

Am. L. H. Lewis

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1986 – 91

THE SENATE

Wednesday, February 28, 1990

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Parliament Buildings, on Wednesday, February 28, 1990, at 11.20 a.m.

PRESENT

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

Senator the Honourable L. V. H. LEWIS (Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office); (Leader of the Senate);

Senator A. MORRISON;

Senator N. W. BOXILL;

Senator D. A. COMMISSIONG;

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

Senator Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND;

Senator A. J. N. PHILLIPS;

Senator T. A. PRESCOD;

Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM, M.B.E.;

Senator the Reverend Canon I. McK. JONES;

Senator Mrs. P. Y. FORDE;

Senator J. S. GODDARD;

Senator Dr. L. L. SHOREY;

Senator the Honourable Dr. C. D. CLARKE, (Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs); and

Senator A. W. A. McClean.

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. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, I am commanded to lay the following documents:-

1. Instrument adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 76th Session held in Geneva in June 1989.
2. The 30th Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Board of Tourism for the year 1988/89.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order No. 1.

ORDER NO. 1 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE SALE BY THE CROWN TO MARITA CLARKE
OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT
BENTHAMS, ST. LUCY

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, this Resolution which seeks approval for the sale of Crown lands to Marita Clarke is a matter that has been under examination for a number of years.

In 1927 the Crown in its right of Government acquired certain lands at Benthams, St. Lucy and these lands were utilized for the purpose of siting the Post Office at Benthams in that parish.

It was by private treaty that the Crown purchased this land from a Mr. A. F. Ward and the St. Lucy Post Office was sited thereon. The Post Office closed in 1963 and the building which stood on the lands went into a state of disrepair so that in 1971 it was necessary to remove it because it posed a health hazard.

Since that time the site has remained vacant and overgrown with bushes and efforts were made over the years on two or three occasions by different individuals to purchase the land.

A Miss Marita Clarke who is owner of adjoining property made approaches to Government to purchase the lands and on two or three occasions action was suspended before the sale was completed.

It is now proposed, Mr. Deputy President, to sell the land to Miss Clarke. She owns the property east of the site. She has agreed to payment of the sum of \$16 000 for the parcel of land and there is no Town Planning objection to the use of the site for residential purposes.

Government's inability to make use of it, therefore, propels Government to dispose of it by sale to Miss Clarke. I beg to move that the Resolution be passed.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Deputy President, in rising to support the Resolution, I know that Government has indicated that it is unable to make good use of the particular area of land and that the intended purchaser, in all probability, will be able to do that. Under those circumstances we can have no serious objection to the Resolution.

However, I think this Resolution affords us an opportunity to raise questions pertaining to Government's overall land policy – land policy not only in relation to Government lands, but in relation to all lands in Barbados.

In recent times with respect to Government lands and with respect to private lands, this country has been alarmed by developments which indicate that what we thought was a clear-cut policy on the part of Government with respect to lands seemed not to be so clear-cut in the minds of the existing legislators.

The most recent incident has to do with Government lands and we are still waiting to see how that matter could be resolved. But I must say that the community at large would have been receiving rather disturbing signs which seem to suggest that persons in official quarters or some persons, and remember "some" means at least one, seem to be condoning encroachment on the lands in Zone 1 area by persons who are establishing houses in a kind of squatter situation.

There are two immediate things wrong with that. We would not want to encourage the development of squatting as a phenomenon in Barbados. We know all the problems that that pose not only for the community. But squatters, by virtue of their situation there they cannot consider themselves or cannot be considered to be living in the most desirable circumstances in relation to the tenure on the land.

Their lot will forever be precarious. They can be removed at anytime.

Going beyond that, the problem of squatting can take on horrendous proportions if it should ever take route and one would expect that since we have been fairly free of that phenomenon in Barbados all over the years, that a responsible Government would see it as part of its responsibility to ensure that that phenomenon is not imported from other countries and introduced into Barbados.

11.30 a.m.

On the question of the Zone 1 lands, I would have thought that it would have been entirely accepted that housing, in particular, and other activities which have been associated therewith – certain things which could threaten our water supply which can pollute our water resources – would be banned from the Zone 1 area. Indeed rather than condoning further housing development there, wherever it exists, that one should be looking to the time where it could be phased out, meaning if a house should be removed from the Zone 1 area, no house should be restored to that spot, under any circumstances.

We are hearing that the officers in the Ministry of Housing, no less than the Minister of Housing has articulated a view that the Ministry be lenient on people if it can be shown that at some time in the past – I do not know how distant past – some houses existed on a particular spot in the Zone 1 area, they would countenance a house being reconstructed on the said spot. I do not understand the reasoning behind that. But it seems to me to be a principle which is antithetical to the one which informs the idea that we should protect our water resources.

We have also been hearing, from other quarters, statements which suggest that certain representatives seem to see their first loyalty as with their constituents rather than with the country.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator McClean, we are debating the sale of Crown Lands in St. Lucy and while we are on that subject, I should like, as far as possible, not to let us have a full debate on the Zone 1 area, et cetera. I should prefer you to confine your debate to the sale of the Crown lands in St. Lucy.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Deputy President, I agree that reference to the views of a representative might go outside the ambit of the discussion, so I return to talk about matters pertinent to Government's land policy narrowly defined. Government's land policy must address the question of utilization of Zone 1 lands in the same way that it has addressed the disposition of this area of land that we are talking about now.

I am saying that Government must accept, as an imperative, that they have to protect the integrity of our Zone 1 lands, they have to protect our water resources from pollution. They have to take a policy stance which would preclude the construction of houses and introduction of other activities into the Zone 1 area where it is indicated by the professionals that those activities run the risk of polluting our resources.

Going beyond we also, in terms of our land policy, have to address utilization of lands for agricultural purposes and for other purposes. We have to address the question of reserves of land for a national park and the like. We have to address the question of the East Coast. Again, we thought that in Barbados we had a clearly defined land policy, as far as development on the East Coast is concerned. Suddenly we learn that that land policy seems not to be so clear in the minds of those who have to implement it, at the moment.

Again I would suggest that if the present administration wants to establish a new land policy they should do that up front and tell the country what it is. But for the time being, we are persuaded that the policy of the country has been – and that until we learnt otherwise, the present administration accepted that policy – that there should be no housing development in certain areas of the East Coast. That has been violated and all sorts of excuses have been advanced for that violation thereof including the fact that the physical development plan does not constrain Ministers. The only thing which really constrains a Minister, ultimately, is the Constitution. That does not mean that a Minister should not recognize that he should conform to plans, policies and legislation which he himself would come to Parliament, along with his colleagues, and change. If he should feel that it should not so conform to these things, come right up front and change the Development Plan; let us have a new Development Plan which would be expressive of the policies of the present administration.

I think there is also the question of land policy of agricultural lands. I know that there is an idea that we should try as best we can to preserve agricultural lands in agricultural use. We hear every day of the large amounts of land which are being taken out of agriculture. Some, just to go in to ruin, whilst others have benefited from a change of use and so on.

We know that our agricultural sector in Barbados now is as weak as it has ever been. There is a particular need to address the matter of rehabilitation of agriculture. That must start with a clear understanding of land use policy in the realm of agriculture.

I should like to call upon Government to address the question of land use policy, indeed, to formulate a proper land use plan for the agricultural sector so that everyone involved in agriculture would know how to engage in long-

term planning, as far as agricultural development is concerned.

All in all, I want to call on Government to recognize that it must, in its approach to land use policy, see that as an instrument of advancing the well-being of the total community and not of any one or two persons. There should be no policies which run against reason which do untold damage to the community and which, at the same time, benefit one or two persons.

Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. President, we are coming close to the season when a lot of stories are told. But I think there is another place for them. There has been no change in the Government's land use policy to permit utilization of lands which any decision which has been taken should not be used for housing purposes, as far as I am aware. That there are approaches to utilize some of these lands, is according to my information, true. But the matter has not reached the stage of resolve, as far as I am aware. It is part of a story that we have been hearing.

11.40 a.m.

That is the only comment I would like to offer.

I beg to move that the Resolution be now passed.

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

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, we have come to the end of Public Business for today but there is a matter of urgent importance that we need to address.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION OF PARLIAMENT

Two days ago the Parliament Administration Bill was proclaimed except for Sections 16 and 17. Those two sections will also come into effect on April 1st. The Parliament Administration Bill provides for a Parliament Commission, the membership of which include eight persons from the House of Assembly, four of whom are ex officio and three persons from the Senate, one of whom is ex officio. The Senate therefore is expected to select two persons to serve on the Parliament Commission. Since the Parliament Commission needs to meet in a day or so in order to authorize certain communications between the Chairman of the Commission and members of staff of the Debates Committee, it is necessary that we take that action today. I am proposing that the Senate be suspended until 12:15 p.m. during which time the Committee of Selection will meet and on resumption the recommendations of the

Committee of Selection for the two nominees will be presented to the Honourable Senate.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, I do not think I am out of order in offering my support for the proposal for the Committee of Selection to resolve this matter.

The question that we suspend this sitting until 12:15 p.m. in order that we may elect two Members for the Parliament Committee was put to the Senate and agreed to. 11.45 a.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Senate has now resumed.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, I would like to move the suspension of Standing Order 66(5) to enable us to proceed with the report of the Committee of Selection.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I now report that the Committee of Selection has met and, in order that we may decide on the two, the question is that Standing Order 66(5) be now suspended.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I am not opposing the proposal, but I would just want to point out that you would be entirely aware that I have not had the opportunity to see the report that will be made and in the circumstances I will anticipate that I will be permitted to clarify any point which I feel needs a clarification from the point of view of my contribution to the proceedings. I hope it will not happen.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You have my assurance there is no problem. Senator McClean, you have my assurance. Okay.

The question that Standing Order 66(5) be suspended was put to the Senate and agreed to.

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have the honour to report that the Select Committee has met in order to select two persons from this Honourable Chamber together with the ex officio Member to sit on the Management Committee of Parliament. We report therefore that Senators Goddard and Boxill each received three votes for selection of that committee together with the ex officio Member who is the Leader of the Senate and that Senator McClean received two votes. Therefore, the two Members of the Committee

who received the majority of votes were Senators Goddard and Boxill. Yes, Senator McClean.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Deputy President, I do not think it is entirely true to say that anyone received any votes. What we had was a nomination process where I nominated Senator Boxill and myself. Senator Lewis nominated Senator Boxill and Senator Goddard, and Senator Blackman nominated Senator Goddard and Senator McClean and Senator Boxill supported the nominations of Senator Lewis. I do not think that I voted for anyone including myself. So I think it is an error to refer to the matter as one of voting. You will recall that earlier I had suggested that the construction you are putting on what happened was not entirely what I thought it was.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that the report which we received from the Committee of Selection be adopted and that the Senate confirm the appointments of Senator Boxill and Goddard to the Management Commission of Parliament.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. Deputy President, in relation to that, I note that we have had none of the details relating to the discussion which took place in the Committee and therefore perhaps I will be repeating things that I said there.

Basically, I think we should start off by noting that the Commission is replacing the Debates Committee and included among the Members of the Debates Committee were the two Opposition Senators and Senator Goddard and the others were Government Senators. The proposal coming from the Government side and not supported by anyone on the Select Committee other than the two Government representatives is that the two representatives of the Senate should be one from the Government and Senator Goddard as an Independent Senator. I am saying that the Opposition's interest in the matter of the administration of the affairs of Parliament which includes the Senate must be recognized and deserving of an Opposition Senator being a Member of that Commission. I wish to point out that the only Member of the Official Opposition who is a Member of the Commission is the Leader of the Opposition ex officio and that the third party in the House of Assembly also has a representative. Therefore, on the entire Commission, the Official Opposition of this country has no higher representation than the third party and also you have the same level of representation from among the Independent Members of the Senate who cannot really represent anyone. They can only speak for themselves and any particular interest that they personally represent. They do not have a collectivity of Independent Senators to form another grouping. The Official Opposition represents the entire country and that really ought to be respected. If Government is persuaded that you should have an

Independent Senator as one of the Senators on the Commission, that should indicate to Government that at least three Senators ought to be on that Commission.
12.40 a.m.

It is totally insensitive for Government to propose a situation which excludes the Opposition from any Senatorial representation on that Commission. The Senate is a Chamber in and of itself and we have interests up here. The House of Assembly is another Chamber. The Commission has to look after both of these Chambers and other matters pertaining to the affairs of Parliament. It is not practicable for the Leader of the Opposition to be able to speak to all matters bearing on concerns pertaining to the Senate. He can only speak in so far as he may have been briefed in advance. And in the context of meetings things crop up where there is no opportunity for immediate briefing. That suggests to me that an Opposition Senator should be there, not to mention that it says a lot about the attitude of the Government to the Official Opposition of this country, when they can put up proposals bearing on the House of Assembly's membership and the Senate's membership that give a third party, a party other than the Official Opposition, the same level of representation on the Commission as the Official Opposition of the country.

We have seen other signs that the Government has not yet become accustomed to the idea that the National Democratic Party is the Official Opposition in this country and must be treated as such. I think basically that that failing on the part of Government reflects on them, not on us. I am urging here now for respect for the Official Opposition of this country, for respect for the people of this country, because the Opposition represents the totality of the people in a particular aspect, and if you are going to treat the Official Opposition shoddily, you are treating the people of the country shoddily and it will not be any skin off the NDP's nose if we do not have persons there in terms of ourselves, but the whole appearance of the thing is improper.

It is not by chance that traditionally both of the Opposition Senators were on the Debates Committee, which more or less did the work that the Commission is now going to do. It is not by chance that that is so, and it is not by chance that there has been sometimes one Independent Senator thereon, just as it is not by chance that we are getting this iniquitous proposal coming from Government in this matter now.

I had hoped to have had the full Minutes, because they would not only have recorded what I said in there, they would have recorded what other people said. I would hope that those persons would have the courtesy to repeat what they said in there in here, and if they do that at least one Government representative would indicate that Government had no strong feelings on the matter. That is what was told to me in there. It mattered not to Government whether it

was a Member of the Opposition or an Independent Senator, once they had one, and that is what was coming through from other officials within the party in the Other Place.

You cannot say that and still insist that you are not going to accede to my very strong feelings in the matter. It has to matter to you. If it did not matter to you, you would accommodate my point of view. If it did not matter to you, you would see that the proposal I am making is rather more decorous than the one you are making; so it must matter.

I am saying that the matter is for the Senate. The Senate has no real proposal before it; it has a report with three names mentioned and the Senate can choose whichever two of those three they feel like. Maybe the Senate can even go outside of that, but at least they can choose whichever two.

I would like to implore Senators to recognise the interest of the Official Opposition of this country in this matter to have representation from among its Senators on the Commission, to recognise the anomalous situation that would obtain if the proposal should go through where the Official Opposition will have just one ex officio Member and nobody else, not even an elected Member. The other Opposition will have a Member elected within the discretion of Parliament and the Official Opposition will have no one elected within the discretion of Parliament. Tell me whether that is fair.

We know that some people feel that the NDP should not ever have been formed and they try to turn a blind eye and they say all sorts of funny things. But it cannot be fair for both Chambers of Parliament, based on the recommendations of Government, to elect a number of Members of the House, a number of Senators and not one of them elected from the Opposition. The one Opposition Member is ex officio. And if you think it is fair to elect a Member of the Barbados Labour Party to the Commission, you can only elect one from the House of Assembly, because none is up here, and no one at all by way of the discretion of Parliament from the Official Opposition, well do it. Ride roughshod over us, ride roughshod over the sensibilities of the people. Do it, but I implore this Senate not to do it.

I would hope, having heard that somebody was cracking a whip, and that it mattered not to the leaders within your party who was the second person, that that is true and that it means that you have a conscience vote in the matter.

I thank you.

SENATOR J. C. W. WICKHAM: Mr. Deputy President, it is very difficult to reject Senator McClean's argument and I implore the Senate to pay heed to it, in the

name of the democracy which we celebrate, and explore the possibility of acceding to his implied request.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: Mr. Deputy President, I really endorse what Senator Wickham has just said. I have been listening to, in my opinion, a very logical argument and presentation by Senator McClean. I feel that we would be lacking in propriety if we did not support that line of reasoning.

I thank you.

SENATOR J. S. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy President, it is a little awkward as I am one of the two persons being recommended by the Committee of Selection. I respect what Senator McClean has said and I do share his view that it would have been much better if this Commission had three representatives from this Chamber; one from the Government, one from the Opposition and one from the Independent Senators who I believe have an important role to play within our parliamentary system.

It is for that reason that I will allow my name to stand, but I do share the views expressed by Senator Wickham and Senator Jones and would ask that it be put to a vote that the Government and the Opposition be represented on the Commission.

I thank you, Sir.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: Mr. Deputy President, I just want to refer to one aspect of this matter. The argument has been put forward here that there will be a lack of propriety in this type of nomination as is proposed here, and by extension a lack of propriety in the National Democratic Party having the same amount of representatives on that Commission as the Barbados Labour Party. If we are just looking at form as opposed to substance, I suppose this argument of a lack of propriety can perhaps hold water. But if we look at the substance of it, the fact of the matter is we have the Barbados Labour Party, a party that captured 42% of the votes in the 1986 election.

12.50 p.m.

We have the National Democratic Party, a party that was created by four sitting Members of Parliament who were elected on a Democratic Labour Party ticket, whose personal vote or National Democratic Party vote would be minuscule.

We have that party being allowed to take over the role of the Official Opposition and to pre-empt the position of a party that represents 42% of the voters of this country. Now, I am talking about form and substance. I cannot argue against the form of it but we have to look at the substance as well.

The substance of it is that the Barbados Labour Party represents far more people in this country than the National Democratic Party. In fact, we have to question really and truly who the National Democratic party represents because the sitting Members of Parliament were elected on a Democratic Labour Party ticket and this is one of the weaknesses in our whole parliamentary system, this whole Parliament that we sit in. This is one of our glaring weaknesses.

We had a situation in Trinidad where the people's National Movement only has three members in the House of Assembly. The Panday group broke away from the NAR with four members but yet they had the propriety not to form the...

Aside.

SENATOR D. A. COMMISSIONG: It is the law in Trinidad? Senator McClean tells me it is the law in Trinidad. I do not know that that is the case. As far as my recollection is of the Trinidad Constitution... Unless there is some other law governing it, I do not know that that is the case.

The point is in Trinidad we still have the Peoples National Movement forming the Official Opposition. I cannot argue against the fact that in terms of the formalities of it, the NDP is the Official Opposition in Barbados. But in terms of the substance of it, there is a great impropriety in what obtains today in Barbados with the National Democratic Party pre-empting, as far as I can see, the legitimate position of the Barbados Labour Party in forming the Opposition of this country and when things begin out of skew, the effects from that follow like night follows day.

This is the only point I am making. Perhaps, very soon we will have to be looking at a means of correcting that type of situation so that it can never occur again and I think that we in this country need a Cross The Floor Act where if a person is elected on a particular party ticket and he wants to cross the Floor he should have to go back to the people in a by-election and that, to me, is the only fair, reasonable way and the only way that is consonant with justice in dealing with matters of this nature. This is a glaring defect in our parliamentary system and it is something that we will have to correct or we will get anomalies like what has occurred here today.

I thank you.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Honourable Senators, please. Are there any further contributions? If there are no further contributions then the question is that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted. Will Honourable Members please...

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Again on a point of order.

I am submitting to you that the committee that I sat on did not come here with a definitive recommendation for two people. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me right, Senator Lewis pointed to you that we have to come back with the three names to this Senate and they would have to vote on it.

I was not party to any resolution, assenting to it or dissenting from it in terms of a proposal that Senators Boxill and Senator Goddard be appointed. I was party to a discussion which was wider than that and names were thrown out by way of nomination.

There was no voting with respect to those nominations because if we had come to voting I certainly would not have voted in a way which would lead to that interpretation. And I am asking, therefore, that you recognise this and do not, as such, indicate to the Senate a proposal which was never made by the Selection Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I am going to make it very easy for the Senate. I will withdraw the motion that I made and substitute the following motion, that Senator Boxill be appointed as a Member of the Parliament Commission.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that Senator Boxill be appointed as the Parliamentary...

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Sir, I am not quite sure what the procedure is going to be. Could you explain, Sir, if there are going to be subsequent nominations so that we could get a picture?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. Thank you, Senator Shorey.

The procedure is that we should have the three done separately so that we should then see exactly what is the wish of the Senate. Are you clear because all three nominations will be put up separately and in that way it will be absolutely clear what is the wish of the Senate.

The question that Senator Boxill be a member of the Parliament Commission was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Are there any other nominations?

SENATOR Dr. L. L. SHOREY: Mr. Deputy President, I wish to move that Senator McClean be a member of the Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you.

SENATOR THE REV. CANON I. McK. JONES: I will second that, Mr. Deputy President.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Are there any other nominations?

1.00 p.m.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, I am a bit confused with procedure.

A Committee was appointed to go into Committee and report back to this Chamber. I have not heard yet what the Committee reported.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I reported to the Committee. Perhaps you were not present. There was a Report of the Committee which I presented upon the resumption of the Senate.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Sir, has the House dealt with that Report?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes, it has.

SENATOR A. MORRISON: Definitively, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. And it has been decided that we should proceed with this matter.

Are there any other nominations? For the benefit of Senator Morrison, I should like to remind you that the motion was withdrawn. That was formally done. Just for the sake of the record, I am reminding you of that. Senator Lewis.

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: I do not know why we appear to be getting ourselves in a tangle because if a motion is withdrawn, it is withdrawn. I did not withdraw the Report. Everybody heard the Report. What I have not done is move the adoption of the Report. I avoided doing that out of an abundance of caution.

It is coming across to me very clearly that there are views represented here who did not seem to want to receive the Report of the Committee, notwithstanding the comments of Senator McClean. This is the sort of thing that we have, that Senator McClean was in the meeting, he was clearly outmanoeuvred, or outvoted, or whatever you want to call it. He comes here, he builds a contention, he gets support of persons on the other side.

In fact, I said in the Committee – and I could repeat – my interest was to ensure that the Government had one of the two people, whether it was Senator Goddard or Senator McClean. I did accept that, in my view – and I said it then and I will say it here – I believe that the Commission would have benefited from having Senator Goddard as a member of it. I could say it here. I said it there.

If the Senate does not wish to go that route, my interest is in having Senator Boxill on the Commission of Parliament. That is my interest and I have so moved, notwithstanding the Report of the Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Lewis. There is a second nomination which has been seconded that Senator McClean be a member of the Commission. I am asking if there are any further nominations, if not I shall declare nominations closed.

There being no further nominations, the question is that Senator McClean be the other member of this Commission. Will Honourable Members in favour please say ayè. Will Honourable Members against please say no. I think the ayes have it.

Therefore Senator McClean will be the second or the other member of this Commission. Senator Lewis.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. L. V. H. LEWIS: Mr. Deputy President, I beg to move that the Senate be now adjourned *sine die*.

The question that the Senate be now adjourned sine die was put to the Senate and was agreed to and Mr. DEPUTY PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly at 1.10 p.m.

CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SEN. HON. L. V. H. LEWIS.....1547

1. Instrument adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 76th Session held in Geneva in June 1989.
2. The 30th Annual Report and Financial Statement of the Board of Tourism for the year 1988/89.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SALE BY THE CROWN OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT BENTHAMS, ST. LUCY TO MARITA CLARKE.....1549

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1547, 1549;
Senator A. W. A. McClean, 1548.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PARLIAMENT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1549; Senator J. C. W. Wickham, 1550.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. Deputy President, 1550, 1552, 1553, 1554;
Senator A. W. A. McClean, 1550, 1552;
Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1550, 1553;
Senator J. C. W. Wickham, 1551; Senator Rev.
Canon I. McK. Jones, 1552, 1553; Senator J. S.
Goddard, 1552; Senator D. A. Comissiong,
1552; Senator Dr. L. L. Shorey, 1553; Senator
A. Morrison, 1553.

SUSPENSION 1549

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1549.

ADJOURNMENT.....1554

Senator the Hon. L. V. H. Lewis, 1554.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

COMISSIONG, Senator D. A.
GODDARD, Senator J. S.
JONES, Senator Rev. Canon I. McK.
JORDAN, His Hon. Senator M. deL.
LEWIS, Senator Hon. L. V. H.
McCLEAN, Senator A. W. A.
MORRISON, Senator A.
SHOREY, Senator Dr. L. L.
WICKHAM, Senator J. C. W.