1950s. But it is not an easy transition. It is not easy out

there to find markets for non-sugar agriculture. Sugar has always been protected. It was protected by the British Government. It has been protected by special pricing arrangements by the Americans. It has been protected by ACP. Non-sugar is not easy. The Japanese misled us. They told us that they were giving us a market for cotton and told the farmers in this country to plant cotton, and then they told us that they would offer us a different price for cotton. The markets are unstable. That is really the rationale behind the cane blade speech, so do not let us be misled about the Prime Minister.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us get back to the Resolution that we are dealing with.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, I will get to Walkers. I am getting there.

Mr. PRESIDENT: You are far from Walkers.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I will get to Walkers, but I am going via Sandy Lane. The lands at Sandy Lane were converted as the honourable Member has said. That was the beginning of the super tourist industry on which we depend today, if you know anything about agriculture at all, and if you do not, your brother will instruct you. Not your brother, of course, Sir. The honourable Member's brother will instruct him that, to a large extent, they were rab lands. They were not the best agricultural lands. Even today the lands on that whole plateau going right through Trents have moved from sugar to non-sugar and to housing, and some are lying fallow as rab land. The conversion of Sandy Lane estate into the beginning of translation of Ronald Tree's whole concept for tourism way back in the 1950s was the beginning of the tourist industry as we know it today, and the Barbados Labour Party, and I do not think anybody in Barbados, has no apology to make for the conversion of the land from one use to another in this particular respect.

I cannot help it if everybody cannot afford to buy a four acre or a five acre lot at Sandy Lane. Your problem is that you had to go up in Husbands and quarrel because Roy Brathwaite bought next to you and low rated your property.

Mr. PRESIDENT: No, no, Senator!

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair, Sir. The honourable Member was distressed because one Roy Brathwaite built a St. Lucy country house next to his.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Do not let us bring this in.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Even where the honourable Member lives now, Mr. President, were sugar lands that were converted. All of that was part of the old

Wanstead and Husbands Estate. Part of Cave Hill, which was in canes when I was a girl, has now been converted to Husbands. This is part of the suburban sprawl. This is part of the process of urbanisation in this country, and it is right that we should have the urban centres around the town. Already we have a position where in excess of 56% of the population of Barbados lives in the parish of St. Michael, and I do not think that it is a bad thing that we should have urban centres in St. Philip, in St. John, in Belleplaine, St. Andrew and wherever else they are being developed.

But the record really has to be put straight on that. The Sandy Lane conversion was not a wanton or ill-conceived idea. There was no thought to convert good agricultural arable land to make any super development for rich ex-patriots to live on. It was the beginning of the tourist industry, as I said, Mr. President, and there is nothing that we have developed in tourism that has superseded Sandy Lane up to this day. It is still the superior product on this island today.

I do not know anything about Jimmy Swaggart. He is not of my religious persuasion, as far as I know, and I do not know anything about the gentleman, so that the references to Jimmy Swaggart go over my head. I am not taking offence, whether it is a joke or not. I am in this business and I do not take offence. I try not to give, but I do not take offence, but somebody at this table said that he is a performer.

Mr. President, what we saw when the Member who spoke before me rose just now was just a performance. But we have been having a serious debate in here.

(*Aside: At a low level.*)

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Yes, at a low level.

We have been having a serious debate in here on housing, on matters to do with Government's acquisition of land and the way in which it goes about it, the usage to which marginal lands might be put in the context of the importance of urban centres, a quite serious debate. It is true that we are not getting the kind of involvement that we would like to see. I do not know why members on the other side are so reluctant to speak. Perhaps, they are not well informed and know when silence is golden, but the debate so far has been at a fairly high level, and we are trying to imbue it with some common sense and are trying to make useful suggestions. I do not think there is anything partisan in this debate. People are trying to take credit where it is due, and that is normal in the course of things, but I think that the last intervention was an aberration!

4.05 p.m.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. President, I would just like to respond to a few remarks about the Govern-

ment's agricultural policy in those days, in regard to the land subdivision into two acre and four acre lots. That policy was a very good policy in that it was done to give people a chance to become farmers who did not have land at that time. We had a lot of landless farmers in those days who had sheep, goats and pigs, and we figured that, as we were at the beginning of our diversification programme, they would need land of their own to practise on. The fact that middle class people bought those lands and then built big houses was no fault of the Government. We had a genuine policy that we were trying to create a new class of farmer in this country to get away from the traditional sugar cane farming, and if we were going to produce a new corps of farmers, they would have to be given small plots of land in order to produce their diversification crops.

Asides

SENATOR A. MORRISON: It did not work, but the policy was a good policy. There was no intention of providing four acre lots for people to eventually build big houses, just plant a few trees and have big lawns.

There is one more point, Sir. The Prime Minister, as Senator Smith has said, was very concerned about the poor working people in the sugar plantations, and the people that he mostly referred to when he was speaking about those canes blades were the people who used to load canes in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, heading them from the bottoms to the top of hills. He was very much concerned with those people, because he said that that was the back-breaking job, and he referred to the people who worked in St. Joseph and St. Andrew who had to head canes day by day to the top of hills in order to load the trucks. Those were the people that he was very concerned about when he said he would not like to see a cane blade in this country. It is not true to say he was not concerned about those people. Senator Smith was very correct, but he was referring mostly to the women who worked in St. Joseph and St. Andrew.

Asides.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: The whole Island would benefit, too, but those were the ones he was mostly concerned about.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I think that this debate has ranged far and wide. It has been very funny in parts, I must say this. I laughed immoderately.

I want to make one or two responses. I think that Senator Tull may have misunderstood my plea for home ownership. I was not in any way saying that everybody would *ipso facto* own a house because the Government decrees it or because the Government's policy moves in

that direction. I was merely saying that anybody who wants to, and who can, should be encouraged by all kinds of legitimate means to own one, because the more people you can get to own their own houses, the more able you will be to look after those who, for a variety of reasons, cannot. But you have to start somewhere.

I must take a little issue with him over this question of middle class people in their \$200 000 houses. This is where I am going now to root for the Democratic Labour Party. In my judgment, if there are such middle class people in \$200 000 houses, those are the people whose parents, or perhaps themselves 25 years ago, were living in the small houses, and if we have done no more than get them out of the small houses into the big ones costing \$200 000, I say hurrah for us. This means that we are fast becoming a middle class society, and there is nothing wrong with that.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: You tried your best to get it down but, you couldn't!

I really think these debates are funny.

Lastly, I want to respond to your point about the Member for St. George North, because I think it must have been he you were referring to when you said it was a silly idea to hold a polyclinic up, as you had been led to understand, because of a path to be built for old people, or disabled people, to avoid the traffic in getting to and fro from the polyclinic. If that is the reason, I would be inclined to applaud the delay, because I think that if a single person gets injured coming to or from the polyclinic, that would be a distressing thing for relatives and friends, and for the community.

I do not believe that that alone is the reason for the delay. There has to be something else, of course, but if that is one of the reasons, I would not knock it. Safety in travelling for old and disabled people is something which has to be provided.

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

Order No. 5 was called – to move the first reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 45(1) and (2) be suspended to enable this Bill to be proceeded with.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I beg to move that a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances, be read a first time.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS)
ACT, 1987

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1987 seeks to amend the Casual Employees (Pensions) Act, Cap. 20, the Statutory Boards Casual Employees (Pensions) Act, Cap. 383, the Statutory Boards (Pensions) Act, Cap. 384, in order to bring casual employees and employees of statutory boards in line with public employees.

There are provisions in the Casual Employees (Pensions) Act which provide for the grant of pension to casual employees who were in the Public Service before July 1, 1971, and who, if employed for ten years or more, would retire with a pension.
4.15 p.m.

Under the original Act, retirement was compulsory at age 60, but in 1971 the Act was amended for the age of retirement to be 65 years, although service after age 60 was not taken into account for retiring benefits payable. The amendment also provided that employees in the Service after July 1971, if not eligible for pension, would be eligible for gratuity only after five years of service.

The decision to increase the age for retirement to 65 was taken because if persons retired at age 60, they would not have made sufficient contributions under the National Insurance Scheme to allow them to get a reasonable pension at age 65. Hence, the provision for extension of the period was to allow them to have five more years to contribute towards National Insurance and Social Security.

Under Section 12 of the Act, continuous service is taken into account as pensionable service, and if there were a break in service, except it was for ill-health, then persons tended to be at a disadvantage.

There were representations made by various unions on these provisions, and on examination, it was realized that whereas public employees, because of an amendment in 1975, were able to store pensions after 10 years' service and on reaching age 65 to be the beneficiaries of the pension, it seemed desirable — indeed, it seemed equitable — that casual employees should also be permit-

ted to store pensions. In addition, there was no provision for casual employees to be able if they had broken Service, to have their portions of service added to enable them to qualify for pensions. Again, this acted as a disability.

What this present amendment seeks to do is to allow an employee, who voluntarily resigns after not less than ten years of pensionable service before reaching the normal retiring age, to become eligible for retiring benefits at age 55. In addition, an employee who leaves the Public Service before he has attained the age of retirement, whether or not he has completed ten years of pensionable service, will now be entitled to store that pension. If he recommences employment for a period of five consecutive years, then the two periods would be counted towards his pensions.

While carrying out those proposed amendments, it seemed desirable and necessary also that these provisions should be extended not only for casual employees in the Public Service, but to persons employed at statutory boards as casual employees, who would have similar terms and conditions of service. So the opportunity is also taken to extend this provision to members of statutory boards who come under the Statutory Boards Pensions Act, Cap. 384.

All of the measures contained in this piece of legislation, Mr. President, are aimed at improving the final position of persons who serve as casual employees or as permanent employees of statutory boards when the time comes for them to retire.

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

SENATOR L. R. TULL: I am glad to see that this important initiative by the Barbados Labour Party has reached fruition at this time. I think it is a very progressive piece of legislation, and therefore, naturally, it will have the support of this side. We vote for it because it is progressive, we vote for it because we are the authors.

But I want to raise another point very quickly, Sir, because it is getting late. The statutory boards are set up by Acts of Parliament. They are run by the boards, and in each one of the Acts I can think of, without exception, the Minister gives general policy guidelines to the board and the board is responsible for the general running of the corporation.

I understand that in recent times, the Ministry of the Public Service has been, contrary to the law of Barbados, issuing directives to a number of statutory boards and telling them what they should do in a number of areas. I have not only been told that — I have seen a piece of correspondence from the Ministry of the Public Service to that effect.

I would hope, Sir, that the Minister who has introduced this measure, the Minister of the Public Service, if he is not aware of this, although I cannot see how he cannot be aware of it, will take a look at it and desist from taking actions that are in clear violation of the law.

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

The question that the Senate go into Committee on the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR the Senate was resumed and the Bill reported as having been passed in Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

4.25 p.m.

On separate motions of SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE RESORTS LTD. AT SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER.

Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Golden Mile Resorts Limited situate at Speightstown, Saint Peter to facilitate a housing sites and services programme.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, a decision was taken some time in 1985 to acquire certain lands in Speightstown, St. Peter for housing. Immediately after the change of Government, this decision was submitted to the new Cabinet, and it was supported. The lands are in six portions – four of them belonging to Golden Mile Resorts Limited and two to other owners.

The demand for house spots in the Speightstown area, particularly since the October 1984 floods, has grown. So that apart from other uses, it is planned to meet this demand and to address the need for resiting houses from these areas which may be used to accommodate other new major development projects. For example it is proposed to develop such major services as transport, shopping, postal, police and health services, to name only a few. Incidentally, none of these new services will be

curtailed for fear of conflict in respect of water zoning. The Ministry has been advised that the Water Authority is determined that the existing mains in the area can service new developments, and new house owners in the Golden Mile area will not be inhibited from settlement, since the area itself is in Zone 5 of the water protection area.

It is probably not generally realized that two of these six lots are already tenancies and, unless my recollection deceives me, this land was leased to the old Housing Authority over 25 years ago. The terms of that lease may be on the brink of expiration, so it needs to be acquired now so that ownership can pass from the Crown to the tenants who have been living on it. A sites and services infrastructural development project has already been completed there, and the passage of this Resolution will help to vest these lands in the Crown and compensate their owners.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 7 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the publication of the notice of abandonment of the acquisition of land at Oistins, Christ Church.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: This, Mr. President, is an abandonment. I do not think it needs to detain us really.

The facts are as follows. Sometime in July 1985 Parliament approved the compulsory acquisition of 535 square feet of land at Oistins for environmental reasons. At that time there was a concrete block building under construction on the same land. Before that, however, it appeared that the Town and Country Planning authorities had in 1983 already approved the change of use for this land from residential purposes to business purposes. Later the entire building was demolished and a new structure started. In those circumstances, the Chief Town Planner started proceedings, and the owner applied for permission to retain and complete on this land the construction of a laundry. He was not given permission and, therefore, the decision to acquire in 1985 was made.

When he applied to the Cabinet, their reason, as I understand it, for refusing his permission was that they feared that the environment would suffer from the establishment of a laundry on that part of the Christ Church shoreline at Oistins. It was claimed, for instance, that if

you had a laundry there, the detergent effluvia would poison marine life, but this did not seem to be so.

To cut a long story short, the Cabinet at the time agreed to purchase the land compulsorily, and they offered the owner \$75 000 for it. But he had paid, as he and his lawyer claimed, \$155 000 for it, and the Land Tax authorities at the time advised that he should be paid \$155 000 for it, in a spirit of compromise.

While the present Cabinet reviewed this matter, the Chief Town Planner refused his application to complete his building, although he felt that there was no reason for Government to take over the property. So in the light of the judgment of the Chief Town Planner, that the Government perhaps had no reason for wanting to take over the property, the Cabinet has decided to uphold the opinion of the Chief Town Planner and to allow the owner to develop his laundry enterprise so long as he agrees to obey planning rules. It is in the light of all this that the acquisition is being abandoned and we are giving back his land to him.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I believe that I need a clarification from the Leader of the House. I thought I heard him, or I understood him to say just now, that the Town Planner agreed that the site at Oistins was not a suitable site for the carrying on of the business proposed, and then I thought I heard the Leader say at the end that it was proposed that the business enterprise would be carried on there. The two do not seem to be compatible.

The outfall of the effluvia, as you say, on to the coral reef would be disastrous. I cannot believe that he has said that. It is impossible to believe that the direct infusion of detergents in the surf would not affect marine life. It is impossible to believe it. Some of the most harsh chemical detergents are used in that business. I would want to be perfectly clear on this, please. I know the hour is late, but this is what has helped to make this a contentious issue over time. The environmental considerations are considerable.

4.35 p.m.

Aside

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: I cannot accept it. I agree that somebody said it is okay, but I cannot accept that the introduction of detergents, however harsh, however mild, anywhere on the coastline of Barbados can be acceptable, certainly not to the environmental public health authorities. Town Planning may think it is okay, but even for land disposal I would be very doubtful. But is that in effect what was said by the Leader of the Senate? That the particular business enterprise would continue there?

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Yes. There will be a laundry there. When the Chief Town Planner refused the application, it was because the owner had transgressed some technical building rules. When we reviewed the matter, we took note of the fact that the Chief Town Planner had expressed the view that there was no reason whatever for the Government to acquire the property. I should also add this that the decision which we took to hand back the property to him is subject to any recommendations or conditions imposed by the Chief Town Planner. So if there is an environmental hazard, one has to assume that the Chief Town Planner will look into that and will, of course, prescribe for him the sort of conditions which will minimise or obviate that hazard, or any hazard.

SENATOR L. R. TULL: Mr. President, I am just wondering whether the Government might not in those circumstances outlined by the Leader of the Senate defer a decision on the abandonment until such time as there is a clear scientific report that the detergent effluvia will not, in fact, damage marine life. To abandon the acquisition and to await a report by the Chief Town Planner, advised by the specialists no doubt, that there might be a difficulty seems to be travelling too quickly. One should perhaps wait until that is settled to know whether the operation of the laundry there would constitute a hazard to marine life before we go on to the abandonment.

I also want to make another point, Sir, one that I need to make over and over, and that is the question of another aspect of the environment. I feel very strongly that we should try to encourage these open areas, these open windows to the sea, certainly in respect of the land at Oistins from the fishing compound right down to the beginning of the hotel — I do not remember the name, Sir — I thought the plan was to have that whole area exposed. To have just one single building there, a laundry, on the seaside, to my mind offends against aesthetics.

I do not know, whether the Minister would be disposed to perhaps holding the matter over until the next sitting of the Senate to see whether the reports of the public health authorities and all these persons who will inform the decision of the Chief Town Planner are given.

SENATOR B. A. MILLER: Mr. President, I want to agree entirely. I live on the coastline, on the west coast, and I have seen this happen time and again. There is not sufficient of a collaborative effort between Town Planning and the Public Health Environmental Unit. Town Planning gives permission for people to build and they care neither whether people's wash water, people's household effluent, is deposited on the beach, which is the case on the west coast.

The fishermen in Prospect where I live constantly make this point to me, that I am the only person along that stretch — it is true I am perhaps the most recent person, nearly the most recent person who has built there — whose water does not go into the sea. They have absolutely no care for the marine life and you can see all the effluent, if you walk down the beach, spattering down, and there are detergents in there.

I really must support what Senator Tull is saying, because I think that as responsible citizens, and at this level, we should satisfy ourselves first of all that proper arrangements have been made for the disposal of whatever effluent may be used from that or any other business along the coast. Here we have one which is in an embryonic stage, do not let us get to the point now where you are putting the effluent into the marine life there and then it will be a long, sad story. What happened when they attempted to build the Coast Guard Station at Oistins tells us about the power of the currents there, so goodness knows where the effluent would move to. It may well find itself ending up on Maxwell and Dover, as indeed sand moved from Maxwell to Oistins and from Oistins to Maxwell all within our lifetime.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TULLOR: Mr. President, I do not really want to detain the Senate, but let us take this story stage by stage. The Cabinet agreed that a certain portion of land and building on that land at Oistins should be compulsorily acquired from the owner for environmental purposes, but the property was the subject of a Town Planning application for a change of use from residential to business purposes, i.e. a laundry. In the meanwhile, while this determination was going on, the owner demolished the old building and started a new construction. It was this action which caused the Chief Town Planner to institute enforcement proceedings.

A new application was then submitted to Town Planning for the retention and completion of the building as a laundry and offices. The Cabinet, however, decided that the application should be refused and the property acquired. The offer of compensation of \$75 000 was made to him. That was refused by the owner on the instructions of Mr. Henry Forde, his counsel.

The Chief Town Planner had earlier thought that he could see no reason for the acquisition of the property on environmental grounds, and it was therefore recommended to the Cabinet that the acquisition of the property should be abandoned and that the owner should be allowed to use his property subject to the Chief Town Planning Officer's conditions.

I would assume, therefore, that since the Ministry of Health was consulted on the environmental aspects of having a laundry there and said it would not pose any problem, it was on the basis of this consultation with

the Ministry of Health and the reply from them that the Chief Town Planner would be inclined to allow the construction to go on. It is in the light of this that the Cabinet has taken the decision to give the man his property back.

SENATOR DR. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, the Leader of Government Business in the Senate has, I think, explained the situation quite clearly, but I thought that what was being suggested was that the Government might wish to hold action just to ensure that, in fact, there is the specific assurance that there will be no environmental destruction if the business proposed goes ahead.
4.45 p.m.

As I understood it, the Leader of the Senate expressed the view that he was on the assumption that there had been this clearance from the Ministry of Health. I just wonder whether it is not possible for Government to accept the suggestion that a final decision be held until the Government can be assured that such an assurance of safety has, in fact, been given.

I do not think that there is any suggestion of causing Government to change its proposal. I think that what is being requested is that Government should, perhaps, take the precaution of clearing and ensuring that the environmental concerns have, in fact, been addressed. I wonder, Mr. President, whether the Leader of Government Business would not wish, perhaps, to hold back from asking for a vote on this matter during this meeting of the Senate.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. President, it is, to my knowledge, that the acquisition of this property has caused great grief and personal discomfort to the owner of the land. As I understand it, this property was formerly owned by a Mr. Justice Ward, who sold the property at some time to a Mr. Ishmael. The present owner, who is a Mr. Thompson, apparently bought the building from Mr. Ishmael and demolished the old building.

As I understand it, there were consultations before this demolition was carried out between others and Mr. Thompson, who is a faithful and sincere member of the Barbados Labour Party, and who had many friends in Cabinet. So he discussed the matter, I understand, before the demolition was carried out, with the understanding that it was his intention to construct a laundry service.

The matter here, as explained by the Leader of the House, shows very clearly that the Chief Town Planner had seen no reason why a laundry could not be constructed on the spot. An argument was advanced by the Minister of Housing at that time in relation to the chemicals which would go into the sea and which, he claimed, would have interfered with the marine life. As

I understand it, the health authorities advised that no such problem would occur, and it is because of their advice that the Chief Town Planner permitted the construction of the laundry.

I know, Sir, that Mr. Thompson is a client of Mr. Henry Forde, who advised him on the matter, and the point is, in spite of the interruptions, that the Chief Town Planner made his decision based on the advice of the Ministry of Health. Therefore, Sir, I see no reason why we should have to delay our decision in abandoning the acquisition.

SENATOR THE REV. CAN. I. McK. JONES: It is all right to hear the last Senator speak, but we have no assurance that what he has said is factual, except his words. So I support the stance taken by Senator Shorey. I think that at this junction we should wait to find out for certain if there is going to be any kind of damage or destruction to marine life as a result of the kind of chemicals they will have to use and the effluent that will come out.

I do not know how a Ministry of Health can tell you that nothing will happen just like that. You do not know what kind of detergents they are going to be using in the laundry and you do not know what damage it is going to do to marine life. I think we should be assured about that before we go ahead and give the person the right to build.

SENATOR G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. President, I rise in support of the abandonment of the acquisition of this land at Oistins, Christ Church. I think that some of the members over there are missing the point.

The gentleman was only offered \$75 000 for his land, \$75 000 for seaside land. He was actually being asked to give away his land. The important thing is that they do not trust the Town Planner nor trust the Ministry of Health, because he has a right to get back his land, and today, if I could vote, twice, or ten times, I would vote that he be given back his land and that he does whatever he wants to do, as long as he complies with the Town and Country Planning orders or instructions.

I support this and will support it 100 times.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. President, I find this whole issue a very peculiar one. Things seem to have been done in a very peculiar manner. Here we have the technicians of the Town and Country Planning Department saying that there is no danger with this thing and, in spite of that, we see Cabinet taking a decision contrary to the considered scientific opinion of people who are the experts in the matter. What even makes me more suspicious about the whole matter is the fact that, in the debates in the House of Assembly, it

appears that the Minister responsible did indicate that there was some element of bad faith in the whole matter. So it would seem to me that the whole consideration for Cabinet deciding to acquire the property was not strictly on health or scientific grounds.

If I can read into the comments of the Minister of Housing that there was some element of bad faith and the peculiarity of the Cabinet going against the scientific advice of its experts, that suggests to me, Mr. President, that there may be something more in the matter. I do not have the files, so I would not know, but it would suggest to me that the only consideration was not the health consideration of chemicals going into the sea. I wonder if the Leader of Government Business can share a little light on that.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Not entirely, except to say that I did not know that the man was a supporter of the Barbados Labour Party. It has nothing to do with it, but if he is, all the more reason why this Government should do justice to him and give him back his land.

Asides.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: No, not at the expense of the environment.
4.55 p.m.

The Ministry of Health was consulted on the environmental aspects of a laundry being there and they said that it would not pose any problem. I did not know the man belonged to their party. I never knew it. I do not even believe it now, because they would never have treated him so.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. President, I beg to give notice of a Resolution which reads as follows:

"Whereas the Legislative Council, predecessor of the Senate, and for some years the Senate itself dealt with Supplementary "Money" Resolutions as they passed the House of Assembly:

And Whereas by an interpretation of Section 54(4)(b) of the Constitution such Resolutions no longer come before the Senate:

And Whereas the sums voted by such Resolutions have, for several years, been considered only cumulatively by the Senate in a final Appropriation Bill after the end of the financial year in which those sums were expended:

And Whereas the Constitution Review Commission in its Report in 1979 recommended that Section 54(4)(b) of the Constitution should be amended so as to give the Senate the authority to deal with "Money" Resolutions and that the Senate should be given the same powers and functions in relation to such Resolutions as it has, by virtue of Section 55 of the Constitution, in relation to Money Bills.

Be It Resolved That this Senate request Government to take all necessary steps to give effect to the recommendations of the Constitution Review Commission."

THE ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, due to the fact that we have Civil Establishment Orders in respect of Public Service pay, I beg to move that we adjourn *sine die*.

The question that the Senate adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to.
4.57 p.m.

CONTENTS

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES RE KNIGHTING OF SENATOR THE HON. J. C. TUDOR BY QUEEN.....196

Senator Smith, 196; Senator Miller, 197;
Senator Jordan, 198; Senator Wickham, 198;
Senator Shorey, 199; Senator Sir James
Tudor, 199; Mr. President, 201.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. Sir. James Tudor 201

The 11th Annual Report of the National
Housing Corporation (NHC) for the year
1983-84.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 9)
Order, 1986.

Statements showing Net Customs and Excise
Receipts for months ended September,
October and November, 1986.

The 17th Annual Report of the Barbados
Development Bank for the year 1985-86.

The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1987.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order,
1987.

The Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers)
(Amendment) Order, 1987.

Guarantee by the Minister of Finance to grant
all benefits and exemptions under section 32
(1) of Exemptions Insurance Act 1983 to
Motor Mechanical Reinsurance Company Ltd.

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 2, asked
by Senator B. A. Miller.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

BORROWING OF US \$1 924 500 FROM THE VENEZUELAN INVESTMENT FUND (F.I.V.).....202

Senator Lewis, 202, 206; Senator Tull, 202;
Senator Miller, 204; Senator Goddard, 206.

ABANDONMENT OF LAND ACQUISITION AT SIX MEN'S, ST. PETER 209

Senator Sir James Tudor, 209, 211; Senator
Miller, 210.

VESTING IN NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORA- TION OF LAND AT SIX CROSS ROADS 212

Senator Sir James Tudor, 212, 217; Senator
Tull, 212; Senator Phillips, 214; Senator
Comissiong, 215; Senator Miller, 216.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WALKERS, ST. GEORGE 218

Senator Sir James Tudor, 218, 224; Senator
Tull, 219; Senator Smith, 221; Senator Miller,
222; Senator Morrison, 223.

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1987..... 225

Senator Lewis, 225; Senator Tull, 225.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GOLDEN MILE RESORTS LTD, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER 226

Senator Sir James Tudor, 226.

ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH 226

Senator Sir James Tudor, 226, 227, 228, 229;
Senator Miller, 227; Senator Tull, 227;
Senator Shorey, 228; Senator Phillips, 228;
Senator Jones, 229; Senator Eastmond, 229;
Senator Comissiong, 229.

QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS

QUESTION BY SENATOR MILLER RE RE- PORT OF NATIONAL POPULATION TASK FORCE 207

Senator Tudor, 207, 208, 209; Senator Miller,
208; Senator Tull, 209; Senator Smith, 209.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 45(1) AND (2) 224

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Senator the Rev. Can. I. McK. Jones 229

Notice of Resolution re Senate being allowed to
debate Money Bills and Resolutions.

SUSPENSION..... 207

ADJOURNMENT 230

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

COMISSIONG, D.A.
EASTMOND, G. L.
GODDARD, J. S.
JONES, Rev. Canon I. McK.
JORDAN, His Honour M. deL.
LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.
MILLER, B.A.
MORRISON, A.
PHILLIPS, A. J. N.
SHOREY, Dr. L. L.
SMITH, F. G.
TUDOR, Hon. Sir James
TULL, L. R.
WALCOTT, His Honour F. L.
WICKHAM, J. C. W.

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986-91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 11, 1987.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, March 11, 1987, at 11.20 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator M. deL. Jordan, (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. Sir James Tudor, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Foreign Affairs) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, (Minister of State, Public Service)

- Senator A. Morrison
- Senator F. G. Smith, Q.C.
- Senator N. W. Boxill
- Senator D. A. Comissiong
- Senator Mrs. V. C. Fraser
- Senator Mrs. G. L. Eastmond
- Senator A. J. N. Phillips
- Senator T. A. Prescod
- Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E.
- Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones
- Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.
- Senator C. A. Blackman, Q.C.
- Senator Mrs. P. Y. Forde
- Senator J. S. Goddard
- Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey.

Prayers were led by Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Senate is now in session.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

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

A Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for nine months ended 31st October, 1986.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Annual Report and Financial Statements for the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation for the year ended 31st March, 1986.

The Barbados Harbours (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The First Annual Report and Financial Statements of the National Health Service Board for the year ended 31st March, 1986.

The Annual Report for the Department of Labour for the year 1983.

The Shipping Incentives Order, 1987.

Diplomacy and Development, a Review of the Foreign Policy of Barbados.

The Estimates for 1987 — 88.

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, perhaps at this stage, in view of the unavoidable absence of His Honour the President, the Senate may wish to have the appointment of this day's

sitting of an acting Deputy President in view of Your Honour's assumption of the substantive role.

I now beg to move that Senator John Wickham be appointed to act as Deputy President for the remainder of the day's sitting.

The question that Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM be appointed to act as Deputy President for the remainder of the day's sitting was put to the Senate and agreed to.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN AS QUEEN'S COUNSEL

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, before we proceed to equally important business, I should like for us to start our proceedings by me getting my own back, so to speak, from the Senate in a rather pleasant way.

When we were last here, I was the very happy recipient of congratulatory speeches, for which I thank the Senate. We all regretted that that occasion could not be made more pleasant, if indeed that were possible, by the presence of Senator Chris Blackman, who was absent on that occasion, but who, obviously, deserve to share the greater part of the honours on that day in my judgement.

Luckily for us, we have him as a captive audience here today, and we can do as we like in that he has to sit and listen to us, and only after he has listened to us may he reply to us, in whatever form he chooses.
11.30 a.m.

It is a very great pleasure for me to remind the Senate that, recently, in the light of the distinction which he has brought to his profession, he has been raised to the dignity of Queen's Counsel and, as I understand, entitled to practice in the Inner Bar. I do not know many Q.Cs, and I do not know whether they are really too much better when they are Q.Cs than when they are not — perhaps I will hear this — but I am sure that the distinction itself is always well merited, and in his case, very much so.

He is relatively young. He just astonished me by telling me he was, like myself, a pupil of the Roebuck Boys School. When I heard that, my mind was set at rest, because I thought that there was something splendid and special about him but could not find out what it was until I had heard that. I discovered that we had been taught by Mr. George Maynard, and that I thought, somewhat dated him, but then I discovered that Mr. Maynard had a long teaching career after he had taught me and, therefore, it was quite in order that Senator Blackman should have been one of his pupils.

Senator Blackman was admitted to practice at the Bar of Barbados in January 1970 and, therefore, has been an attorney-at-law for 17 years. He is also the Chairman of the Caribbean Council of Legal Education. He is the past President of the Barbados Bar Association and he held that office from 1983 until last year. He also did his stint in education at the managerial level, because he was chairman of the St. Leonard's Girls Secondary School from 1980 until last year. I cannot think why he stopped being chairman. I hope it has nothing to do with the change of Government. But he has also been Deputy Chairman of the Barbados Development Bank for about four years, again until last year. He has been a trustee of the Anglican Church, from 1981 — 1984, and he is, happily, still Church Warden of St. Leonard's Church. He has been that from last year and is likely to be that for many more years to come.

I think the Senate is indeed honoured by having Senator Blackman among us, and honoured more so by the width and variety of experience which he brings to our council. I think that in these matters we are all unanimous, but I know that I speak particularly for every Senator in wishing him the greatest possible success and thanking him for the privilege which he has given us of congratulating him on this honour in his profession.

He is young enough to postulate the hope that we may see him as one of Her Majesty's judges. Even if we have the misfortune of going before him, the fact that he is there on the bench will at least give us some pleasure.

I have very great pleasure in asking the Senate to respond in whatever way it wishes to the distinction which Senator Blackman has achieved, and to say on your behalf, but you will say it yourselves, I am sure, how very pleased we are to have to record our pleasure at this occasion.

Applause.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, I, too, should like to join with the Honourable Leader of this Senate and pay tribute to Senator Blackman on his elevation to the distinguished rank of Queen's Counsel.

I have known Senator Chris Blackman for some considerable time. He is now the head of the distinguished law firm of Carrington and Sealy. I think I am correct in saying he is the first black man who joined that firm, and to have risen to the distinguished position of leader of that particular firm, which has had a long and distinguished reputation of over 100 years, must be an indication of the dedication and the contribution that Mr. Blackman has made to the development of law and to the progress of that firm.

We are from two different professions. I am a barrister by profession and Senator Blackman is a solicitor, but by one stroke of Parliament we are all called attorneys-at-law. I still consider myself a barrister, and I never dabble in the things that solicitors are asked to do, because I know very little about solicitor's work, although I can give opinions. In his function Senator Blackman has had very limited advocacy, but in his own field he is certainly one of the stalwarts of the profession, and the honour which has been conferred upon him is certainly well merited.

Not only in the local Bar has Senator Blackman's distinction been recognized, but for Senator Blackman to be elected, after a period of acting, as Chairman of the Caribbean Council of Legal Education, which is responsible for the education of all barristers in the Caribbean, is a sign of the high esteem in which he must have been held by his colleagues throughout the Caribbean. I think the first chairman of that distinguished body of lawyers was our own, the Right Honourable Sir William Douglas. Then, I think that we all looked at it as a post which should be filled by a Chief Justice. But the mere fact that his Caribbean associates and various Governments, which are also part of it through their Attorney Generals being members of this council, have selected Senator Chris Blackman to head that body for a period is, and must be, some sign of the high esteem in which he is held by his Caribbean colleagues. So, Mr. Deputy President, it gives me very great pleasure to add my measure of praise, commendation and congratulations to Senator Blackman on this occasion.

Senator Blackman and I have had our differences, and I suppose any lawyer who has not had a difference with his colleague is either not a good lawyer or he is a "yes man", because the whole question of legal practice is a question of differences of opinion. So we have had our differences and we have had our legal clashes, as we represent two different spectrums of the legal profession. Of course, one client goes to Senator Blackman and one goes to Smith and Smith, so naturally there must be the adversary aspect of our practising. But throughout his career as a lawyer, Mr. Blackman has always shown to the court a sense of decency, respect and decorum which I think many attorneys should emulate. I have never known in his legal career — and mine has spanned his twice — any judge or magistrate, or anybody, ever complain that in the performance of his duties Senator Blackman did not discharge them with dignity, honour and decorum.

I would like to congratulate him personally, apart from the official congratulations which this Senate is bound to offer him on this occasion of his elevation.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

Applause.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. President, let me also join with those who have already spoken to pay tribute to a friend, not a professional colleague in the sense of the word but certainly a colleague, and member of this Honourable Senate on the distinction conferred on him, details of which have been already given by the Leader of Government Business, Sir James Tudor, and to share with Senator Smith the encomiums which have been heaped on his head.

11.40 a.m.

Sir, though I cannot speak of his legal practice and knowledge, having no personal experience thereof, I have certainly found him — and I think this has been well demonstrated in the proceedings of this Honourable House — to be a person of studied manner and speech who is extremely careful in saying exactly what he wishes to say so that he should not be misconstrued, who has an eye for the public weal and is concerned, very evidently so, for the good of his country.

I would like to extend best wishes to him, congratulations, and to hope that he will have many years to offer continued service to his country in this Chamber.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I would just like to add a few words to those very notable sentiments that have been expressed by the Leader of the Senate, by Senator Smith and Dr. Shorey.

As Dr. Shorey said, I am not a legal person, so I cannot really say much on the legal side, but one thing I admire about Senator Blackman is that he has the courage of his convictions — he says what he wants to say, regardless of whom it is to agree with him or not. I know this from the Synod. I know that he sometimes has to disagree with some things that the Synod members are doing and he does not hesitate to tell them when he disagrees with them. I think that is a mark of high honour, that is something to be proud of in any young man.

He is a young man. I think that I also had something to do with him in school at Harrison College. I do not know if he remembers anything about that, but I think I remember seeing him some time. He was a quiet boy then, and he seems to have remained quiet all through. He is not one of these people that stand out. There are some boys you teach who you do not ever forget you taught. I found Senator Blackman was not one of those troublesome kids, but he was always there, he was always attentive.

From what I heard from Senator Smith, it is high praise that a man as young as Senator Blackman could be considered to be head of the Caribbean Legal system, so to

speak. It must show that people have a very, very high opinion of not only his academic excellence, but his measure of justice and fair play.

As was said by Senator Smith, the person who preceded him was the Chief Justice and it was felt that only people like Chief Justices would be in that prestigious position. The fact that he is not even a Puisne Judge, let alone a judge at all, and he has been given that high office speaks volumes for the impression that people have of this young jurist.

I wish him, on behalf of the Senate, every success in his future career and I am pleased to say that we independent members of the Senate are happy to know that we have amongst us on this side, which we never had before, at least not in my time, someone who knows something about the law, so that when these redoubtable lawyers on the other side get up and say their things, we have somebody on our side that can say something for us, too. I am very glad about that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. Deputy President, having only been a member of the legal profession for a little over two years, I hope I will not be considered presumptuous if I, too, add my congratulations to Senator Blackman on attaining the status of Queen's Counsel.

I did have the privilege of serving under Senator Blackman on the Bar Council of the Bar Association when Senator Blackman was President of the Bar Association. In fact, when we were both appointed to the Senate, we did make a pledge to the other members of the Bar Council — I think both of us made a similar type of pledge — that in our actions in the Senate we would do all that was possible to live up to the high ethical standards that are expected of a member of the legal profession. I see that Senator Blackman has succeeded admirably in keeping to that pledge in that he has now been appointed to the status of a Queen's Counsel, certainly one of the highest positions one can reach in our profession.

My experience of Senator Blackman — and it is an experience that I gained during my tenure on the Bar Council — was of a man in a hurry, a man eager and anxious to get things done. This trait, unfortunately, is not one that a lot of senior members of the profession are blessed with in terms of remedying defects within the legal profession itself, but certainly Senator Blackman, as President of the Association, always seemed to be in a hurry, and eager and anxious to get things done.

I know that during my tenure on the Bar Council a lot of the work that we wanted to get done never got off the ground because of procrastination by certain members of

the profession, but certainly that could never have been said about Senator Blackman. He was always anxious and rearing to go. I think that during the time he has been in the Senate we have seen glimpses of that type of approach.

The other characteristic I have been able to notice about him is that whenever I have had dealings with him as a young lawyer, he has always shown the type of consideration that a young lawyer really appreciates from a senior member of the profession. He is always there willing to lend an ear, and in your dealings with him, he goes the extra step in assisting one of the young lawyers.

I, too, should like to add my congratulations. I think I am now the only remaining member of the Senate, lawyer in the Senate, who is a member of the Outer Bar. My other colleagues are now elevated to the.....

Aside.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Oh, Miss Miller! She probably will soon attain that status as well.

I, too, as a young member of the profession, would like to join, especially with Senator Smith, as a Q.C. himself, and add my congratulations to Senator Blackman for a distinction that has been well earned.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, for the first time really in my life I must say that words fail me. I did not expect this ordeal this morning.

First of all, I should like to thank Senator Sir James Tudor for initiating this debate and these sentiments. I would very much like to have been here last month to have offered my congratulations to him on his preferment to the Order of Knighthood, and I now do so formally for the record, a distinction richly deserved.

I am not sure that I deserve all the things that have been said about me, except I think there is some, perhaps, justice in the observation made by the last speaker, that perhaps due to my youth, of which some frequent reference has been made, I am in a little bit of a hurry on occasion. But I think time is too precious to be wasted, and I get a little upset when people seem to want to put things back, so to that extent Senator Commissiong's observation is apt.

In respect of the honour which was conferred on me late last year, I need to put on record thanks to a lot of people who may have made that road possible. The form of admission to the Inner Bar these days does not permit any sort of public occasion, so the things I would like to have said then, I would need to say now.

11.50 a.m.

The first person I would like to place on record who has been responsible for that which I have come to at this point is my mother. She gave me lots of encouragement when I was a school boy and who made many sacrifices for me to receive the education at Harrison College. I would like to put on record here today that all that I am, I owe it to her.

There are the people who taught me. It is only an accident that I became a lawyer. When I was thinking of leaving school in 1962, I was tempted to go into the Public Service, because in those days the salary offered in the Public Service to someone with two A levels was the princely sum of \$132 a month. Articled clerks were usually offered something in the region of \$60 a month and I could not afford that loss of income.

However, I well recall that it was the advice of the then Headmaster of Harrison College, the late John Hammond, who pointed out to me the economics of attempting the solicitor's route, in that if I qualified, within a period of time the shortfall in the \$60 — \$70 a month would be more than compensated. I took his advice, and although I am now earning somewhat in excess of the \$132 a month, it seems to me, in retrospect, that what I earned then — in fact, I got \$90 — did a lot more things than what I am now earning.

Next are the people with whom I articulated at Carrington and Sealy. I was articulated to Mr. D. P. Lynch, Q.C., who did a lot to mould my career, and whose attitude to a young lawyer was to throw you in the deep end of the pool and say, "Swim!" If you did not swim, you took in the water and went down. In the other life, Sir, I cannot swim, but I learned to swim in Carrington and Sealy. Mr. Dennis Clarke, who was a senior partner at that time, also did a lot to influence and help me along the way.

I have to thank the partners with whom I practise, who have been very tolerant and generous with their time in respect of my other obligations.

Senator Sir James Tudor referred to the fact that a number of things came to me in 1986, some of which, unhappily, were related to the election while others had nothing to do with the election. But it has been my lot that whenever I lay down two burdens, I take up three, so it really is just as well that life has a way of balancing out, otherwise I might not be able to survive.

I am very appreciative, Sir, of the kind remarks made by all those who have spoken. I hope that in the time that is left to me in this Senate and elsewhere in the public life of Barbados, I will always strive to function as one would expect of the highest standards of members of my profession and that would behave and contribute to the dignity of this Honourable House, of which I am very proud to be a member. I much appreciate all that has been said.

Applause.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I should like to revert to "Messages From His Excellency The Governor-General". The following has just been received, and it is dated March 3, 1987:

Dear Mr. President,

I shall be absent from duty, for medical reasons, from the 7 to 14 March, 1987.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 30 of the Constitution, The Honourable Mr. Denys Ambrose Williams, GCM, Chief Justice, will be appointed to be my deputy.

As The Honourable The Senate is not expected to meet before 7 March, 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

MOTIONS RELATING TO BUSINESS

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, in view of the nature and size of our business at this sitting, and also in view of the fact that we have all received a supplementary agenda which will require permission to be given for dealing with these matters in the course of today's sitting, I now beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 22(1), 45(2) and 45(3) for the remainder of this day's sitting.

The question that the named Standing Orders be suspended was put to the Senate and agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I wish to draw to the attention of the Senate that in respect of the Supplementary Order Paper, I will ask them to note that these measures have all been circulated. I wish to make sure that this is so, so that they can be read a first time in the case of Bills.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let it be recorded that these Bills be read a first time.
12.00 p.m.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

THE FIRE SERVICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 1 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Fire Service Act, Cap. 163.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, this is a Bill designed to cure an anomaly and also to remove a disadvantage. It seeks to bring the enlistment of firemen into line with what is the policy in respect of members of the police establishment.

Police constables, members of the Senate will be aware, are appointed on probation for two years, and in accordance with the the quality of that service while they are serving probationary appointments, they may be confirmed after that period of probationary service in their appointments, or, as the case may be, they can have them terminated. This is the practice which extends generally over the Public Service, except, for some reason, in the case of the Fire Service.

The probationary period of public officers other than the police and members of the Fire Service is of one year's duration. It has therefore been recommended by the Chief Fire Officer, and accepted by the Cabinet, that the manner of enlistment of policemen should also apply to firemen. In order to do this and to bring it into line, Section 8(1) and (2) of the Fire Service Act would need to be deleted and Section 8(3) amended to provide for a probationary period of two years instead of the annual enlistment after a probationary period.

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

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, the purposes of this Bill cannot be controverted. My contribution, however, Sir, would go to a concern I have about the increasing incident of fires we see taking place in our community, and this is against a background where I am slightly puzzled as to the causes.

There was a time in our national life where cooking by kerosine oil and the use of kerosine oil for lamps, for lighting and reading was the norm. But today, with improved electrification and availability of gas, households have more means. Yet, these incidents are happening almost every week, and I am wondering where the problem lies. Is it that people are not being shown careful demonstration as to how to use the improved facilities on their premises? That people turn on their gas stove and forget that the gas would be escaping in the room and they light a match and then there is an

explosion? I do not know, Sir, but there is a concern, and I wonder if the Honourable Leader could perhaps ask some questions of the Chief Fire Officer as to what enquiries into these fires indicate as to the causes of these fires. It may be that, rather than increase the premiums for these incidents, the insurance companies should carry out some sort of public relations in educating the people who use gas stoves and gas cylinders of the dangers in respect of them.

The other concern I have relates to an experience we had in Bridgetown a couple of years ago, when there was a fire in Roebuck Street and High Street which affected a fellow law firm. I remember that while we were trying to get the documents from upstairs down into the vault rather feverishly, the fire officers were concerned that in one of the buildings adjoining that office there were some chemicals. They discovered chemicals when they went there but they had had no previous knowledge of the existence of those chemicals. This also occurred a few months ago when there was a fire on Pinfold Street, when the chemicals actually got away and ran into the gutters and into the sewage system.

I think that the call was made in the Other Place as well, that the Government should introduce legislation to require some careful registration of premises where toxic materials are kept so that when fire fighters respond to a fire, they have a knowledge of what they are going to encounter. Certainly it is hazardous to other people in the community when you live chock-a-block against one who is keeping highly toxic chemicals, and it is harmful to the fire fighters who go and start fighting an ordinary blaze and then find there is gas. So I think there is some need for legislation to compel a register to be maintained, that where certain toxic things are kept on premises, the Fire Service be notified, and that any variation of that should be accompanied by the appropriate advice so that the appropriate safeguards can be maintained.

I have much pleasure in supporting this measure.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy President, I join with Senator Blackman in some of the remarks he has made. I think the time has also come when explosives, such as dynamite and gelatin and so on for digging wells, and other explosives, should be controlled solely by the police, and not just have a situation where somebody goes and gets a permit and hands it to a well digger, and he goes down to a place that sells dynamite and be allowed to buy dynamite and caps and so on and keep at his home. I lived in Curacao for quite a while and I have never seen anybody other than the police detonating dynamite.

You will remember that the other day, some children, by some misfortune, came into contact with these explosive caps, and a little girl or boy, I think, got

damaged as a result. I think we are too lax here, and this has been going on for too long, and this is dangerous.

I think the time has come when all explosives and volatile fuels should be stored in one place or in places belonging to the Government and be only distributed with a permit from the Government, and only to responsible people. What is to stop a man who has a grudge against you from going to get somebody to get dynamite or these caps, or even those people who are going to dig wells from buying more dynamite than they really need and keep the explosives to go and blow up somebody's place if they had a noise with the people. If these things are controlled by the Government, and only the Government, you would know that you issued x amount of things and that they are issued to the police, and the police, or somebody specially allocated, would detonate these things.

This thing has been going on every since, and although it is true that we have not had many people involved, how about the fishermen? I know quite a number of people whose hands have been blown off as a result of dynamiting fish. How did they get the dynamite? If we control these things, it would stop a lot of the nonsense that has been going on.

If we are going to rule the country, we should rule it. We do not want to rule it with any iron hand, but we need to rule it sensibly, and I think this is one of the things we have got to look into as a Government, stop allowing any and everybody from getting those explosives.

12.10 p.m.

Gas stations sell bottled gas. The time has come when these bottles should have a meter on them so that people would know how much gas is in them. I am of the opinion that a lot of people who buy gas go and buy a lot of half empty or half full bottles, whichever way you like to put it. You should not have to go and buy a bottle and have to go back at the station to get another bottle because the gas has run out by the time you get home. I think the time has come when these bottles either should be weighed so that you get your full weight, or a meter be placed on them so that you would know that you have x amount of pounds of pressure in them, so that you would not be gypped as is being done now.

In supporting Senator Blackman, again I would say that the time has come when — let us not take it lightly, I am very serious about it — the Government must control all explosives coming into this country. Not only the Government must be allowed to distribute these explosives on a permit basis, but the Government should be responsible for detonating these things and not leave them willy-nilly in the hands of Sam, cow and the duppy and everybody. (You cannot say "Tom, Dick and Harry", because Tom is dead, so I would only be able to talk about

Dick and Harry.) The time has come that we must control these things, and if we do not do it, we are going to find ourselves in a very awkward position.

Thank you.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy President, I, too, should like to join Senator Blackman and Senator Boxill in expressing my concern about the number of fires which have really besieged poor people in this country for the last six or eight years. Every day we hear about a house being burnt down. We get more house fires now in Barbados than we get cane fires. We have been able to control the incidence of cane fires over the last three or four years, but at the same time we have a very big incidence of house fires and they are all poor people, except you get a store in town being burnt down.

It is the small houses being burnt down. I do not know if it is the gas cylinders that is causing it. I do not know if it is electrical faults. Whatever it is, it needs some kind of serious investigation, because, day by day, there is another fire, everything has been lost by poor people, the whole house, everything, and people become homeless with big families. This has been very, very significant in the last three or four years.

It is high time the Government institutes some kind of remedy so that we can get to the bottom of these fires. Some people say that the electric company might have too much voltage. There is a new house that was burnt down in St. John last year that we have been working on, the Prime Minister and myself in his constituency, a brand new house. It was approved for wiring and, the next thing you know, the house burnt down. The Fire Service was saying that it might be some electrical fault. It might be the study of some kind of case eventually.

There are several houses being burnt down in this country every year, more or less monthly now, and we cannot hear the reason for the houses being burnt, but we know a lot of people have been homeless, people with families and new houses are being burnt down. Four years ago, you used to hear about old people's houses being burnt down and old people burnt up in the houses. Now you get the young people's houses being burnt down. So there is something wrong with the fire thing in Barbados.

It is high time that the Government institutes some kind of investigation along with the Chief Fire Officer so that we can get some kind of understanding about more safety measures for people in their houses, both from the point of view of the gas cylinders and from enforcing more rigid standards with the wiring of houses, according to the rigid standards set by the electric company. We have rules, and we should see that those rules are carried out to the benefit of the people who are paying their money to get

their houses wired, and that when they wire their houses, they do not get these electrical faults coming along and have their houses destroyed.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. Deputy President, I just rise to support Senator Morrison on his appeal for proper investigation into house fires in Barbados. I have noticed that this is an area that is drastically lacking in my career as an attorney-at-law. I think the Fire Service is supposed to investigate the causes of fire when the fire actually breaks out, but on a number of occasions where I have had cause to act for a fire victim, in whatever circumstances, whether it be a warehouse having burnt down and the person's goods having been destroyed or in a hotel being damaged by fire and the visitors' goods having been damaged, and I have had occasion to write for a fire report, you find that, invariably, when you ask for the causes of the fire, the fire report really tells you very little. It seems to me that a critical enough investigation is not carried out, because you get this fire report and you need to know what are the causes of the fire to determine whether fault lies with one person or the other, and the fire report really should tell you. It is of no use to you really.

There seems to be a need, bearing in mind what has been said by Senator Morrison, Senator Blackman and Senator Boxill, for the Fire Service to beef up their operations in this area, analysing files and finding out what is the cause and thereby seeking to provide some sort of remedy for this proliferation of house fires. I just want to draw attention to the fact that there seems to be some failing on the part of the Fire Service.

I can recall that when the Attorney General met with the Fire Department not too long ago, they were complaining about onerous working conditions and lack of support. I know that this Bill will do something to assist them in removing one of the irritations that they have to face. I think that there is perhaps a case for Government giving a little more attention to the Fire Service, especially with a view to beefing up their operations in terms of an analysis of house fires.

SENATOR A. J. N. PHILLIPS: Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support the sentiments, Sir, of the former Senators who spoke.

I have two or three concerns in another area in relation to fires, and one concerns the lack of fire alarm systems. With the lack of fire alarm systems often goes the loss of life, because, in most instances, when persons realise that their house is on fire, it is too late — they are engulfed and cannot make any exit.

Furthermore, Sir, in some of our systems of construction, we have to use these protectors, those wrought iron grills to windows. Very often, Sir, you find yourself in a sort of a prison situation where, if a fire occurs, there is no exit. I think this is a serious matter which should be looked at by the Government through its agencies such as Town and Country Planning and Housing Division. It is a serious matter to be caught in a house in which you have no exit, in which you may be aware that there is a fire but you cannot reach an exit.

The other matter to which I want to refer is the lack of insurance by the poor people in the country. What often happens is that after a house fire, there are a number of requests made to the Government, to the mercantile community and to individuals, because, obviously, the houses for the most part are not insured and persons have to be seeking the help of others to replace their units.

I believe that Government could have a look, through their insurance corporation, at some means of subsidizing insurance policies for poor classes. Since we have measures like the Unemployment Levy, maybe we could have a sort of an insurance levy where everybody would have to pay some small percentage of their earnings towards the support of an insurance policy which could assist in replacing persons' houses. I believe that this is an area which Government should look at very, very seriously, because I believe that the replacement of houses has a serious cost to both the Government and to the community at large. I believe that, if such a policy was implemented, it would be a tremendous help to the Government, the community, and particularly to those poor persons who are unable to have, or have not been educated to the importance of insurance.

12.20 p.m.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy President.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I would like to assure all Senators that I have taken very careful note of what they have said and propose to bring all these points to the attention of the Cabinet in a general way, and, where I can, specifically to the departments of Government more concerned. I, therefore, do not wish to respond individually to the points made, except to say that I thank the Senators for making them.

I have a concern of my own which is connected to the other contribution, but which I think is of its own kind. I think that the word should go out from this Senate today in an appeal to all the people of this country not to leave children unattended at home in houses with all the windows and doors shut. I think it is perhaps the most terrible tragedy of all in a fire that anybody, but most of all young children and old people, who perhaps cannot move

about easily, loses his or her life simply because he or she cannot get out of a fire. I know it is trite to say that we are all our brothers and sisters keepers, but I wonder whether we could ask everybody in this country, as part of their neighbourly concern, first of all, to make sure as far as they are aware of it — those who know children of neighbours living near to them who are left alone — to see if they can spare any time to just go next door and look and see that all is well before they retire.

But more so, parents on no account should leave children alone, except for very grave and sufficient reasons. I mean, obviously if a child is ill and you have to run to two or three houses in the next street, or to a doctor or whatever, to get assistance for it, a parent or a guardian may have to take the risk of leaving the other children alone in order to go to get assistance for the child. I would regard that as a grave and exceptional circumstance.

The idea that you should feed children and put them to bed, shut them up in a house, and then go to pay a social call two miles away or wherever, is to me, reprehensible. I do not have any children of my own, but it is a most terrible experience for me to read that children have been burnt in their beds in houses because they just could not escape. I think that we ought to, from this board, if I may call it that, send out an appeal to the country at large to look after their children better, not to leave them alone, and, of course, what I said about the children applies equally well to the old and incapacitated.

There is not much we can do when something has already happened. But if the experiences of these tragedies can help us to prevent all others, then these tragedies would have not taken place in vain, painful as they are. So I would hope that this kind of appeal could go forward from us that, in respect of children and old people, they should not be left alone, and in the cases where it is absolutely necessary to leave them unattended for good and sufficient reasons, one should make sure, for instance, that no flammable or other dangerous materials are within their reach. It is better to dismantle a stove and take the gas cylinder out in the yard and put it there until you come back. It is better even to leave them without matches or without anything that can conceivably entice or catch their capacity for exploration. If it is a case where you tell them that they can warm their food until you get back, it is better to let them eat it cold. Take everything from them with which they could light fires.

Whatever the other reasons for house fires may be — and there are reasons which need to be investigated, as Senators have told us — I think the least acceptable reason is the burning up of children in houses. I hope that Senators would agree that this appeal should go forth from all of us who sit around this table today.

Applause.

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. SIR JAMES TUDOR, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR the Bill was read a third time and passed.
12.30 p.m.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 2 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Cap. 5.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, before 1984 it had been one of the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, and Regulations made thereunder, that the accounting officers in diplomatic Missions abroad should be the senior pensionable officer in any Mission. Then, by a decision made in 1984, the Cabinet decided that the accounting officer of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that is to say the Permanent Secretary, should be directed to appoint all Heads of Overseas Missions, that is whether or not they were public servants, as his authorised representatives to be financially responsible for the funds of their respective Missions.

When I became Minister last year, I took the view that it was safer for us to revert to the old system where public officers alone should have accountability for public funds, as it had been in the time when I was first Foreign Minister. I was able to persuade the Cabinet that the control, receipt and expenditure of public funds in Overseas Missions should properly be the responsibility of the most senior pensionable officer assigned to each Mission, and I told the Cabinet that I proposed in advance, even of rectifying the law, to give directions to reverse the situation I had found. I believe that that approach was permissible to me under existing legislation, and so I did it. But we also thought that, in order that a matter like this should not rest on the whims or on the decisions of individual Ministers, we should anchor the principle right back in the law where it was. The purpose of this amendment is to make sure that, from now on, according to law only public officers can be

accountable in Overseas Missions for the receipt and expenditure of Government funds.

I wish to share on this matter a judgment, which I admit to the Senate is a purely personal judgment, but which I have formed and which, if I may say so, cemented my view that we should go back to the old practice. We did have last year — I think this is public and general knowledge — a disquieting incident in the High Commission in London where an altercation took place between the High Commissioner and the senior public officer in the Mission. I do not believe that this took place because there was any particular ill-feeling on the part of either against the other. I think that that incident arose because the system they were both called upon to work in had broken down, and it is my judgment that it would not have taken place if we had not changed the system whereby the senior public officer in the Mission would himself alone have been accountable for the expenditure of public funds. But you had a situation there in which, by the change of the system, the Head of Mission was quite properly, as he himself conceived it, the sole accounting officer, and he took it upon himself to declare that matters which had not come to his notice could not properly be advanced or dealt with, simply because he had been by-passed in his position as senior accounting officer.

What had happened in that instance was that some repair work had been done in the High Commission, and the question of the payment of the bills arose. The senior public officer, quite properly, according to the existing rules which we are changing, took the accounts rendered by the person doing the work to the High Commissioner and said, "These bills are to be paid and here is an account of the work which has been done," and the High Commissioner took the view that simply because the law allowed him to have the last word in these matters and to have authority to spend public money, he, not having been brought into the matter before the expenditure was authorised, was unable to authorise the payment. It was settled in the end, but I tell the Senators this because I want to emphasise that sometimes when personalities clash, they do not clash because they have any endemic ill-will to each other, it is that there are discrepancies and anomalies within a system which bring them into conflict with each other, and unless, of course, they are careful to restrain themselves and see that they have to use some objectivity in working the system, they are bound to have differences.

What, therefore, we are doing with this amendment is to make sure that the chain of financial accountability is restored to where it was, that the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the overall accounting personality responsible for the disbursement of Government funds in the total Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but that his designated officers in the Overseas Missions shall henceforth, if this Bill is passed, be always

the senior public officers in the respective Ministries and not politically appointed Heads of Mission. If, of course, public officers are Heads of Mission, then no problem arises.

I have been a Head of Mission and I cannot think of any duty I would less like to perform than that one. Even although there were cases in which my opinion had to be asked, I always fought shy of that. As a matter of fact, I am going to disclose something about myself which will show how silly I am. I was High Commissioner in Britain for two whole financial years before I discovered that there was a separate vote in the High Commission for entertainment, and I was entertaining the Government's guests at my own expense. Two whole years passed, and I could not do anything about it, because the money went back in the Treasury. I think it was just as well, although it was bad for me, that that happened. I think that it is best to let public officers account for public monies and for politically-appointed diplomats to steer clear of these matters.

12.40 p.m.

I do not know what motivated the last Government to make that change. I have not discovered a reason. I do not particularly wish to know that either. But I certainly would not be at all happy being Minister of Foreign Affairs if politicians could spend Government money in Overseas Missions. I asked the Cabinet to let us revert to the old system that I knew, because I always think it is better to work in the system you know, in which case you would always be knowing the system you are working.

I recommend this Bill to the Senate and beg to move that it be now read a second time.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy President, I do not know if what I am saying is necessary that I rise to support this Bill, because, naturally, I have to support the things that Government brings or sit down, but I would like to add further.

Before I go on to the substance of what I want to say, what happened in England, and I would like to say this to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, happened because people were sent out to Missions who had no affinity to the general populace. People were sent out just because they were somebody's friends, or because they went to school at Harrison College, or because they had big names. You do not take up any and everybody and send them to represent people overseas. You find all sorts of Barbadians overseas — poor Barbadians, white Barbadians, black Barbadians, tall Barbadians, short Barbadians — and you cannot pick up any and everybody and send them out to represent people who are only going to see people from what colour ties they wear.

What happened in England is a very remarkable situation, because, as far as I have been told, one officer was sent up there to make peace between the two Harolds, but, unfortunately, instead of making peace between the two Harolds he found himself embroiled with one Harold. It was a very unfortunate situation for something like this to happen in a mission.

Strange enough, I came back here today with this in mind to raise. I did not know that this was on the Order Paper, because I did not see the Order Paper until just now. I did not think that any politically-appointed person should have any right to the taxpayers' money willy-nilly.

In Canada, we have a monstrosity for a car. I do not think you can give it away now, because nobody is going to want it. It is a big, overgrown cadillac, one of these long things. It would do good for a hearse. The engine had to be changed, I think, once or twice. The whole thing should have been gotten rid of and a modern car bought. You are going to have trouble giving this away! Nobody will want it! The expense involved in getting it away from the point of giving to the point of receiving is going to be so expensive that nobody is going to bother with it!

We had a very unpleasant situation in the Ottawa Office. It did not come down to fisticuffs, but it almost got to that point because of the "mcguffy" who was sent down there. Nobody in his right sense of mind could think of sending Lester Whitehead to represent anybody anywhere. If it were possible to have a brain transplant, I would almost ask to get Lester Whitehead's brain, because it is a virgin brain! I do not think he has used that yet! You do not take up those kinds of people and send them out to represent people.

He almost got himself in an unpleasant situation because he refused to pay a man who had worked for the Government. It was not until the man ripped off the door and they had to call in somebody to put back on the door that he decided to pay. He then realized the man was a serious guy and really was going to take things in his own hands to get his money. It was a small amount of money that he could have paid the man, but because he had the right to pay the man, he refused. If a civil servant had to pay this man, the money would have been paid ever since, because he was advised to pay the man. The man had worked for his money, but he did not have any time to sign it, and he kept the man coming down to the office day after day after day. The man could not get his money, so one day he heard that Lester Whitehead was inside there and said, "I am going in there." The guard said, "You cannot go in there." So he decided to take off the door. The door came off and he went inside to share some lashes! It is then that Lester Whitehead decided he was going to write the cheque and pay the man the money.

Laughter.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You are laughing, but this is a serious matter. No civil servant was going to get himself involved in this kind of business. If a civil servant knew the man is entitled to get his money, he would have paid the man his money, and all of this sort of nonsense would stop. But you have these people who think they are Gods and Lords because they can fool certain people. They cannot fool me.

He refused to pay and, as a result, the Government will have to pay to put back on the door, because it is a rented building that we have. The man ripped off the door, went in for Lester and grabbed him up — and then he signed the thing. So we had to pay the man and now we have to pay to put back on the door.

I am extremely happy to see this Bill coming before the Senate today. I came up here to draw it to Senator Tudor's attention that the time has come when we should revert to the original plan.

Being a politician, there is not anybody who can really say truthfully that they have got me into anything dishonest or unpleasant. They may say that I was rough and uncouth. That is all right. They could always say that I am short, but they can never say that I was dishonest. I do not agree, and I could never ever agree, that any politician has any right to be picking on people or firing people, paying out money or withholding money. It is not within our prerogative. That is for the civil servants.

Senator Tudor said he was appalled when he discovered this thing, and so am I. Therefore, I am extremely happy to add my little bit to this Bill. I hope that it never happens again, because, as a taxpayer, I do not want to have to pay to put back on another door because some annoyed customer takes off a door to get a small amount of money that the Government owes him.

I thank you.

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy President, I should like to commend Government for this piece of legislation. It is absolutely necessary, and I would really like to know the reason why it was changed to give politically-appointed Heads of Missions the right to disburse taxpayers money. It could lead to a lot of underhand dealings in the administration abroad, because if a foreign Government was paying money secretly, for whatever purpose, then the Head of a Mission, politically-appointed, could give a discharge to the Government without the civil servants knowing it. It need not pass through the books of the Mission at all. That is what worries me, and why it was originally done around the time of the American invasion, I would like to know. It was done almost at that period and, therefore, this Government, which is committed to honesty in political affairs, has had to revert to the original rule.

I would not be a member of a Government which would allow people, political people chosen at the whims and fancies of the heads of Governments, to sign receipts on behalf of the Government. Ministers who are elected cannot do it. I could not do it when I was a Minister, neither the Leader of the House nor the Honourable Senator Boxill. The Permanent Secretary was the legal officer and everybody knows that. The Opposition say they do not handle money, which is true, but then you pick up a politician, or you pick up somebody chosen willy-nilly, and you give him the right to receive millions of dollars, or disburse hundreds of thousands of dollars, as I said, without the knowledge of the pensionable persons in the Service. I am very happy to see that at the earliest possible opportunity, this Government has brought this amendment. We never knew any explanation for it because the system worked. We have been independent for almost 21 years — it is coming up — and only in the last few years it was changed, because there was never any hue and cry that it was not working.

12.50 p.m.

Under the Financial Rules, you must have somebody who is accountable. The politician who is appointed Head of Mission can be dismissed tomorrow and go back in private practice or do what he likes. But the civil servant, if his pension is at stake, has got to give some degree of accountability to the person who administers the financial affairs of this country.

This legislation may seem simple just reverting back to something, but I would like to know the original reason which forced the last Government to change it to give to politically-appointed Heads of Missions the right to sign for and receive money on behalf of the taxpayers of this country. I suppose the whole story will never be told, because we will never know why, and I would like to commend this Government, and especially the Minister of Foreign Affairs, for doing, at the first possible opportunity, what is only the sensible thing to do, which is to go back to the accountability of civil servants for the disbursement of taxpayers' money.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. Deputy President, I will be very brief. As a newcomer to the Senate, I am not familiar with the antecedents of this matter, but it seems to me that Government deserves its commendation for the action which is being proposed. One need hardly do more than offer this, since the explanation given by the Leader of Government Business, Senator Sir James Tudor, has been very clear, lucid, rational, I think, beyond question, and I would like to lend my support to it.

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Deputy President, my contribution is in support of the measure, but I want to take a slightly different guard on the matter.

The Bill deals with the accounting officer in Overseas Missions, and I just wish to make reference to the fact that with I think one exception, all the Missions of Barbados at the present time are headed, or will be headed, by non-career persons. I am not going to use the word "politicians", because I think one of the appointees will not want to be described in those terms. I have a concern about this. I understand that perhaps non-career people might be the best exponents of Government policy in a foreign land, but I wonder, Sir, if having almost 99 per cent, and I think the exception at the present time is Brussels, of your Heads of Mission held by non-career persons is a fair matter to the public officers, because there is a legitimate expectation and ambition of someone who has worked in the Public Service that he will rise to the top of his profession and expect to head a Mission.

I can understand that a number of Missions could be reserved for the Public Service and some could be held by nominees of the Prime Minister in terms of persons who are not in the Public Service. But I wonder whether it is fair to the people in the Foreign Service that, virtually with the exception of Brussels at the present time, and Washington, where the holder is soon to demit office — and although the new appointee to Washington, although a retired public officer will not be a career person in the office — opportunity for promotion is cut off from them.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, I did not believe that I would wish to speak on this matter, but I could not let the comments of the previous speaker pass without saying something to clarify what is possibly a misconception in his mind. The power to appoint persons in the Foreign Service — that is all persons, not only career persons, at least not only political appointees but also career officers, and indeed every officer for that matter in the Foreign Service — is reposed in the Prime Minister, according to the Constitution of Barbados.

The Foreign Service has been the fast lane in the Public Service for some time. Many public officers, who, if they worked in other Ministries, might have been forced to pursue the grind of the mill for a long time, have been fortunate enough, some through political manoeuvring, to get into the Foreign Service and get on the fast track. Having got on the fast track, they became Senior Foreign Service Officers, and it is a fact that most of the persons preferred for appointment to posts of Deputy Permanent Secretary recently have come out of the Foreign Service. They have come out of the Foreign Service because they are not ready for the level of Permanent Secretary, but having been in the fast lane, they are ready to go into a Ministry to learn to work in a different way.

The Foreign Service has its own special ties, so persons in the Foreign Service have benefitted more in recent years than other persons, generally, in the public

sector. I am certain that persons in the Foreign Service can really have no concern about promotional opportunities, because when one reached the level of Head of Mission, one is expected to be at the level of Permanent Secretary, and if you went through the ranks of the Public Service, you will discover that of the existing Permanent Secretaries, four or five of them — and if I think I may even find a sixth — have already gone through that process in the Foreign Service. To put them back into the Foreign Service as Heads of Missions is almost to demote them, and, I can even go further, it is not to make best use of their existing skills, so that there has to be an opportunity created for other persons in the community who wish to make the sacrifice of going to serve the country overseas.

There will always be, I believe, opportunities for persons in the career service to reach that level, but take the present ambassador at Brussels. Having reached that level, he has been promoted to the rank of Permanent Secretary. How long does he stay there? Do we keep him there for ever and not allow him to come back into the Public Service to work in a location where his service can be maximised? That is a problem we have as a small country, and it is necessary for us to understand that. I do not think that the present Government has any reason whatever for wanting not to have career officers heading Missions, but the present state of affairs in this country push us to a position where, if we want to make the best use of the skills of these people, they have to come and serve at home base.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. Deputy President, I wish to thank my colleague for that particular intervention, because it saves me time in making my own. I not only had it in mind to draw the Senate's attention to the observation which he has made, but I had some others of my own which I can now make.

We are going to have, perhaps in a couple of weeks' time, a full dress debate on Foreign Affairs. I have laid today a large document called Development and Diplomacy, which I hope Senators will read and will be ready to debate, both generally and specifically, all the issues which arise in this matter.

I should just like to say that, since I have taken up this Ministry, I have found that one of our areas of weakness in our diplomacy is that, as a small country, we have not yet developed what I would like to describe as "a professional diplomatic service". Because of changes of Government, and because through changes of Government people from outside of the Civil Service have been brought in, I think there is a misconception here that we are appointing politicians for their own sakes. What we are trying to do is from time to time go outside of the ranks

of the Civil Service to develop the professional diplomatic skills, if there are any, in the wider community.
1.00 p.m.

I should like to draw to the attention of the Senate that it is not, for instance, that the Soviet Union is *per se* a more developed country than ours that their diplomacy appears to be so smooth, or indeed smoother than the diplomacy of the United States Government. The reason the Soviet Union — and I would want Senators to bear this in mind — seems to have fewer problems in its diplomacy than the United States is simply that it does not shift its people around. Ambassador Dobrynin, who has just gone back to Moscow, has been the Soviet Ambassador in the United States for something like 25 years. He has run through, during that period, about nine Secretaries of State. So he has been in a position to tell his people back home, "Do not take any notice of this one", and when the next one comes, "Take that one seriously. You are going to have to give me different instructions to deal with that one. He is not a push over like the last one." Similarly, President Gromyko, who is now Head of State of the Soviet Union, had been Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union for as long as I can remember. So Gromyko has run through 100 other Foreign Ministers from 30 or 40 Presidents and Prime Ministers.

It is the continuity in your diplomacy which gives you success. I would like this for my country. If I achieve nothing more as Minister of Foreign Affairs in this particular stint of duty than this, I would like to be able to start building up a corps of diplomats, drawn both from the Public Service and from in the wider community, so that whoever has the Government will always be able to call on the resources of these people, whether they are members of my party or members of the other party. I think it is, for instance, absurd that merely because a Government has changed, we necessarily have to dispense with the services of good diplomats, or because a Government has changed you cannot call upon people in the community who may be businessmen, who may be architects and who, although they do not know it, may have the kind of diplomatic skills you want. I would like us to be able to depoliticize our diplomacy. I do not know how I would succeed, but I am going to try very hard for it.

I wish to give the assurance that we are not wedded to any principle of keeping public servants out of senior diplomatic posts. As my colleague have said there is, in most instances, a necessity to move them out in order to guarantee their upward movement in their careers, because the public conception of an ambassador is somebody higher than highest. This is not so. An ambassador is a public servant like any other, but because of what is perceived in the public mind as the attractions of living in a big country, drawing their allowances and so

on, people tend to think that if you are an ambassador you are higher than the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communications and Works. You are not. He has to give you instructions at sometime or other, and mostly you have to depend on him for how you are to carry out specific diplomatic functions.

I have been an ambassador, I have been a High Commissioner, I am now a Minister. When I was an ambassador, I had to take instructions from Ministers. I now give instructions to Ministers. Sir William Douglas — I never went before him, thank God, and therefore my conception of working with him is not that one — was in my office last week for a briefing, and he particularly told me that he would regard me as being there to guide him and to give him instructions so that he can carry out the diplomacy of Barbados. He has been Chief Justice, but he is now an ambassador and he falls under my discipline. I never thought the time would come when I would be able to say to him, "Douglas do not do that!"

Laughter.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: So there it is. We will try, and we will give you the best service we can, but you must have some confidence in us.

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. SIR JAMES TUDOR Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, the Senate was resumed and the Bill reported as having been passed in Committee without amendment, and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: If Senators do not mind very much, I would like to do the third Bill and then have the luncheon adjournment. It is the Bill to amend the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, and I ask leave for Senator Lewis to take charge of it.

PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF TAXES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 3 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, 1987.

1.10 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, Cap. 85, came into existence in 1963, and it provided for taxes to be imposed on the basis of statements made during Budgetary Proposals by a Minister of Finance. The provision in the legislation is that with effect from the date on which statements are made in Budgetary Proposals, or

if contained in another piece of legislation, it would become effective either in the date of a specific Bill or on the announcement made during Budgetary Proposals.

The original legislation provided that those statements in the Budgetary Proposals would be effective for a period not exceeding four months, unless formally made into legislation approved by Parliament. During 1984, the former Government extended the period during which those measures remained effective to 12 months. The effect of that extension was that a Minister of Finance in any one year could make budgetary proposals, they would be imposed on the taxpayers of this country for a period of time up to 12 months. And he could come back the following year and repeat the same proposals, without bringing a formal legislation, and extend them for a further 12 months, and he could come back the third year, although it is unlikely that it would happen. But it was very possible with the existing legislation to continue to extend budgetary measures year after year without formalizing them as proper and adequate taxation.

At the time of the amendments in 1984, this Government disagreed with the extension from four months to 12 months, and it was one of our commitments to the people of this country that we would, at the earliest possible date, reverse the legislation to ensure that, within a period of four months, any budgetary proposals would have to be formalized in law if they are to continue.

This measure, therefore, seeks to give effect to that provision. So the amendment which we now propose in the legislation today reverts to the earlier position of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act whereby, four months after budgetary proposals have been made, the Minister of Finance, or some other appropriate Minister, would have to bring legislation before the House of Assembly to ensure that taxes applied would continue. It is a straightforward measure and I do not consider that it can be much of a controversy.

I propose, Mr. Deputy President, that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support this Bill. I think it is on record that the only time that the whole body of independent members voted against the Government was on this particular Bill, as far as I can recall. Everyone of us voted against it, because we could not see how it would be possible for a Government to keep people waiting 12 months before they instituted whatever they were going to do, and we all opposed it.

So I have no difficulty in supporting this, and I am sure that other independent members will follow suit. We opposed the 12 months the last time and we will do it again this time.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. Deputy President, I also rise to support this Bill, as a member of the past Senate with Senator Jones. We all opposed the Bill because, for the same reasons as the Minister introducing the Bill set out, there it was that a Minister could make an announcement that from midnight tonight so and so would happen and it would be a year before it happened.

I was not conscious of what Senator Lewis has said, that it could be repeated from year to year without ever bringing it to Parliament. But we felt that it was wrong that the Minister could do this, and, before the people's representatives had a chance to debate the taxation, a year could pass and the taxes would be imposed.

Like Canon Jones, I have no hesitation whatsoever to support this Bill, Sir.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Sir, I am not going to be long, Mr. Deputy President. I should like to draw to the Minister's attention that I see absolutely no justification why anybody in Barbados, or anywhere else, should have to pay \$25 to get a passport that only lasts five years.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: All of this is about taxation. I am not speaking to you anyhow.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy President, there is another point I would like to raise at this stage. I noticed that when it is advertised that someone wants workers, maybe they only want three people but they get 200 people, but the 200 people who are applying for the jobs must go to the police to get a Certificate of Character and they have to pay \$10. Multiply 10 by 200 and see how much money you make. The Government should not be exploiting people, and I think these are wicked bits of legislation that we have to reverse. I am only bringing this to the attention of the Minister.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I do not mind him. I did not vote for you, Sleepy. Hush your mouth!

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I am not saying, Mr. Deputy President, that the police have not got to be paid for it, or somebody. Everybody working have got to be paid. But I am saying that I do not see any reason why 200 people applying for one job, that means 200 times 10, should each have to get a certificate.

Aside.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: I wonder if he is representing people, or if he really represents people.

(Aside: SENATOR F. G. SMITH: I have not lost an election yet.)

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: And you never ran in so many so good either. That is your business.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: Yes, I am addressing the Chair, Mr. Deputy President. A man who scarcely can write nearly beat him. He only beat him by 20 votes as a Minister. So do not let Senator Smith give me this kind of talk and think that he can get away with it.

I am saying now, and this is my privilege, that I do not see any justification for anybody paying that kind of money for a passport. All people who must get a Certificate of Character must go and pay so much money to the police to get a Certificate of Character to apply for a job that, most likely, they do not get. Two hundred people applying for one job and they do not get it. Why should this thing be happening? I think that the time has come when we have to look into these things if we are representing poor people. We are representing people, poor or rich, and therefore these are bits of legislation that we have to get off the Statute Book.

Asides.

SENATOR N. W. BOXILL: You are all right. You have got to make friends with the police, not me, man.

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

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Senate was resumed and the Bill reported as having been passed in Committee without amendment. Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. L. V. H. LEWIS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, I think Senators might wish to have a respite now.

I beg to move the suspension of the sitting until 2.30 p.m.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.30 p.m. was put to the Senate and agreed to, and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT suspended the sitting accordingly.
1.25 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

(Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair)

PUBLIC BUSINESS (RESUMED)

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Civil Establishment (General) Order of 1987 seeks to give legislative effect to deliberations which have taken place between representatives of Government and representatives of the several trade unions representing public officers and teachers.

The original proposals for increases in salaries and wages for the period beginning April 1986 were received from the National Union of Public Workers, the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Secondary Teachers Union, the Barbados Workers Union and the Barbados Association of Principals in Secondary Schools.

Proposals from the Prison Officers Association were received some time towards the end of settlement and no proposals were received from the Fire Service Association.

Since the agreement reached by the unions and Government, the Police Association has written indicating its acceptance of the level of increases accepted by the other unions, with one or two conditions which will have to be examined.

The bases on which several proposals were said to be formulated were the upward movement in cost of living since the 1984-86 contract; the effects of taxation, especially Income Tax, on the disposable income of workers — but after the Budget of July 1986 all those

considerations of the effect of taxation were probably turned the other way — they argued that there were comparable hikes for workers in other sectors in the community and they set out what was their understanding of the estimated growth in the economy over a two year period 1984—86.

Consequent upon those considerations, the National Union of Public Workers sought increases of 25% at the bottom of the scale, Z.39, rising to 15.5% at the top of the scale, S.1, estimated to cost \$27.1 million, and I hope that if this is reported, they will report correctly and not what they said on the news media last night and today. The BWU sought an 18% increase on salaries at the bottom, Z.10, rising to 10% at the top, S.1. The estimated cost of the BWU proposals, if implemented, for the people they represented would have cost \$9 million. The BUT, on the other hand, was seeking a 27% increase at the bottom of the scale, Z.36, or \$890 a month, rising to 17% at the top of the scale, or S.5, which is that for a secondary school headteacher, an amount of \$3 675 a month. The teachers' proposals, if implemented, would have cost the country \$12.393 million. This is for the secondary school teachers that they represented. Then the Secondary Teachers Union put up proposals, 23.5% at the bottom rising to 14.3% at the top, at a cost for the people they represented of \$1.685 million. The Association of Principals of Secondary Schools, representing some people near the top — the principals, to wit — 14.2% at S.5, which is the existing salary level for headteachers, and their proposals were not quantified.

Various negotiating sessions were held before June of 1986, and a meeting was held between the former Prime Minister at an early stage of negotiations. The NUPW and the BUT negotiated jointly after May 28, 1986, and seven joint meetings were held with those unions. There were also three meetings with the BWU and four with the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union.

The negotiations began in May of 1986, with Government offering, initially, a 5% at Z.3, which was unacceptable to the unions. When the negotiations were suspended for the General Election in May 1986, Government's offer for the first year was then at 8% at Z.39 graduating to 5.8% at Z.16 to 4.6% at Z.1. For the second year there was an additional offer of 2% for all posts from Z.39 to Z.4.
2.35 p.m.

When negotiations resumed in July of 1986 and the BUT and the NUPW negotiated as a joint team, the Government's new fiscal measures had been implemented and the unions were invited to take note of the effect of the tax free income up to \$15 000 per annum. The Government side emphasized that the tax concession

would satisfy many of the unions' complaints about the rise in Income Tax, although none of the unions was willing, at first, to accept this. In an effort to address the situation, Government's offer rose to 9% at Z.39 graduating to 1.4% at S.1, with an additional 2% across-the-board for 1987—88.

The BWU indicated a willingness to accept that final arrangement in negotiations with them and the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union also agreed, but the joint negotiating team of NUPW and BUT indicated that it was unacceptable to them. Cabinet examined the matter and directed that the Head of the Civil Service meet with the joint union team, and after two or three meetings it was agreed between the unions that the unions would accept the Government's offer of 9% at the bottom of the scale rising to 1.4% at the top of the scale, or S.1, with a 2% increase in the second year.

The union also sought, and it was accepted, that there were grounds for removing the bottom of the scale at Z.39 and adjusting the lower grades accordingly. It was also agreed that in respect of servers in the School Meals Department, the request that regular salary structures be made available for them and they not be considered as part time workers would be examined. It was further conceded that as soon after April 1987 as possible, all outstanding matters affecting teachers, including reclassification, would be addressed.

It is therefore proposed that 9% at the bottom going up to 1½% at the top be granted in respect of the year 1986—87 and that a 2% be granted to all public officers in respect of the year 1987—88, and that during the month of April 1987, arrears of pay for the year 1986—87 be paid to public officers.

Mr. President, I now move that the Resolution be approved.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is moved that the Resolution be approved. All those in favour.....

SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. President, I am sorry to be late in rising on this occasion.

The remarks I wish to make are of a general kind and seek to highlight a number of areas in the Public Service that I will ask the Honourable Minister to give some attention to.

I have a recollection, Mr. President, that once upon a time there was a grade of officer in the Public Service known as Administrative Cadet, which was a sort of recruiting grade for persons who had no real experience of the Public Service but had certain qualifications. It was designed to attract people into the Public Service at a level

where they could be kept and then utilised for the better good of the country.

I raise this, Sir, in the context that a number of the recent graduates of the University of the West Indies in this island and from the other campuses, they graduated last year, are still without employment. In one case I know of, a young man, who on leaving the Community College was encouraged by his parents to go to the university to get a degree because it would improve his employment opportunities, having taken their advice has still found himself unemployed. I do not think that I should be thought to be suggesting that Government must be the only employer of last resort, so to speak, but I am wondering if some attempt could not be made to make it possible for persons who leave the university, and have by their exertions obtained worthwhile qualifications to be provided with employment, if only on some basis in the Public Service, to avoid that sense of frustration which affects them and may make them an ultimate problem to the country.

On a more specific level, I would like to make a reference to the provisions in the General Order in respect of the grading of persons in the legal service of the Public Service. In particular, I refer to the grading of people who hold the rank of Magistrate of this country and the Chief Magistrate.

Every legal practitioner will agree that the burden of the administration of justice in this country falls upon the magistracy. They do 90% of all the criminal work, and a great deal of the civil work as well, but you have a situation where a magistrate, with all of the responsibility that he has to carry — and there is a Bill in these proceedings dealing with those courts — is graded at a level below a Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel or a Deputy Solicitor General who do not necessarily have, and with great respect to those officers, the same strains and obligations which those persons carry.

2.45 p.m.

A magistrate is S.5, Chief Magistrate is S.4 and these other officers are S.3 to S.2. I wonder perhaps if the Minister could look at some possibility of their being a regrading of these officers to make the magistracy an attractive place where not only career persons but those in the private sector might wish to make application.

Sir, with those few observations, I should like to say that I am in general support of the Order. There are one or two anomalies, which obviously will creep in on a matter of this kind, but I think that since this Order only really has a rather short gestation period, and we would have to look at another Order of this kind in another year or so, these things could be looked at in the interim.

Thank you, Sir.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I should have mentioned that when the original Bill was laid, there was a correction done which was dealt with in the House yesterday, and I really want to draw attention to an amendment to the Order, lest it be thought that we were trying to slip anything through.

There was an amendment in the Order which provided for a new sub-clause 11(5) and which corrected an error in the first printed Schedule A. It related to the post in the Prime Minister's Office of Private Secretary which was superseded by a post of Senior Executive Secretary. That correction has been made. We had a long debate in here about that some time ago, so I would think that it would be remiss of me if I did not draw attention to that.

I would like to just respond to the matter of the young graduates and say that Senator Blackman's concern is our concern in the Ministry of the Public Service, because we believe that when taxpayers' money go towards training young men and women, if they fail to find employment elsewhere the Government has a duty and a care to identify with them and, as far as possible, assist them if not in finding employment in the public sector, assist them in some way to determine how best they fashion the rest or the beginning of their working life. To that end, the Chief Personnel Officer has been already requested to draw up a dossier, including all the qualifications, of those persons who have touched base with them, who have not found employment in the last three years, and there are some who have not worked for three years since graduating. Our intention is to come up with an action plan to ensure that they do not become Rastas or end up in the drug scene, because we feel that it is when you have persons properly trained and not legitimately employed that they get into all sorts of mischief, plus the fact that, who knows, there may be a future Prime Minister among those people, and the country would have been the poorer if we allow them to slip away.

With regard to the grading of persons in the legal service, magistrates and the Chief Magistrate, some representations have already been made, and when we are looking at the classification exercise beginning sometime in April or May, this year, we will certainly take that into consideration.

Obviously, there are anomalies. Whenever one has finished an exercise like this, there will be anomalies. The ones that are drawn to our attention and which are recognised as such will be corrected. All will probably not be, but they will arise at a subsequent date for consideration.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 5 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the comments which I made earlier about the Resolution to deal with the public officers relate in the same way to this Resolution, the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order.

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1987

Order No. 6 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, there are full time public officers and there are part-time officers, and this Resolution is aimed at providing salary increases for those part-time officers covered by the Part-Time Officers Order.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE INCREASED WAGES TO PUBLIC AND CASUAL EMPLOYEES

Order No. 7 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the increase of wages to public and casual employees of Government with effect from 1st April, 1986.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, the Public Service comprises monthly paid employees and employees who receive wages on a weekly or hourly basis. This Resolution is intended to replace the earlier Resolution providing for what are called key scale rates for those employees categorised as public employees and casual employees under the appropriate Resolution.

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

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

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, if the Senate approves, I suggest that we do not break the passing streak, if I may so call it, of my colleague, and let him proceed with other matters standing in his name. Order No. 10.

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO PENSIONERS

Order No. 10 was called — to move the passing of a Resolution to approve payment of increased cost of living allowance to Government pensioners and to fix the minimum pension and cost of living allowance payable to all Government pensioners.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, whenever salary increases are granted to public officers, it is customary to bring pensioners into part of the action, so to speak. On April 2, 1986, the former Administration, in budgetary proposals, obtained the consent of Parliament for increases in the pension of certain pensioners. Those pensioners who had retired before March 31, 1976 were granted a cost of living increase equivalent to 50% of the existing cost of living allowance. The consequence of that was that several pensioners received increases, because they retired before April 7, 1976, which gave them somewhat better pensions than persons who retired subsequently.

Among other things, the cost of living increase, when added to the pension, gave a minimum pension of \$321.60. This Resolution now seeks to adjust that pension and cost of living allowance and round it to a nominal figure of \$325.
2.55 p.m.

It also seeks to provide an increase to those other pensioners who did not benefit from the April 1986 increase and to give an across-the-board increase of \$20 a month to all pensioners retiring between April 1, 1976 and March 31, 1987.

It is proposed also that where an increase in pension of \$20 a month when added to an existing pension gives it a total less than \$325, the person automatically goes to \$325. If a man was getting \$300 in pension and cost of living, when you add the \$20, you would still have to give him a further \$5, so the minimum increase he would get would not be \$20, but \$25.

What we are really doing is putting a bottom ceiling on pension and cost of living, and we also are providing a small increase to those persons who did not benefit in 1986. They will receive this from April, 1987 onwards. It is a step forward.

I do not believe that there is any controversy in the grant of an increase in pensions, Mr. President, and I therefore move that this Resolution be approved.

The question that the Resolution be now approved was put to the Senate and agreed to.

LEASE OF LAND TO BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY

Order No. 8 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at the Bridgetown Harbour, St. Michael to Barbados Port Authority.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, this is really an incursion into ancient history. It seems that under the terms of a loan agreement which was entered into way back in 1975 between the Government of Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank, a loan of US \$9.1 million was made available to the Government of Barbados to assist it in financing a project which included the expansion and improvement of the Port of Bridgetown. One of the conditions attached to that agreement was that "within six months of the date of the creation of the Port Authority, the borrower shall present to the bank for its approval agreement or agreements pursuant to which all the assets and liabilities of the Port Department and the assets of the Port Contractors Barbados Limited as well as the assets of any other entity considered essential to the operations of the Port Authority should be transferred to, purchased or assumed by the Port Authority."

Section 47(1) of the Barbados Port Authority Act, which came into being in 1979, I think, provides that when that Act commences, apart from lands and buildings and all interests therein of whatever nature belonging to the Crown and used exclusively for the purposes of the Port Department, all such lands and properties should be transferred to and vested in the Port Authority.

In consequence of all this, the Cabinet looked at this matter again on June 7, 1986 and concluded, among other things, that the lands to be used by the Port Authority should be leased to it for 50 years at a peppercorn rental, with an option of renewal for a similar period.

In connection with this, they had prepared a draft Resolution and submitted it to the Port Authority for consideration. The Port Authority, however, had requested that an area of 1.061 hectares of land occupied by BICO, and which forms part of a larger area which was

vested in the IDC, should be re-vested in the Crown and be included in the lands to be leased by the Barbados Port Authority.

The Cabinet has agreed to the above proposal and so decided to add that small portion of 1.061 hectares to the original area of 27.52 hectares previously mentioned, so that the total area now of 28.588 hectares be leased to the Barbados Port Authority. So the Resolution seeks to lease these two joint areas of land to the Authority for the period of 50 years at the rate of \$100 a year, with the option for renewal.

I now beg to move that this Resolution be approved.

Sir I am passing around the plan so that Senators may see it.

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

MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987

Order No. 9 was called — To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Cap. 116.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Sir, the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act in Section 131 provides that where a magistrate convicts or makes an order, the person who is convicted or against whom the order is made may appeal at the Court of Appeal against such conviction or order. But section 138 provides that the appellant shall, within three days after giving notice of his appeal, enter into a recognisance, in whatever the prescribed form is with surety or sureties, unless he remains in the custody under Section 140.

It appears, Sir, that several instances have occurred in the past where persons convicted under the Narcotic Drugs Act of an offence and have appealed, and have entered into the required recognisance and thereupon released, if they are not nationals of Barbados or are non-residents, shades of Jerry Hall I hope not, they then leave Barbados, and where the appeal is subsequently dismissed, they can even evade punishment. So in an attempt to prevent this abuse of our laws, it has been decided, on the advice of the Attorney General and others equally knowledgeable in these matters, that there should be some amendment to the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act in a particular direction.

This Bill seeks to increase the amount of the recognisance which may be required — that is, I suppose, bail money — by a magistrate. In the case of an appellant who has been convicted by a magistrate of a narcotic drug

offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment, the offender can only be released on bail granted by the High Court while he is awaiting an appeal. This, in the judgment of those who know, will tighten a lot of loose screws in the present administration of the Act which allow people to leave our country, being non-nationals, when they have seriously broken our laws.

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

SENATOR F. G. SMITH: Mr. President, with the Bill itself there can be no quarrel, and I would just like to throw out a suggestion to the Attorney General.

I do not know whether the Honourable Leader of the House knows whether a comprehensive Bill dealing with narcotic and the penalties of a more severe nature is likely to reach Parliament soon, but it is a pity the opportunity was not taken when the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act was being amended also to amend Section 27. Under Section 27 of this said Act, Sir, a person charged with treason shall not be admitted to bail except by order of a judge. Where a person is charged with any felony other than murder, the magistrate may, if he thinks fit, admit him to bail. So you get with treason a High Court Judge can grant bail. With a felony other than murder, the Magistrate has a discretion. But Subsection 3 says:

"Where a person is charged with any offence other than those mentioned in subsections (1) and (2) — (that is treason or murder) — the magistrate shall admit him to bail unless there is evidence sworn before the magistrate that the accused person either intends or is likely to leave the island or by any other means evade the trial or unless such person has been previously convicted of a felony."

This simply means, Sir, that you could have 40 convictions for marijuana or for drugs, the magistrate has to give you bail, because marijuana is not a felony, and if you are a Barbadian not likely to evade trial or run away, it is automatic. Perhaps I am not speaking as a defence attorney, but my interest is as a defence attorney is much less than my interest as a citizen of this country who is seeing the young people of this country destroyed by drugs, and even although criminal law and narcotic offences perhaps pay the best money now — people do not have any money for the ordinary breaking and entry, it is the drugs that bring in the bread — I still cannot, as a responsible member of this Honourable Senate, allow my interest as a defence attorney to transcend, nor am I allowed to be inferior to, my interest as a responsible citizen. What I would say is that this section should be amended to give the magistrate discretion to refuse bail if the person has previous convictions for drugs. As it is, the

magistrate can make bail for \$10 000, which they find so easily, because it is drugs, but he has to give bail.

Ordinarily, if a magistrate refuses bail for any offence at all, you can apply to a High Court judge for bail for any offence at all. So even if it were a narcotic offence and the magistrate refused bail, the accused could still go to the High Court judge. But the magistrate now has no discretion. So if you have got ten previous convictions for drugs and you come before the magistrate with 20 pounds of marijuana, he has to give you bail. He cannot refuse. He can make it any amount, although the Magna Carta says that bail should not be excessive, but he has no discretion. If people with previous convictions knew that if they were caught with drugs again they would not get any bail — and, of course, if they went to a High Court judge with previous convictions he would be unlikely to refuse it, too — then this might contribute in some small way to halting the use, proliferation and distribution of drugs in the country.

I spoke to the Attorney General myself, and I think he sees my point, and I have discussed it with other colleagues including the Minister of Transport and Works, who has recently been elevated to Queen's Counsel, and they see this point. I want the magistrate to have a discretion and not be bound, as subsection 3 says, to give bail, no matter how many convictions a man has. If he has a previous conviction for stealing a cucumber, or he had a previous conviction for a felony, then the magistrate has a discretion. But if he has none as a pure drug dealer, the magistrate cannot refuse him bail.

If we are taking drugs seriously, and the proliferation of users, then I would like the Attorney General to even come down soon with an amendment to this subsection, giving the magistrate a discretion to refuse bail in cases where the accused person has had a previous conviction for drugs. The other part is very good, but I have seen magistrates hesitate and "himmy — haw", and then the lawyer asks if they know Section 27, subsection 3, and being a lawyer, he has to give your client bail.

I would just like to draw to the Attorney General's attention that in the tightening up on the drug question, this question of a magistrate's discretion to grant or refuse bail in Section 27, subsection 3 should not be amended, not necessarily to deprive the ordinary criminal or the ordinary accused person of a right to bail, but if you are a persistent offender in drugs, then the magistrate should have a discretion to refuse bail. If those who deal in drugs know that bail is not automatic, especially if they have not got a conviction for a felony, and if they are Barbadian, it might in some way contribute to dampening the ardour and cutting down the use, sale and the possession of drugs.

3.15 p.m.

I just want to mention it openly. I have mentioned it privately, as I said, Sir, to the Attorney General and to other legal colleagues in Government. I think they agree with me that that section 2 could make a contribution to the cutting down of the incidence of drugs if persistent drug offenders know that bail is not automatic under subsection (3) of section 27.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. President, I rise to support both the Bill and in a general way the point that Senator Smith has made about Section 27 of the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act. However, I would approach Section 27 in a slightly different way from Senator Smith.

Both the Bill and Section 27 are dealing with the whole question of bail. Section 27 deals with the question of bail at the very outset of the trial when the accused person first comes before the court and has to plead, and the Bill deals with the question of bail at the stage where the person has actually been convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment and then appeals that conviction.

Section 27, as Senator Smith quite rightly says, ties the hand of the magistrate in a narcotics drug charge, where the accused person has never before had a conviction for a felony. If he has never before had a conviction for a felony and he now comes before the court on a narcotics drug charge, which, under our law, is a misdemeanour, the magistrate has absolutely no discretion and must grant him bail.

Of course, as Senator Smith has quite rightly pointed out, this has caused a lot of problems for magistrates, and I have known of one magistrate who, in spite of Section 27, has refused to grant people charged with narcotic drugs offences bail. Even though you point out to him, "Section 27 ties your hand," he will tell you, "I know that, but I have the public of Barbados to protect, take it to the High Court," and he would remand the person in custody. You then have to go to the High Court, and we really need to get away from that type of situation where a magistrate, because he feels he must protect the public of Barbados, flaunts the law.

What I would suggest to Senator Smith is that the correct remedy for that is to make narcotic drugs offences felonies. If a narcotic drugs offence was a felony, then, automatically, the magistrate would have a discretion under Section 27. In other words, it would not just be a case of automatic bail. The magistrate would then sit down and say "You are now before me on a felony and I now have the discretion to decide whether to grant you bail or to deny you bail." That is an easy way of dealing with it, simply making it a felony.

It is really ridiculous the type of offences that are felonies and those that are simple misdemeanours. As Senator Smith pointed out, if you steal a cucumber that is

a felony. Any offence of theft, no matter how minor it is, is a felony, and this goes back to the way in which the old common law treated offences against property. Any offence against property was deemed an extremely serious offence. Obviously the narcotic drugs offences are fairly recent offences — they do not harp back to the old, great moral wrongs that constitute the common law offences — and therefore they have been made offences by statute as opposed to the old customary common law.

The rule of law is that where you have a statutory offence it is deemed to be a misdemeanour unless the statute which creates the offence explicitly says that it is a felony. I think that this is one of the areas of law reform that we need to look at. There are a number of statutory offences which, because the Act creating the offence does not say they are felonies under our law, are therefore only misdemeanours. Anybody in their right mind today would be of the opinion that a narcotic drug offence in the present situation in Barbados is a much more serious offence than stealing a cucumber, to use Senator Smith's phrase, and I think that an easy way of getting around this is to change Section 27 provision to make it a felony.

I would urge upon the Attorney General that a systematic programme of law reform be instituted where all of these offences are looked at, because a narcotic drug offence today is much more serious than it was to the well-being of Barbados probably 40 years ago when this drug problem was not as rampant as it is today. So clearly there is a need for an on-going programme of looking at the laws and bringing them up to date and making the changes that are required.

I totally support the Bill before the Senate today. I think it is a Bill that all practising lawyers would support. This is a loophole that has existed in the law of Barbados for a long long time. The position today is that if a visitor to the island is convicted of an offence at the Magistrates' Court level, is sentenced to a term of imprisonment and appeals the sentence, the magistrate automatically has to grant the person bail. What happens is that the magistrate will usually ask for a surety and a large sum of bail, and the overseas visitor will bring in the money from the United States, Canada or wherever and then skip the country. In fact, some of the embassies have now reached the point where they no longer stand bail for visitors from their countries, because they get the sureties to sign and then they leave the country, never to return.

Of course, it is expected that they will leave the country. When you are granted bail, it is expected that you will leave the country, because, generally, the appeal case does not come up for months. This is another problem that we are going to have to look at, that appeal cases do not come up for months. He is given his passport, but you expect him to come back to stand trial. Human nature being what it is, very few people would come back.

It means they would never come back to Barbados again, but very few people would come back to stand trial. It means that they are virtually paying for their freedom. They have committed the offence, they have been convicted, they have been sentenced and they pay for their freedom, because, obviously, they would not come back, and the surety money would be collected by the Crown of Barbados. Everybody accepts this.

If you represent a visitor to the island and he is convicted, automatically you appeal, regardless of how strong a case you have. Any lawyer worth his salt is going to appeal, because it means that the person will automatically be granted bail and has the option whether to leave the country and pay the money, or leave the country and then come back. So it is definitely a loophole and this does a lot to correct it. It is across-the-board to all visitors to the island.

Similarly, it is a good measure in terms of drugs, because the drug menace is becoming such an alarming proposition in Barbados that it is only right that the only court that should have the right to grant bail to a person convicted of a drug offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment should be the High Court. That should not be for a magistrate, not in the prevailing circumstances in Barbados. The offender should be forced to go and have the matter properly adjudicated before a High Court judge.

I hope this is but the first salvo in a general programme on the part of this Government against drug trafficking in Barbados. I think that this Democratic Labour Party Government has the moral legitimacy to go on an out and out campaign against drugs in Barbados. It was one of the areas that the party focused on extensively during the last General Election, and now that we have been elected, I think that it behoves this Government, having that type of moral legitimacy and having that type of mandate from the people of Barbados, to go on an all out campaign against drugs in Barbados. I would like this to be a broad-based campaign not one aimed at punitive measures such as this Bill, but also involving drug education, drug rehabilitation and co-ordinating the diverse efforts of all sorts of institutions and all people in Barbados who are already playing their part.

3.25 p.m.

You see people of one organisation holding a march or a seminar, or a set of lectures, and really and truly we are duplicating efforts. If Government could put together a cohesive and co-ordinated programme, I think that that would really be in the best interest of the people in Barbados. So I welcome this measure so far as it relates to the Narcotic Drugs Act, and I am hoping that the suggestion made by Senator Smith and myself about making narcotic drug offences felonies as opposed to what they are now, misdemeanours, would be implemented,

and that very soon we see a full-scale onslaught by the Government of Barbados against drugs.

My final point is that if we are now denying people automatic bail and saying that they must go to the High Court, our court system has to get its act together because you cannot be keeping people remanded in custody and have them wait for months and months before their appeal comes up. This is one aspect that the Attorney General's Chambers need to look at very, very seriously. We have now taken away the automatic bail, so the possibility is that a lot of people who were automatically granted bail will now be remanded in custody at Glendairy pending their appeal, so the type of thing that went on before, and still goes on today, where you have to wait months and months before your appeal comes up, can no longer continue. You cannot deprive a citizen of his freedom, or even a visitor to our island, and then keep him waiting for months on end before his appeal is heard. I think it now behoves the Attorney General to make sure that the court system is so structured that appeals are expedited.

I thank you.

SENATOR V. C. FRASER: Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bill. I am very happy today to see that we are talking now about taking some very strong measures in connection with the whole question of narcotics in this country. I think it is a step in the right direction.

I want to congratulate the Government for taking this step. I know sometimes these things take a long time to come, after many of us have been constantly harping and working on various committees to try to get something really constructive done, but we see that the laws are affecting the whole exercise, and sometimes to us it seems an exercise in futility. So I am happy that this has come, and I hope a number of loopholes that we have looked at with the Attorney General as a women's organisation, and have had discussions with the Minister of Women's Affairs and so on about, will be removed, because the citizens of Barbados feel very upset when people can come here and we can get the impression, which I as a citizen or any other citizen will get, that these people are doing as they like and are just leaving scotch free. What is worse is that we have seen incidents where people will go abroad and try to give our country a very bad name as to whether justice was done or was not done with regards to them.

I join with Senators Comissiong and Smith in that I would like to see the penalty as stiff as possible. I would like to see us go back to the cat-o'-nine tails, because we do not want to have a generation of people who we are going to be depending on to be Prime Ministers and Senators as people without brains. Somebody talked about a virgin brain this morning, but they will not even have virgin

brains. They will have no brain at all because narcotics will destroy the very fabric of the person.

I have seen these people at home and abroad. But I am concerned with at home, because I am a nationalistic Barbadian, and I am glad that my Government is very concerned about drugs. I sincerely hope that we do not keep this back, that it is dealt with as a matter of speedy urgency, if there is such a term, and any loopholes are dealt with quickly, because we cannot have laws to prevent us from dealing with those people who come here to destroy our country and to destroy the lives of our young people. Drugs are one of the major social problems in this community today, whether we accept it or not. I am dealing with Barbados. I have to be concerned with Barbados, because I live here, and the people who are going to break houses, who are going to steal things and kill people because of drug addiction, and who are going to schools to put drugs in sweets, balls and all sorts of things, as is happening here in Barbados right now. I have been on the Advisory Committee on Drugs and I know what is going on. I therefore hope that the Attorney General will see it fit to ask his officers to work very, very expeditiously on all of these matters so that we can further benefit.

Mr. President, again I congratulate the Government for taking this step. I hope that, as the journey of a thousand miles begins one step, we will take nearly the thousand very soon and try to get illegal drugs cleaned up from around this place.

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I rise to thank those Senators who have spoken and to give them the assurance that their concerns are shared by all members of the Government. It is certainly within my knowledge, and I give this assurance, that the Attorney General and his department, and other people who have some knowledge of this matter, are looking very carefully, if I may say so, very urgently, at all the concerns which have been expressed here.

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

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and the Senate went into Committee on the Bill, Senator M. deL. JORDAN in the Chair.

3.35 p.m.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On motion of Senator the Hon. SIR JAMES TUDOR the Senate was resumed and the Bill was reported as

having passed the Committee without amendment, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

On separate motions of Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. SIR JAMES TUDOR: Mr. President, I think we have come to the end of our business, and I wish to thank Senators for their efficiency and despatch of the business before them.

I am at the disposal of the Senate in this matter, but what I am proposing is that we should adjourn *sine die*,

because, among other things, our Chamber is going to be used for the whole of next week by the Other Place for the debate on the Appropriation Bill. I do not know how much more time they will need on that matter, but I must warn Senators that I might possibly be asking for a meeting of this Chamber on Monday, March 23.

I will only now, if the Senate so desires, move a motion for adjournment *sine die*, which I so do.

The question that the Senate adjourn sine die was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.

3.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR 233

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 9 months ended 31st December, 1986.

The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation for the year ended 31st March, 1986.

The Barbados Harbours (Amendment) Regulations, 1987.

The 1st Annual Report and Financial Statements of the National Health Service Board for the year ended 31st March, 1986.

The Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1983.

The Shipping (Incentives) Order, 1987.

Diplomacy and Development — A Review of the Foreign Policy of Barbados.

The Estimates for 1987—88.

MOTION RELATING TO SITTING

Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR 233, 237

Appointment of temporary Deputy President.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 237

CONGRATULATORY SPEECHES

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR C. A. BLACKMAN AS QUEEN'S COUNSEL 234

Senator Tudor, 234; Senator Smith, 234; Senator Shorey, 235; Senator Jones, 235; Senator Comissiong, 236; Senator Blackman, 236.

MESSAGES

MR. DEPUTY PRESIDENT 237

Message re absence of Governor-General from duty from March 7—14.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Senator the Hon. Sir JAMES TUDOR 237

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1987.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1987.

Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1987.

Resolution to approve the increase of wages of the public and casual employees of Government with effect from 1st April, 1986.

Resolution to approve the lease of land at the Bridgetown Harbour, Saint Michael, to the Barbados Port Authority.

Bill to amend the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Cap. 116.

Resolution to approve payment of increased cost of living allowance to Government pensioners and to fix the minimum pension and cost of living allowance payable to all Government pensioners.

FIRE SERVICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987 238

Senator Tudor, 238, 240; Senator Blackman, 238; Senator Boxill, 238; Senator Morrison, 239; Senator Comissiong, 240; Senator Phillips, 240.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987 241

Senator Tudor, 241, 245; Senator Boxill, 242; Senator Smith, 243; Senator Shorey, 244; Senator Blackman, 244; Senator Lewis, 244.

PROVISIONAL COLLECTION OF TAXES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987 246

Senator Lewis, 246; Senator Jones, 246; Senator Ward, 247; Senator Boxill, 247.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 1987 248

Senator Lewis, 248, 250; Senator Blackman, 249.

**CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS)
ORDER, 1987.....250**

Senator Lewis, 250.

**CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME)
OFFICERS (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1987 ..250**

Senator Lewis, 250.

**INCREASED WAGES TO PUBLIC AND CASUAL
EMPLOYEES 250**

Senator Lewis, 250.

INCREASED COLA TO PENSIONERS.....251

Senator Lewis, 251.

**LEASE OF LAND TO THE BARBADOS PORT
AUTHORITY 251**

Senator Tudor, 251.

**MAGISTRATES JURISDICTION AND
PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1987 ..252**

Senator Tudor, 252, 255; Senator Smith, 252;
Senator Comissiong, 253; Senator Fraser,
255.

SUSPENSION 248

ADJOURNMENT 256

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, C. A.

BOXILL, N. W.

COMISSIONG, D. A.

FRASER, V. C.

JONES, Rev. Canon I. McK.

JORDAN, Hon. M. deL.

LEWIS, Hon. L. V. H.

MORRISON, A.

PHILLIPS, A. J. N.

SHOREY, Dr. L. L.

SMITH, F. G.

TUDOR, Hon. Sir James

WALCOTT, Hon. F. L.

WARD, L. A.