THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 22, 1983.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.20 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Leader of the House)

Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry)

Mr. L. E. Sandiford, M.A. (Econ.)

Hon. L. B. Brathwaite, (Minister of Housing and Lands)

Mr. J. G. Odle, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. V. L. Johnson, M.A., (Minister of Transport and Works)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour, Social Security, Sport and Community Services)

Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary)

Mr. R. E. Brathwaite

Mr. H. A. Blackman

Mr. A. Truss

Prayers were read by Mr. R. E. Brathwaite.

Messrs. B. M. TAITT and M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, November 15, 1983.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the Meeting of November 15, 1983 be taken as read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been informed by the Clerk that members of the Opposition are asking that confirmation of the Minutes be postponed since they were only received yesterday.

The Minutes are therefore postponed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of:

A Bill to amend the Police Act.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the last occasion when the House met, a number of Resolutions dealing with the Ministry of Housing and Lands were sent down to be laid. Inadvertently, only one of those Resolutions was dealt with. I wish to give notice of the Resolutions at this stage, and to ask for your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with one of these matters today. They all deal with the acquisition of lands. The lands have already been dealt with to some extent, in the sense that work has been undertaken on them. These are just the formal proceedings.

I beg to give notice of the following:

A Resolution to compulsorily acquire 30.7 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

A Resolution to compulsorily acquire 222 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

A Resolution to compulsorily acquire 233 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

A Resolution to compulsorily acquire 55.3 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this the first time that notice is being given of these Resolutions?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: One has been dealt with already, but these Resolutions were all sent down at the same time and, inadvertently, as I have just mentioned, were left out. If Members on the other side are amenable, and you, Sir, I would be happy to have them done and get them out of the way, since it is a question of compensation and what have you in these matters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are now seeking leave to do these Resolutions in all their stages today?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes, Sir. There are all together.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It has been intimated that there is no objection to the Resolutions being done, so they can be done at the appropriate time in the course of the day.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN a Bill to amend the Police Act was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Government Business be the instant Order of the day.

Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now the instant Order of the day.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 8.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THE IVY, ST. MICHAEL FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Order No. 8 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the Ivy, St. Michael for housing development.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we advance in this nation to the point where we seek to house the population, we will have to take steps from time to time to acquire lands which are available within the environs of the central part of this country; and wherever the Government sees lands that are available for the construction of apartment blocks, for the housing of the lower income groups, as well as for sites and services, Government proposes that this should be the case.

Over the years, Governments, and I speak of all Governments now, not only the Barbados Labour Party, have been endeavouring to improve the lot of people who are without homes and to make them more comfortable by way of a shelter. But no Government could ever be able to provide all the houses required for housing the people.

There is a considerable backlog of applications for houses within the National Housing Corporation. As a matter of fact, there are far more requests for houses than we have houses at the moment existing. I believe, based upon the information available to me, that there are over 7 000 people who have applied in recent times for houses. That gives you an idea as to what the situation is. There might be a question of people who might be considering that, since Government houses are heavily subsidised, they want to move into that direction. Therefore, the Government is constantly on the lookout to see how best it can house its people, and on conditions that are reasonable.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.30 p.m.

I do not seek to take this opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with the housing policy of this Government, but dealing with the question of rentals, I want to say that the time has come when there should be a more scientific approach to the question of rentals within the National Housing Corporation. As a matter of fact, I feel that rents should be based upon the incomes of the people who live within the housing area, the total family income, so long as they are there. I also feel, as I have said before, that after living in the housing estates of Government, people should gravitate towards the ownership of their own homes, thereby releasing units within the Government estates for people who are less fortunate. Until such time comes, Government would have to continue to provide facilities for them.

The Ivy offers a very good opportunity. It is a depressed area, to a large extent. Not only that area itself is depressed and needs to be given a face lift, but there is a great demand in the total urban area for houses close to the City and to the work place, and therefore Government must look, wherever it is possible, to find lands in St. Michael on which to construct apartment houses and also for the resiting of people.

I suppose it is well known that the Government has been carrying out a large programme of resiting because of the dislocation caused by the development of new roads and new alignments. It is to this end that the Government seeks to acquire this land. There is no major problem.

The Opposition, I understand, wishes to see the plan. The plan is available to them, and I will pass it on to let them see what there is available.

With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN (St. Michael East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I listened carefully to the honourable Minister of Housing when he introduced this Resolution. I was glad to hear the explicit recognition that the Ivy is an area where there is a depressed housing condition. The corollary to that statement, therefore, would have been that since this is an area where people live in depressed housing conditions, the housing constructed in this area, or contemplated for construction in this area, would go to people who reside in this area.

The statements which followed were shot through with ambiguity and seemed to suggest that people would be moved into the area, resited into the area. As representative of that area, cognisant of the enormous social difficulties of bringing people into a district where better housing is made available for them without improving their living conditions, I would want some clarification as to whether this land is acquired for the purpose of moving people into the area, and the people of the Ivy will then be left like individuals staring at the Promised Land, but never being able to reach it.

This kind of programme, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has serious implications for a consideration of housing policy. To conduct a programme of housing where people put up buildings randomly and move human bodies in them, is no different in principle to constructing pigsties and moving pigs in them, or constructing stalls and putting cows in them.

Within recent months there has been much thundering about criteria used for the development of housing. We have words fluttering about like "efficiency" and the like, but the proposals which are contained in these notions of efficiency, when analysed, amount to nothing more than a mish-mash of plantation practices and outmoded rudimentary practices relating to the theory of the firm.

When one contemplates organising a Ministry or a department for the purpose of providing human beings with housing, one has to recognise that the provision of housing first and foremost is a social activity, and consequently, the social implications for the provision of housing must be carefully analysed. When one produces housing it must be part and parcel of a social development plan. A housing programme cannot exist in splendid isolation from the social currents around it, and that is precisely why, when one is locating housing, one must take cognisance of the environment in which it is located.

Already, for reasons best known to the Ministry of Housing, certain people have been moved into a housing area in the Ivy, which was promised to the people in that area by the then Minister of Housing. It was specifically, categorically, unequivocally and unambiguously promised to these people, and yet we find other people moving in, for reasons best known to those individuals responsible for it. I would be failing in my responsibility as a representative of these people if I did not make it clear that I would support no more building of housing in that area if it is going to create a situation where more people will be brought in from the outside, because it creates social difficulties.

Now to those who are not interested in sociological analysis, the Ivy may well appear to them, at first blush, to be nothing more than a depressed slum area somewhere in St. Michael. That area has had a long and colourful history. The people in it are complex people and one must understand its idiosyncracies, and any attempt to disrupt the normal organisation of that community will cause serious social problems – as it has.

You cannot bring anybody in there to change the Ivy. If you are not acquainted with the history of the Ivy, the people in the Ivy change people who come in there. It is not the other way around. But this whole programme, if it is suggested by the honourable introducer that it is intended to resite people into that area, indicates a clear misunderstanding of the fundamental social work that is involved in the development of housing and the provision of housing for people in low income groups. So much for that.

In the past, other areas of land within that same general area have been acquired. Over two years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a spot of land was acquired at Clarke's Land, My Lord's Hill. At the time that land was acquired, this House was told by the then Minister of Housing and Lands that that land would be used for the purpose of resiting people who lived in a depressed area called Thompson Land, in Licorish Village. Indeed, the honourable Minister for Parliamentary Affairs (Hon. L. S. Craig) who in February, 1981, was Minister of Housing, stated publicly that he had already set the machinery in motion in the Ministry of Housing for that specific purpose.

12.40 p.m.

I must now ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since that area is now covered with bush and the residents who live in close proximity to it are persecuted by a proliferation of mosquitoes and other pests, if this policy for the resiting of residents from Thompson's Land in Licorish Village has now been abandoned? I would ask the honourable Minister of Housing that question.

There is no point wasting the time of this Honourable House passing these Resolutions and acquisitions if, at the end of the day, nothing is going to be done about it. The people of Thompson's Land, having seen, read and heard of the proposal to resite them to more amenable conditions of living, are asking me day and night, when is the programme going to be implemented? I now transmit their question to the honourable Minister of Housing.

I go back to the question relating to the policy with respect to the development of housing in given areas. When we conceive of putting houses in a particular location, the Ministry of Housing would be well-advised to liaise with other Ministries responsible for the delivery of social services, to ensure that they have a wholistic look at the areas where housing is contemplated.

Very often, land in a given area could be more optimally utilized for purposes other than housing. We are a society subject to fads. It has now become a fad of late to drive around the country looking at unoccupied spaces and talking in terms of buying them for houses, or for house spots, without looking at the areas as a whole, the people within them, making an assessment of their particular needs and using the land for the purposes that are best suited for the satisfaction of those needs.

We must move away from the anachronistic policy of pharisaically patting ourselves on the back and saying: "There is land there, we brought it and we are going to put houses on it." It is not good enough. When one wants to band about words like, "scientific", then there must be a scientific methodology truly implemented. And the only scientific methodology implemented would be to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach, looking at many other aspects of life within a community and ensuring that, once a decision is made to put housing in an area, then housing is indeed the number one priority in this area.

I hope that those concerned would take the few comments that I have made in this matter in the spirit in which they are intended. But I certainly believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are storing up serious difficulties of a social nature for ourselves if we continue to think of housing in isolation from other social problems.

Thank you very much.

Mr. A. TRUSS (St. Michael Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on this compulsory acquisition of land at the Ivy, but after the last honourable Member (Dr. D. G. Blackman) had his say, I feel that I, too, should add my sentiments.

The problem is that the words of the honourable Member for St. Michael East, a lot of fancy words, in the colloquial expression of Barbadians, "pretty for days", adds up to one thing – sour grapes.

Asides.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he accused us of wasting time in this Honourable House. Wasting time, Sir!

(Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Sour grapes what!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

Asides.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Michael East please calm yourself. Please, please.

Asides.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker (I will talk if I have to).

(Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Do you think it is Craig you are dealing with?)

Mr. A. TRUSS: The behaviour of the honourable Member is indicative.....

(Dr. D. G. BLACKMAN: Man, you cannot tell me about any behaviour! Foolish red boy like you!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please. Would the honourable Member for St. Michael East, please calm yourself. Please calm yourself, please.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if I may be permitted to continue, when the honourable Member for St. Michael East was a Minister, the comments which he just made, he should have made then. As far as I am concerned, the honourable Member for St. Michael East has no right to behave in the way in which he did, asking the Minister who introduced the Bill the questions which he did, when he very well knows the answers to all of them.

I would like to state, as a matter of record, that we on the back bench of this Party, and indeed many Members on the front bench, and indeed many Members in the Opposition, in the last four or five years have

received very little, if any help at all from the honourable Member for St. Michael East.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member for St. Michael Central please speak to the Resolution before the House.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Sir, thank you for your guidance. Because of the disturbance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am being misled.

The point is that the compulsory acquisition of land at the Ivy in St. Michael for housing development is a good thing, as far as I am concerned, for the people of the Ivy. And if the Honourable Minister would like to bring a housing development in the area of St. Michael Central, I would be extremely happy to receive it, because there is not one in St. Michael Central. I cannot get a house in St. Michael Central for my people.

The honourable member who has just sat down had a housing estate in the Ivy. I cannot get a welfare house fixed in my constituency. When he was Minister, he fixed three hundred.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member desist from what he is doing. If the honourable Member continues, I will have to ask him to curtail his speech. Please speak to the Resolution before the Chamber.

Mr. A. TRUSS: Thank you, Sir.

In essence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am saying is that the people of St. Michael Central, the people that I have the honour to represent, are in dire need of housing. I, too, would like to see the Minister of Housing do something, find the piece of land, compulsorily acquire it, to set up an estate for the good people of St. Michael Central.

If he, in his wisdom, and the Cabinet, and the front bench in their wisdom, find it necessary to bring people from outside to move into the houses they build in the housing area, I have no quarrel with that. Because all of the country people are in need of housing – in St. Lucy, St. James, Christ Church, and St. George. So you cannot tell me that because we have compulsorily acquired a piece of land recently in the Ivy, only the people from out of the Ivy are entitled to live in those houses!
12.50 p.m.

I say that, as a Government, we should look at the broader spectrum of things. You cannot deal with things in isolation. We are all Barbadians. The people of St. John, St. Michael South, St. Michael West, they have their problems as well. We are the representatives of groups of people in Barbados who voted us into this House of Assembly. So if you are going to tell me that you can only build a house and put people in it from the Ivy, then you are saying that you should not build houses for the Opposition, and I am against that, because the members of the Opposition represent Barbados, and they, too, are entitled to get something, in spite of the fact they sit on the other side of the House.

When people are in need, it is my humble opinion that you must not look at where they live, come from, the colour of their skin, or the colour of their political persuasion. If they are in need, they are in need.

This sociological nonsense that is espoused by the last speaker, as far as I am concerned, is sour grapes. I would like to see every Member in this Honourable Chamber have a housing estate. I do not have one. The honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) cannot get one. The honourable Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) cannot get one. The Members for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle) and St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull) cannot get one. In fact, the Minister himself, from St. Andrew, cannot get one. Instead of the honourable Member from St. Michael East getting up and saying, "I thank you very much," he talks about the sociological imbalances and implications that are involved, simply because it concerns with St. Michael East.

I say, Sir, that we must take a strong stand as far as these matters are concerned. These matters concern all of us in Barbados, each and every one of us, and I do not know why one particular man, individual, or honourable Member in this Chamber should be singled out to receive any preferential treatment over and above any other man.

I have over 700 applications for welfare housing on file. I have, perhaps, one of the constituencies in the St. Michael area that is largely made up of the proletariat. Perhaps, I have the highest unemployment rate in St. Michael as well....

Aside

Mr. A. TRUSS: You gave people jobs at Burger Bee. I do not own Burger Bee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have even helped to write letters for honourable Members on the other side; recommendations. The honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman), two of his people came to see me within the last two months looking for work. I wrote them personal recommendations. I am not proud of it but I even had to tell a lie and say that I knew them. I stated that I knew the honourable Member for St. Philip South would be happy to see that they get some meaningful employment so that they can continue to exist.

There are areas in this country that have no political boundaries as far as I am concerned. We must all live, because we are all Barbadians first. We must stop knit-picking at each other. What every Member on the front bench is entitled to, every Member on the back bench is entitled to, and every Member in the Opposition is entitled to. As to priority, that is a matter that the Minister and Cabinet will have to sit down and decide, but we are all entitled to the same things.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not say that I am very sorry that this Resolution did not apply to the constituency of St. Michael Central. I would be praising the Government and Minister, running up and down my constituency shouting out from a fog horn saying, "Look what I have done for the people of St. Michael Central". Instead, I have to keep my mouth shut, because I cannot get a housing estate. I cannot even get a welfare house.

Aside.

Mr. A. TRUSS: The new Minister tells me to do not say that, because he will look after me. I have great confidence in him. The only problem is that by the time he gets around to me, because he is limited as far as his resources are concerned, by 1986 I may have "gone through the eddoes", as they say.

The people of this country look towards their representatives for certain things. There is no Local Government. I am not saying that I am the most accessible politician on either side of this Chamber, but my constituency is situated in Swan Street, in Bridgetown, and I see people every week, even from your constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker. From St. James, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, Christ Church West Central, St. Michael North, St. Michael South, St. Philip North and St. Philip South! It is an absolute fact. I see them irregardless of where they come from, because they are in need, and wherever I can feel a need, I try to do something, unselfishly and as a parliamentarian, looking after the best interest of all Barbadians.

Now, when I get up to make my point, I am to be insulted by the last honourable Member who just sat down. I will let that go, because in the fullness of time people show their true colours. They always show their true colours.

I say I support the compulsory acquisition of this land in the Ivy, for housing development, and I urge the honourable Minister, when he gets back to his drawing board and his officers, to try and see what he can do for the people of St. Michael Central.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the topic of housing always seem to spark a lot of heat in this House, and quite rightly so, because it is one of those social amenities that is classified as a need and not a want.

Some considerable time ago, the past Ministers of Housing have promised to bring to this House a White Paper on Housing, and I have been asking them for it for a little while.....

(At this point there was a power failure.)

SUSPENSION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member recognizes that while the reporter may be able to hear what is being said, I do not think that we should continue in this manner.

I will suspend this House for ten minutes, depending on the restoration of the electrical power.
1.00 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I think we are well aware of the fact that we have a problem here with the power. At this point I would rather think that it is better for us to take the luncheon break.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.45 p.m. This would give us enough time to have lunch, and hopefully we will have the current when we return.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
1.27. p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the honourable Member for St. Philip North was speaking. He may continue.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was making the point just before we were interrupted by the electricity that this Honourable House had been promised a White Paper on Housing, and that we are all looking forward to this White Paper, because it is such an interesting subject, touching every single person

in Barbados, that it would give the honourable Minister and this House the opportunity for a full scale housing debate so that we on this side could make suggestions for the implementation of the housing programme. Unfortunately, to date we have not as yet had the privilege of that White Paper and therefore it is a little difficult for members of the Opposition to really have an insight of the proposals and plans of the Ministry of Housing as far as the housing of people in Barbados is concerned.

However, this particular Resolution poses no problem for me, since this is an on-going housing development in this area, and the acquisition of this land will allow the expansion of this area.

I heard the Minister make a remark, on which I would like to give him the benefit of my thinking, and this was about rent. He was saying that the suggestion has been made that rent might have to be based on income. I think this would be a very wrong way of tackling your rental problem. What I would suggest to the Minister is that the approach to rent on the housing areas owned by Government should be started from a base of the economic rent for the appropriate properties.

The economic rent could very easily be ascertained, since it is well known that on houses there is a fairly small return, unlike what a lot of people think, of maybe between 3.5 per cent to 4.5 per cent return on rental units. It is a fact that it is a physical asset which really appreciates in value as the day goes on. Most people go into rentals because they are trying to provide, as they say "for their pension," but the actual return in housing is only in the area of 3.5 per cent to 4.5 per cent.

If he should adopt this base, I think the Minister should consider solving his problems by then giving credits to deserving cases, according to the requirements of those cases. Therefore, if he went into a particular house and he discovered that there was only one person working in that house, and they had so many children at school, he should develop a point scheme whereby this individual would have so many credits, which would allow him to put a specific rental on that household. Those people who would not qualify for credits, because they could well afford the economic rent for the units, would then be asked to pay the economic rent, but he must start with one base rent and allow credits for deserving cases. He should not use the income of the individual as a basis for rental, because you would have a situation where people who enjoy a similar commodity would be paying different rents. This would be a very bad and wrong way to decide your rental rate in the housing area.

The time is going to come when you will get into the whole idea of housing and rents. I would have hoped that the honourable Minister would have used this occasion to enlighten the House a bit more on the progress he has made, since he has taken over the Ministry. A lot of us would like to know what has happened with those senior officers who were suspended, if the Minister is now satisfied that they can come back to function, if the Ministry is in top gear, what provision he has made for the provision of those services that were supplied by those officers? It is obvious that unless those officers were not working at all, there would have to be some vacuum left. I would hope that the Minister is satisfied that the Ministry is now functioning and that his programme is well on the way.

As I said before, the acquisition of this particular parcel of land poses no problem, since it is the continuation of the Ministry's programme in this area.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to make one or two observations in respect of the turn which this debate took. In the first place, I want to apologise to the House itself for the type of behaviour which I witnessed, and to you, Sir, for the difficulties with which you were presented in terms of controlling the attitudes of people.

In a very short time this House will be celebrating a milestone in its history, since I think it would be reaching the 350th year as a Parliament. Therefore, there must be a lot of tradition and history to this ancient Parliament within the Commonwealth and in the world.

I would wish that when people get up to speak on matters in this Parliament, no matter how charged their feelings might be on issues affecting the country or their constituency, that they be calm, understanding and restrained in their approach. This Parliament is no rum shop out there where people can get drunk and behave as they like. Neither is it a mental institution for the cure of the ill. By the ballot box people may be able, by mental illness or otherwise, to come in here, and therefore democracy provides for that.

I would hope that in the fullness of time, men and women who come to this Chamber would respect the position of this Chamber and understand that this is no place for bad behaviour and intolerance. I myself have always approached the task which is before me with a clear understanding of my public duty and my debt to the people of this country. While it is true that it takes all people to make a world, if not the world would not be a very nice place to live in, because you need to have people of diverse opinions and attitudes, we must at all times constrain ourselves.

What affected me particularly in the earlier stages of this debate was when I glanced across in the Gallery, although we are not to take note of that, to discover that there were many school children in here who were wit-

nessing the type of display where we saw, and I would hope that in future this attitude does not continue. If people feel that they have reached the point where they are tired of being in this Parliament, where they are intolerant to another opinion, I think they have reached the point when they should depart.

There is no room for intolerance. We only had a debate recently on the situation in Grenada where it was felt that situation was as a result of intolerance of people, and therefore we cannot afford it in Barbados. I deplore what I have seen here today, and I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to apologise to you and to the nation for the behaviour which we have witnessed here today.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal directly with this Resolution, as long as I am Minister of Housing and Lands, no housing area will be developed on a parish pump basis. If it is for St. Andrew, it will have to serve the interest of Barbadians. The money that is spent on the construction of buildings for letting to the public is the money that comes from the Consolidated Fund, the monies owned by all Barbadians. It is selfish, to say the least, that anybody should think that, with the more pressing needs of people for housing in this country, you can give 67 units to one small area. I would be lacking in my duty, I would be unfit to be a Minister of the Government, to preside over a situation where one man can arrogate to himself the right to allocate 67 units in an area to the exclusion of all others. If that is to be expected of a Minister of Housing and Lands, I am not the man for that office.

Barbados is for all Barbadians, and I do not see people in terms of their colour or their political persuasion when it comes to making decisions in the interest of my country. The country and my people come first, and that should be the highlight of all people of goodwill in any part of the world.

3.00 p.m.

With respect to the development at the Ivy, Thompson Land which we heard about and Licorish Village are depressed areas. So is Cat's Castle, so is Emmerton Lane, so is Greenfield, so are parts of Beckles Road and other areas. There are depressed areas all over the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in St. Joseph the Government started a scheme at Lammings, which is not getting off the ground. It was started long ago. What has anybody got up and said today about that? One at Maynards, St. Peter was started and stopped. If you were awarding housing developments on the basis of loyalty to a Party, both Lammings and Maynards would have gotten off the ground and continued to completion. It is unfortunate that it is not so, but in my time I will try to ensure that they are completed.

The resources of the country are too slender to take care of all the needs in housing in one moment. We have got to look at the national cake and what part of that cake can be allocated to housing, and within that allocation, we have to look at the greatest needs and see the areas that we must operate in.

St. Michael is vital and crucial because people tend to gravitate towards the urban area. I myself do not support such an attitude. That, of course, is to defy world thinkers in housing. It is felt that the conditions in the country should be made sufficiently conducive whereby the people in the country will remain in the country, and I hope that in the fullness of time, and with the plans that the Government has already put in train, that the people will remain where they are and not try to come into the City area. But the main problems that I have witnessed since I came into the Ministry of Housing and Lands are problems within the St. Michael area, and parts of Christ Church and St. James. Obviously, the pressure for land space would be greater in these areas, and we have got to be careful how we allocate these resources.

The areas complained of are areas that I am aware of, but no man is an island. No man can think that one constituency must have all and others none. It will not work during my time nor in any Ministry that I am in.

The Ivy was fortunate to have a reasonably good housing development. It will, given the funds and the necessary climate for improvement, have the additional facilities that the Government has promised. But to suggest to me that there is hostility to people who come in is certainly un-Barbadian, and I do not want to put it any stronger than that.

I have never known a Barbadian to be intolerant to his neighbour unless encouraged to be intolerant by influences that might be evil. Therefore I do not subscribe to the view that the people in the Ivy, or in Belleplaine, or in Maynards, or in Lammings, or anywhere for that matter, will be hostile to their Barbadian brothers.

We are a single State. We are not even a Federal State; but even if we are not, we should have a common call which would link us together. I do not want to develop much more on this.

We have grown accustomed to the histrionics of people. We have grown accustomed to people who by their loving words can become intoxicated by the exuberance of their own verbosity, and who certainly continue to dwell in a lot of language. While this Parliament, and most Parliaments, are very adequate sounding-boards for such people of that eloquence, it does not mean that the country's business is done in such a form. I do not propose to say much more than that.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) spoke about the White Paper which has been promised. What we have done, and what was not done on that side, is promise a White Paper, which we are producing, and we hope to lay the White Paper in Parliament as soon as Cabinet has made a conclusive decision on that White Paper. The Ministry itself has finalised that White Paper and Cabinet will pronounce upon it, and after that pronouncement is made, the White Paper will be laid in this Parliament.

The honourable Member said he did not agree with the system of linking rents with incomes. That system was developed fairly successfully in Singapore, and while we cannot draft everything that is done in foreign lands to our system, Singapore has been able over a period of time to develop a number of social institutions that can stand the light of day and can be used as models for developing countries all over the world.

While I am not final in my conclusion as to the type of methods that will be adopted, I would like to see a better system employed than the present system which we now use. I am not hard and fast on any project, I am always open to any suggestion which is made to me.

The honourable Member wanted to know what progress has been made since I took over the Ministry. It is not for me to tell him that. It would be like my recommending myself for high office or some post. It is for him, as a spokesman on Housing, to make a critical analysis of the performance of any Minister from the time he is in office, so he is transferring to me the duties which he should undertake to perform. I do not propose to reply to him on that beyond what I have just said.

With respect to the officers who were put on special leave, those matters are still engaging the attention of the National Housing Corporation. When those officers were put on special leave, the Corporation was virtually without a Board, and obviously it had to function. The Act is specific as to where the power lies, and the Minister exercised his power.
3.10 p.m.

There is one thing I want to assure you, however, and it is that those officers will have to go, and there can be no compromising about their position. They have been put in the scale and weighed and found wanting, and I cannot tolerate any situation where people are not functioning to their maximum, or not functioning at all, and wherever the axe has to fall in the interest of efficiency, the axe will fall. If the honourable Member has tears to shed for them, and he will know why he wants to shed those tears, I am sorry for him. That is the position with respect to the officers.

There are people who are carrying out the functions. There is a manager, who is acting, and there is a technical officer, who is also acting in the post of the person who was suspended; and as the saying goes, the show is going on. I do not think the people who are working in the system are complaining. I think what we must be concerned about is that, essentially, the National Housing Corporation is set up to serve people, and if it is serving people, and doing it well, nobody should worry or complain. I think I have answered most of the questions.

I would like to briefly mention the honourable Member for St. Michael Central (Mr. A. Truss) and tell him that I appreciate the manner in which he put forward his points of view. I thank him for the support which he gave me on this Resolution. I assure him that when lands become available in that constituency and the need is present to satisfy the unresearched that a housing area is desirable, I will do all in my power, so long as I am here, to ensure that that is done.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What about St. Joseph?)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I have already dealt with that. Unfortunately the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) was probably at rest; maybe sleeping.

I believe I have covered all the issues, and I hope to the satisfaction, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of all concerned.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 9 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Oistins, Christ Church for road development and other purposes connected with the Oistins Re-development Scheme.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this area of land which the Government is purchasing will be used to complement the development which is at the moment taking place, and will hopefully be shortly concluded, to put Oistins in the upper reaches of the 20th century and in the 21st century.

In dealing with this matter, I would like to pay tribute to the honourable Member for Christ Church East Central (Hon. H. B. St. John) for the indefatiguable work which he has done in bringing to finality, or near finality, the work which has been taking place in Oistins for some time now.

This area on which a mobile canteen, so it is called "mobile" but it looks more permanent than mobile, is

erected, is at a point where there is a very bad road junction. As a result of a study which was carried out, it was thought that it is not the most suitable place to have such a thing as a canteen, and that that area of land will of necessity be needed to carry out further improvements in the area to complement the work which has been done lower down, to provide for a freer flow of traffic within the area.

With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to be very long on this. Unlike what the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) might think, I have no tears to shed for the senior members of the National Housing, but I am very disturbed by the morale of senior officers of the Public Service.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member cannot now start a debate on staffing at the National Housing Corporation when we are dealing with acquisition of land in Christ Church.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Minister in introducing this Resolution stated that the land at this area was required for the purpose of complementing the Oistins Development. The honourable Member did not go on to state precisely what the complementary development would be, and I wonder if he could perhaps indicate what use will be put of the land which is now being acquired by this Resolution.

It seems to me that in recent times, if I understand the honourable Member correctly, a canteen, which he described as a mobile canteen but seems more to be in the nature of a permanent fixture, was set up on the site of which the honourable Member is speaking, and it seems to me as if some fairly extensive work and expense has gone into the setting up of the canteen facility.

It seems to me that there must be some lack of co-ordination somewhere if a structure like that is set up so openly and in the face of everything. One would assume that all the necessary permission from the agencies and authorities had been got. Or if the permission has not been got, one would wonder why the facilities have been allowed to be established on such a permanent basis only to discover now, at some later stage, that the land is to be acquired for public purposes.

The question is what is going to happen to the person who has spent the money to sort of "improve" the place – I use the word advisedly expending money in the way in which it has been expended? Does the compensation which is going to be paid by Government takes into account compensation for the expense in setting up that canteen that now exists there.

Perhaps the honourable Member could indicate if Government policy has been co-ordinated to the extent that an acquisition is not now taking place in relation to lands which either Government has already approved for certain development, or by lack of proper supervision has allowed a development to grow and are now taking steps to deal with it?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): I think the honourable Member who just sat down has raised a number of points, but it is a pity that the honourable Member did not recall a debate of this House when this very piece of land was the subject matter of a debate.
3.20 p.m.

The activities that have gone on on this land are totally unauthorized and illegal. Let there be no doubt about it. There will be no compensation paid in respect of those illegal activities unless the Privy Council rules that illegality in carrying out developments can entitle a person to payment.

The Government has already made its position very clear, that this piece of land, for years, was identified as being necessary for a traffic regulation scheme at a very dangerous junction.

Under the Democratic Labour Party, the United Nations sent a Town Planner here and this was one of the areas that was identified by Mr. Nimmerford. As a matter of fact, when the plaza was being converted from a cinema into a shopping centre, provision was made then for the cutting off of the corner, and work had actually started in the cutting off of the corner. At that time, there was a gas station on the other side of the road. And it was always understood that, whoever was so foolish as to buy that land, they could not possibly get planning permission.

So now, we see that not only has there been an illegal breach of the Town Planning Regulations, but also we now have a claim, *ad misericordiam* in here, that the person should be compensated.

I am not going to join.....

Mr. M. A. KING rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what does the honourable member rise.

Mr. M. A. KING: On a point of elucidation, Sir.

May I indicate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I did not make any plea, *ad misericordiam,* for anyone in this Honourable House, and the honourable Member, who is in the course of speaking, should not misquote me by saying that I am making a plea on behalf of anyone. I raised questions to the honourable Member.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Government cannot have people who break the law and then expect to get compensation.

The honourable Member specifically asked the question, and he said that he presumed that all of the requisite authority had been given and therefore compensation would have to be paid in the land for the buildings which appeared to him to be permanent. And I started off my speech by saying that the honourable Member obviously forgot a debate in here, when we were dealing with the Town Planning, in which I mentioned this as one of the cases I used to illustrate my personal view that the days of one man planning ought to be over in Barbados. The honourable Member should recall that.

So there is no question of any Government plans being unco-ordinated. We have a deliberate defiance of Government by a few people in this case and, as I said, the question of compensation will only arise if the Privy Council rules that there is to be compensation. The Privy Council is the last Court of Appeal under the constitution of Barbados. If they rule that there is to be compensation to a person who deliberately goes out and breaks the Town Planning law, then we will have to pay because as law abiding citizens we have to follow the last Court of Appeal in Barbados. That is the only way he will get compensation.

Now to answer specifically the question, Sir, anybody who drives there will know that there have been many, many accidents; at least two or three fatal. I well recall early one morning when two young people where killed at that corner with a motor cycle. There has always been confusion as to whether the road going to Silver Sands is the through road or the road going to the airport.

When you are coming down from the airport, you are confronted with a 'Y'. So there is a scheme for allowing traffic that is coming from the airport towards Oistin that wishes to turn to go in Enterprise, to go through a slip way to the left. So there is no difficulty here, and we are getting ahead with it.

There have been one or two problems in respect of the completion of the land site at Oistins and they are being solved. They have come up against a large amount of peat in the area and the drains had to be put on secure foundations. That is the reason for the hold-up.

It is expected that the major works will be completed by the middle of December. This traffic scheme which we are dealing with here will obviously be one of the future developments. We could not do it until we had the land.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wish to make a brief intervention in this debate.

The Resolution that we are dealing with is for the acquisition of a parcel of land by the Crown compulsorily. That land is 813.55 square metres or thereabouts and it is being acquired for the purpose of road development and other purposes connected with the Oistin Re-development Scheme.

I would wish the Minister in his reply to give some more specific details as to how this particular scheme will be integrated into the Oistins Re-development Scheme, and perhaps in doing so, give us some particular statement on the way that scheme is actually really going.

I recall that, apparently, when the scheme was officially opened that there were some problems, and that there was a large body of invited guests, including – I am on to the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a little latitude, I believe, Sir,.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The latitude I will give you is going towards the East to the airport and Silver Sands, but not towards the west and towards the sea.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take note of your admonition, Sir.

I will just refer then to some of the statements made by the Minister in relation to this development and I would be very glad if he could spell this out a little more for us, because we have not had any update in this Chamber about that scheme.

Thank you very much.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is always fully lucid in these matters. I can quite see that at this time he is catching at some straws, probably, to prolong this discussion. He has raised no point that I think needs to be seriously addressed.

The Addendum is, to me, quite clear, and I have already clearly stated that it is for the improvement of the free flow of traffic in that area. A study was carried

out, and the Government is looking at a number of options as well, even though the re-development process at Oistins has already begun and nearly completed. Government might well, in the fullness of time, look at an additional road leading from somewhere lower in the Welches section maybe, going up to Oistins, and a number of other options after it has seen the type of traffic flows which you will get as a result of the improvement which has just been made to Oistins.
3.30 p.m.

But this is a very bad area. I pass there daily, and every person who travel along there will recognize that that is a dangerous intersection. Those who are coming from the Silver Sands – Chancery Lane area into the main flow from Seawell Airport or Thornbury Hill, will recognize that all of those areas up there need to be straightened out and put into a proper shape. Thornbury itself has a very bad junction, especially for those who are making a right turn on getting to the top of Thornbury Hill. Those are areas which we are looking at, which we are hoping to put right. But we have to start somewhere.

As the honourable Deputy Prime Minister pointed out, the folks involved are quite aware of the position. We do not know who lives abroad; all we can do is take the necessary decisions, and the culprits will have to be brought to justice. We are not here to try anybody. We do not believe in summary justice as is done in some countries in the world. There has to be due process of law in any trial.

There is not much more that I can add. Oistins is still being redeveloped, and as soon as the work lower down, that is to the west of this site, is completed, we will be moving on to this point where this supposed "mobile canteen" is sited at the moment.

That is all the information that I can give to the honourable Member, who is always very careful in his analysis and very forthright in his presentation, but who, for once, seems to have fallen flat this afternoon.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHEAPSIDE, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 10 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Cheapside, St. Michael for road improvement.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if it is necessary to go into a lot of discussion on this Resolution. In moving the Resolution, I would just like to say that most of these acquisitions deal with the areas of land that have been acquired by Government for the tidying up of the Cheapside-Fontabelle area, bearing in mind the siting of the Post Office in that area and the general improvement of the free flow of traffic.

Government, in its thrust to ease the traffic congestion in the City of Bridgetown and its environs, has embarked upon a massive road building campaign and in this exercise it has approved a lot of expenditure in terms of the acquisition of properties to effect a freer flow of traffic.

With those few remarks Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HOLETOWN, ST. JAMES

Order No. 11 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Holetown, St. James to provide accommodation for the Rates and Taxes Division and for a public health inspector and for a post office.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this land is part of an area of land that Government has already acquired. This parcel was actually offered to the Government, since the owners felt that it might not be of much use to them since the Government had acquired the main portion of this land.

The Government has accepted the offer, reluctantly however, but thought it in the very best interest of the vendors that it might be a wise thing to do so as not to create any problems for the persons involved. This is why this acquisition is before the House.

I beg to move Sir, that this Resolution be now passed.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT: I beg to second that.

Asides.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BUSH HALL, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 12 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bush Hall, St. Michael for housing development and other community purposes.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier in the day I mentioned that the Government was looking at developments within areas that might be regarded as depressed areas, and as a result of my making mention of depressed areas, the Government heard an approach to the subject, the like, possibly, of which it has never heard before. But I have reasons to believe that the person in whose constituency this land lies would not be adopting such an attitude, but rather would be willing to compliment, since his remarks just a few moments ago indicated that this is the attitude.

This land, for those who believe in acres, is approximately three acres of land. We feel that a number of things can be done here by way of providing recreational facilities for the community since it is a very large catchment area up there in Bush Hall and Bank Hall, and surrounding areas, as well as providing sites and services for people who might be willing to be resited.

There is another thing that I would like to add to that. Daily in the courts of Barbados a number of tenants are served with eviction notices, orders for those people to removed. The National Housing Corporation is unable, not unwilling, to provide all the lots that these people so evicted would need, and therefore it is important, even though it is extremely expensive to do, for Government to acquire all the lands that are needed. But the Government, nonetheless, considers that it has a duty for the public at large and seeks to take every opportunity to complement the land bank which it has been trying to build up over the years.

We feel that with this area being acquired in Bush Hall Yard, Government will be able to provide needed facilities within that area. It will not be in St. Michael Central, but certainly it would be contiguous to that area. Unfortunately, we cannot have a situation where it will be in St. Michael South, nor at Lammings, St. Joseph, but those are the areas which we will address.
3.40 p.m.

I would like to say on this, and I am sure it will be to the delight of the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) that I have given instructions – I do not like to use the word "directions" – that surveyors should move in *en masse* into the Bay Land and adjoining areas with a view to surveying the spots there in order that those spots can be sold to the tenants, who are entitled to them under the system which has been enunciated by the Barbados Labour Party. If they have not been in there yet, I hope I will be made aware that they have not yet gone, but they have been requested to move as quickly as possible in that direction.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. L. SISNETT (St. Michael North East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I certainly do congratulate the Government on this occasion for again honouring one of its Manifesto pledges of 1981, to acquire this property for social development.

I happen to be the representative of that constituency, and I know the pressing needs of the people there for housing and social recreation. I would want to know that once the Resolution is passed today, the Ministry involved would speedily set the wheels in motion to acquire the property.

What do we do with the land which is being acquired? I think there is no greater need in Barbados than housing. A portion of land could be set aside for some housing development, because it is one of the depressed areas, as we have heard earlier today from another speaker, and as the Minister has rightly said, there are many people within that Bush Hall/Spooners/ Bank Hall area who are in need of housing.

Also in that area there is a pressing need for recreation facilities. Some of the most talented youth in Barbados are to be found in the immediate neighbourhood of Bush Hall and Alleyne's Land. But if you were to look at it, there is no physical provision for recreation within that area – all the sporting activities are done in the streets. I would certainly hope that the Ministry would devise and develop some playing areas such as those which have been established at Deacons, with various facilities such as paddle tennis, netball and basketball. Perhaps what would be of tremendous importance to the residents of that area would be a playing area where mothers could take their children, a kind of a play park.

I feel that there is no area within the country that has a greater need for the people to have some form of outlet for their creative and artistic development. Perhaps the Ministry of Culture could put in a small community centre to assist in this area. Just across the street where the Washington High School used to be, the headmaster there had given that building to the residents where they could hold various kinds of shows – acting, singing, drama, and so on – but that has been closed. What are the residents left with?

The Bush Hall house stands in the middle of the area, and I feel that after a survey has been done, everything should be done to see what part of the main building can be retained without demolishing the building. There is some history to it. It is alleged that some time in the past slaves were sold on the plantation there, and it has also been said that the lands surrounding that portion of the property, the evergreen tree, cannot be developed.

We would like to think that whatever is done there, the people would be justified and they would see what the Government has done for them.

I would not want to be as naive as another Member has been today in thinking that a complex should be developed solely for the people of Bush Hall, because with the limited funds at Government's disposal I feel that every Barbadian should take a share of what the Government can provide. When it is housing, I would expect that it would be sensibly allocated to the residents of the area along with other people who might have a pressing need for housing.

I certainly wish to thank the Government for honouring its manifesto pledge of 1981 when it said it was going to acquire the Bush Hall house for housing and other community development. I would hope at the same time that they would move very speedily and erect something which would be more visible. I would not like to see this go into the archives as just another acquisition, I would like to see something happening in the not too distant future.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution seeks to acquire 12,148 square metres mainly for housing development and other connected purposes. It is known that housing development in Barbados is carried out by the National Housing Corporation, and as a result the National Housing Corporation of Barbados has recruited staff to assist them in carrying out those duties and functions as delegated to them under the Act under which they operate.

It is within my knowledge that the present Minister of Housing, when he took over the Ministry, was not quite satisfied with the functioning of this Corporation and invited a new Board to function.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all due respect to the honourable Member, I am not going to permit a debate on the National Housing Corporation and its staff under these Resolutions. I will not. They are extraneous to the Resolution, therefore I am asking you to stick to the Resolution before this Chamber. The honourable Member knows full well, if he wants to have a full debate on the staff of NHC, exactly what he should do.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Certain remarks made at this point by the honourable Member for St. Philip North were ordered by Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER to be expunged from the Record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not going to allow a debate on the staff of NHC under a Resolution for Central Government to acquire land at Bush Hall. If the honourable Member persists in doing this, I will have to be more drastic. There are ways and means of initiating any debate in this Chamber under the Rules. Members must learn to follow the Rules.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be guided by your ruling. I would only say that the Opposition finds no problem in agreeing to the acquisition.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be long on this particular Resolution. We note that the Member for St. Michael North East (Mr. L. L. Sisnett) was in praise of the Minister. He is speaking from the back bench, and we have had a variety of positions from the back bench on this matter of housing today.
3.50 p.m.

But what has emerged clearly in terms of the provision of housing as far as the Government is concerned is a clash of principle as to how these houses should be provided and who should be served by these houses.

One Member has advanced the view that it should be for the persons in a particular area where the housing development had taken place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That did not arise in this discussion.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes. Part of it did arise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member is well aware that he is trying to debate an issue which arose on the very first Resolution today.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Member who spoke could refer to a particular principle and thank the Minister in certain terms, I believe I am on fairly good ground to refer to it. But if it is your indication, that I do not, I will stay off of that subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are referring to statements made by the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Dr. D. G. Blackman), you are quite right to refer to that. But I am not going to allow a debate at this stage on something that happened earlier in the day. It cannot happen under the Rules.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was referring to what he said, but I see you have drawn the line very tightly. But I believe we will have an opportunity in public shortly to talk on this matter.

I would merely like to thank the Minister for the indications he gave that a team of surveyors will be going into the St. Michael South area to carry out certain survey work so that the residents of that area may be able to get proper titles to the land which have been promised by previous Governments to them and I take the indication of the Minister.

I have been pressing for this action for quite some time, and I can say that the Minister has indicated that he is responding, and I certainly look forward to the action being completed as quickly as possible on behalf of my constituents of St. Michael South.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT QUEEN STREET, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER

Order No. 13 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Queen Street, Speightstown, St. Peter for the construction of the Speightstown By-Pass Road.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that it is necessary to enter into much debate on this matter. These are matters that are just being put in place for the construction of the highway in Speightstown, which is well-known to everybody. Most of the lands have already been utilised and I do not think there is much to say.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to second that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Government on behalf of the people of St. Peter and the people of the north. I really can say that it is quite a lot of help to us, because when you combine the new road in Speightstown and the Spring Garden Road, it only takes fifteen minutes to get to town, whereas we were accustomed to taking thirty-five minutes.

I would like the honourable Minister of Housing and Lands to continue to proceed a little further North, especially to that nice district of Six Men's Village. I hope that he will soon go there with an acquisition so that those people in Six Men's Village would be served, and that corner around there by Six Men's store, which is very, very dangerous, looked at. Every two weeks you have accidents around that corner.

I hope the Minister will continue to go North and continue to straighten the roads in that direction so that we in the north can enjoy this road widening exercise and enjoy driving as much as anybody else.

I thank you.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not plan to speak on the Resolution, but I believe a matter has arisen which I can clarify.

With respect to the Speightstown By-Pass Road, I do concur with the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) that this is a new development feature for the northern section of the island. The road is for all intents and purposes now open, providing very comfortable access to the northern parts of Barbados from about the mid Road View area. But one of the considerations governing acquisitions in the area is a need to further develop the northern-most end of this highway, going into the Six Men's area. The honourable Member for St. Lucy has raised the question about the dangerous bend by the Six Men's store. I can give him the undertaking that that project and the extension of the highway northbound, will be starting very early in the coming year. I would expect that it should be able to start around January or thereabout to provide the other link. It will necessitate the removal of some houses in the Retreat area, but they will be resited in the immediate environs, so there will be no major dislocation of the persons resident in that community.

I should like to point out that from my own observation of the intersection at the By-Pass and Church Street, it is a dangerous intersection and would perhaps need to be signalized. I believe that will come up when we discuss certain aspects of the MTW programme later on during the course of the session.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier in the day when I introduced a Resolution, I intimated to you that I would be seeking the leave of the House to deal with it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There appears to be no objection to the matter being discussed. The Minister is therefore granted leave.
4.00 p.m.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER

Order No. 15 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to acquire lands at Speightstown, St. Peter for the purpose of road development and improvement.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is to regularise a situation which now exists. The lands acquired are to be used for the improvement of the highway in Speightstown, St. Peter. I do not think it is necessary to say much on it, but if honourable Members need to have any explanation on anything, I am quite willing to give them such explanation.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell us something about this road development. Unlike the Spring Garden Road, there seems to be quite a number of entrances to, and exits from the road. I wonder if he can tell me whether it is intended to put up traffic lights, or how these intersections will be controlled for the safety of both pedestrians as well as those who use vehicles on these roads.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, much as I would like to reply to the honourable Member, I am sure he will agree that this is a matter to do with the Minister of Transport and Works, and I do not know if the Minister has the facts at the moment, but it is a matter which he will wish to address.

If the information is not available, I can assure you that I will get the necessary information and pass it on to you, but if the honourable Minister is in a position, probably he can give the answer, because I suppose you are aware that the Ministry of Housing and Lands acts on behalf of client Ministries and not necessarily on its own.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the need to acquire additional land in the area of Road View for the purpose of road improvement is largely to do with the need to widen that section of the road where the St. Peter Cemetery Wall now sorts of obstructs the line of sight with the new Speightstown by-pass. The proposal calls for the removal of the wall and for the provision of parking facilities in order to accommodate traffic off the highway in the event that there are funerals in that area, so that the road will not be unnecessarily impeded.

With respect to that junction where the new by-pass road intersects with the old Speightstown Road, that road is going to be controlled by a signal, not a traffic signal, but a stop sign. The proposal there is to limit the amount of traffic that is going to be coming on to that highway at that point. Obviously, the road is designed as a by-pass road and it forces traffic to proceed northwards from that point.

Those persons who have a need for internal circulation between that Road View junction and, say, the Elmers Supermarket, will be operating on that old piece of Speightstown Road. It is designed to be a slow access so that there will be no possibility of anybody feeding on to the Speightstown by-pass to create any problems at the intersection. The road is curved to control access on to the by-pass road and an ordinary traffic stop signal will be able to control that intersection.

The only other significant accesses on to the new by-pass road are those two points at the Round-the-Town and Church Street junctions. These two are major intersection points and the idea is to control them with stop signs as well, but my own view, particularly having seen the Church Street by-pass junction, is that just a stop sign is not really going to be adequate to control that traffic. I think the intersection might be dangerous, and I am going to be proposing that the section be controlled by a mechanical control signal so as to eliminate any possibility of a tragic accident occurring on that intersection. There will be no other accesses as such on to the by-pass road.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FONTABELLE, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 14 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Fontabelle, St. Michael, for the purpose of road improvement.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, again these lands are already in use. There are small portions of land and this Resolution just seeks to regularise the position and to put the records straight.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Order No. 6 was called – To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Health Services Act, Cap. 44.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amendment which is before this Chamber is to give the Minister wider scope in dealing with matters pertaining to derelict houses, refuse and cleaning up of areas which so many Barbadians have been complaining about over a period of time.

I think it is common knowledge that Barbados is a small place with a fragile tourist industry, and its inhabitants, who must come first, are always exposed to diseases such as leptospirosis and yellow fever out of areas where you have rats and mosquitoes breeding.

It has been very difficult over the years to get many of the people who own these derelict houses to have them removed, and it is also very difficult to get people to keep around their premises clean and tidy. The Government is therefore giving the Minister wider scope whereby the Government can go and knock down any of the derelict buildings which may be a hazard to the health of the community and charge the cost to the owner of the building, if he can be found.

In very many cases, it is very difficult to find a number of these people, many of whom may have died and left the property by way of a will to many of their children who are living overseas. Some of them died intestate, and in such cases there is always that problem of family rows, and because of that, the buildings remain in a very bad state of repair.

The Government therefore has decided to go a little further by amending the Act to give a directive for a servant of the Minister to have these buildings demolished and charge the owner the price of the labour for the demolition and cleaning up of the area.

It can be argued that one does not like to have a building, no matter how bad it may appear, demolished, because it is the wish and pride of all Barbadians, and I believe of nearly everybody, to own their own house. But this has been posing a problem for a very long time and there have been a number of complaints.

One must take into consideration that the Health Inspector of today is a much more professional individual, having so many other areas to monitor, for example, the inspection of barber shops, hairdressing salons, canteens, food premises, to help ensure that the health of Barbadians is preserved. It is therefore, incumbent upon the Government that they have the machinery at their disposal to have these things done immediately.
4.10 p.m.

I believe that in a very small country like Barbados, where rats have always been a problem, health standards must be maintained. There were some fifty-eight cases of leptospirosis in 1982, which resulted in nine deaths. We are fortunate that up to October of this year we have only had fifteen cases reported. There have been no deaths. I believe it is the wish of all members in here, of all Barbadians, not to have a single case reported of that very deadly disease.

The Government is also prepared, if the owner of the house does not come forward to lay claim to the premises, to auction the property and charge against the owner of the house what monies there are due for the demolition of the house and the cleaning up around the area. After those funds have been taken out, the funds are to be made available to the individuals. If after a period of time no one should come forward, the monies will be placed into the Consolidated Fund.

I therefore think that Members on the other side would agree that this Act enables the Government to make sure that Barbados can be a safer and cleaner place for all of us to live in. I would hope that Members on the other side would see the need for this bit of legislation.

With those few remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased that at the end of a very long period of agitation by many people, we have finally improved the machinery for relieving a considerable amount of public cause for complaint in Barbados. I do not think that there are any Members of Parliament, on either side, who have not had letters from their constituents from time to time asking them to get some action taken by relevant Government departments on a next door piece of land.

This has arisen, to a large extent, because of the fact that a number of people who own property in Barbados no longer reside in Barbados. Also, there are a number of people who buy property in Barbados on the hire purchase system, so to speak, while they are abroad, but they fail to recognize that property ownership carries not only legal obligation, but certain social and moral obligations.

We also have another class of case, in which there are disputes between owners of land about the ownership of inherited property and no one would go forward.

I have felt very strongly about this. I have been consistent on this matter. I have raised this many times in the House.

One day, deliberately, between Bethel Church in St. Michael and Oistins corner, I counted the number of derelict buildings, and I got forty-two on that road alone. Cabinet appointed a special sub-committee of civil servants, and of Ministers to consider the Civil Servants'

report, and a survey was done in St. Michael and parts of Christ Church alone, I think it was the Local Government area of the City, and we came up with 1900 areas of land which were abandoned.

Now this is a very interesting thing, because at some point in time, a society has to make a decision as to whether private ownership can be allowed to keep within its possession land, not using it, very often not paying the taxes on it, and more importantly, allowing it to get in such a state as to cause a nuisance to others.

I feel that whatever our strong views about individual ownership and our concepts of ownership, there has got to be a dividing line somewhere. So I am one of those who believe that whatever odium a Government would incur by taking strong measures in the interest of public health and in the interest of the environment generally, we have to risk it. In my view, a few individuals should not be allowed to be so irresponsible in their ownership of property as to cause so much annoyance.

A classic one, a bad one, really bad one, was the one next to an eating place in Rockley, between the hotel and Chefette. You will see a building there. But the owners of that building live in California. They care little about Barbados. Every time one or two people try to buy it, they jack up the price.

We have another very bad one too, at the top of Garrison Hill between the Police Station and the Virginian Restaurant. A very, very bad one! In Bay Street, opposite the former Governor-General's residence, another bad one! A lot of those people live in the United States and a few of them have been traced to Brazil. So I really feel that this is one Act that we have to get ahead with.

I think that we have done very well in trying to balance the rights of the subject, because they are still checks in there so that they can, so to speak, at the last moment, still decide to do something about it and prevent the sale. There is a sufficient period of time between the exercise of the notice of the power by the Minister and the execution of such power for the subject to intervene.

We also had this problem. One of the reports that we have had from the committee that we appointed was that although the original Act empowers the Ministry of Health to do certain things, the law required personal service. So we had to amend the law to allow the normal substituting service, because it is fairly impossible to serve somebody who lives in California.

The second point of principle that we have had to deal with is the question of the cost of clearing and so on. The Ministry of Transport and Works is going to be appointed contractor to the Ministry of Health to do this work.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well I think that many of these houses will be able to pay the cost that will be charged.

We are also going to use the existing work force in the Ministry of Transport and Works to do this cleaning up. And we have to recover the cost. I do not see why the taxpayers' money should be spent in doing this job, when all of us who own property have to keep our surroundings clean.

Those are the objects of this piece of legislation, and now that this is the last bit of machinery which is necessary to carry out the Government's wish, I think that the Ministry of Health will have no excuse at all. I would hope that a definite section of the Ministry of Health will be empowered to deal with this matter. As I understand it, nowadays public health inspection has become very specialized. It is no longer what it used to be in the past. They are now trained at the Community College and they are called paramedicals.
4.20 p.m.

But there is a Public Health Engineering Unit which has been set up, I believe, to deal more with these kinds of engineering problems, and I would hope that they will settle in their minds who is the boss and who is to deal with this. The Government has certainly expressed its desire to have this dealt with.

There is a strong feeling, and other communities have done it, that if some of the land acquired is suitable for public housing, it should be bought by the public housing authority and auctioned for public housing. You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Government is not going on the road of condemnation and forfeiture, although I personally believe that we could go on that road constitutionally. We are pursuing the road of recovering the expenses, so you may find that the Crown may be bidding for some of this if it is suitable for the housing authority.

I have great pleasure in seconding this piece of legislation.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that one would object to the necessity of legislation to deal with derelict buildings which will probably present some health hazards. But one has to be concerned as well that this type of legislation does not stretch beyond what it is intended to do.

Apart from derelict buildings, it also takes plants into consideration and one wonders if it is necessary to have this type of legislation to deal with injury to

plants. My feeling is that plants can have a very wide interpretation, and it is difficult to perceive a case where one has to lose his property because of some injury to plants. I feel that this may not be necessary in this type of legislation.

It may very well be involving the question of debushing and I understood the introducer of the Resolution to say that the public health inspectors are no longer available to do this kind of inspection.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of elucidation: I did not say that. I said that they are so professionally trained that they now have to visit the beauty parlours, the shops, and canteens and so on. They may be a little lax in these areas. I never said that they do not do it any longer.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: I think the point I wanted to make was that there is a shortage of staff, and this is a wonderful opportunity to provide employment for other people who need not be that well trained. After all, in all the other services you have the kind of paramedicals and so on who are allowed to do the kind of work that the professionally-trained person will not do. On the other hand, I think that we have the Parks and Beaches functioning and I see no reason why they ought not be involved in this clean-up programme.

Our main concern obviously would be that it does not affect the smaller people who may not be in a financial condition to keep some of their premises very clean. We have quite a lot of old age pensioners and so on who have properties and I know that many of them have applied to the health authorities to send people to actually clean their premises for them.

I hope that this type of legislation will not in any way be an obstacle to them to retain their own property, in view of the fact that they may not be financially strong enough to do it. After all, a person who is on a pension but is fortunate to have some kind of property, might not be able to meet the expenses that I understand today people can charge for keeping your premises clean.

I do not think we are opposed to the idea of removing those buildings that present health hazards, but certainly we would not like the legislation to work against those people who may not be fortunate enough to fill the the role and pay the expenses, no matter how small they might be, in the light of the passage of this piece of legislation. I thank you Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I can assure the Member on the other side that the Government will in no way go out of its way to hurt citizens of Barbados, furthermore old age pensioners.

But we do know that there are some young people who are living at the old age pensioners, who, rather than they trying to do something to help the old age pensioners like working around the house, tilling whatever land they may have, having a kitchen garden or flower garden and so on, they sit down on the corner waiting until the old age pensioner's pension comes, go and draw it, and gamble it out. So you may be saving the old age pensioner from herself or himself for that matter. I am quite sure that the Government will in no way exercise its powers to hurt old age pensioners or people of that nature.

As far as plants are concerned, I believe that this is in because sometimes there are some plants, for example, that can be making a neighbour sick.

Your next door neighbour may be allergic to some plant and the person who owns the plant may not be very friendly towards this individual. It is there where you take into consideration such things before you decide to exercise your powers. I think that you would agree with me and I would agree with you that this legislation would not be stretched in any way to hurt any individual Sir.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I think we were raising the question of Clause 3. My colleague who spoke on this side was asking for some clarification, and we would be glad if it could be given now.
4.30 p.m.

I understood what the Minister who introduced this matter was saying, but as it reads, 11A states:

> "Subject to this section and section 11B, where property is in a dangerous state or is injurious to the health of human beings, animals or plants...."

I interpret this to mean that where the house poses a danger to human beings, to animals, or where the house poses a danger to plants. I would be glad if this could be explained a little more for me. This may be a drafting

technique of which I am not aware. If the property is dangerous to plants, then the Minister can move in and .....

(Aside)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I would be glad if the Minister could throw some clarification as to the specific intent of this section.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: As I understand it, Sir, the emphasis there is on property, and property means that physical area of land with whatever there is on it. It can have on it something that emits – a chemical is not beyond comprehension – something that is injurious not only to other property, but to human beings or to plants.

Let us suppose now that you have love vine. Love vine can be on derelict property and the love vine can be dangerous to other plants, the next door neighbour's plants, for that matter. You can also have some other type of parasite which is attracted by derelict property, which in turn, if it escapes, would be dangerous. So the clause is wide and comprehensive.

It is a general souped-up clause. There may be just one of every hundred cases in which the question of injury to plants may arise, but the real gravamen of the whole thing is that the property includes physical property as well as choate and inchoate property. It is a whole souped-up, omnibus thing.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, it would have to be an omnibus souped-up clause! I heard the Minister and I still have some doubts as to how it is actually worded. I do not think it is as clear as it should be.

I would like to give the Government a little warning. The Government seems to be speaking as though it is free from blame in these matters. I believe the Government itself has derelict buildings, including a number of lighthouses, in which the Government is very negligent in these very areas, and I believe.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a Second Reading speech.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1983

Order No. 3 was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1983.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution, I will draw honourable Members' attention to the fact that it effectuates the Government's objective of a periodic review of posts, the upgrading of some, and what is more important, putting on a permanent basis a number of temporary posts.

The details of the Resolution will disclose each of the various categories of posts which have been singled out for the treatment I have mentioned.

The most important one provides for the re-organisation and management of the Printing Department. I think honourable Members who have had experience in this Chamber before would be in a position to recognise the tremendous improvement that has taken place in the printing of the debates, in particular the very careful and persistent effort that is going into seeing that it comes out as reasonably close to the date of the debate as possible.

We know that proposals have been made for special provision to allow our debates to be out within a week, but those proposals would involve special machinery devoted to the parliamentary work alone.
4.40 p.m.

I hope that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will soon be able to announce certain improvements to Parliament. As night follows day, it is almost certain now that the Post Office will be opened in this Parliamentary Session. It is coming on well, and we know that many of our aspirations for improving the lot of Members of Parliament and their physical surroundings cannot be effectuated until we have under control the whole of this section of the Public Buildings. But that is coming along and I understand that by next year it will be completed. We will then be in a position to carry out the major reforms.

So I commend this Resolution to honourable Members. I think that it will help to remove some of the sources of discontent in the Public Service, which arise from the holding of positions of a temporary nature by some people, in that we have decided to establish a number of posts.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one short question which I have to raise. It is in relation to the section dealing with the Police Department, where there is the substitution of three points in the "P scale" as shown in the Addendum.

It does seem that the differential between the maximum of the P3 and the P2, the maximum of the P2 scale being 39 228, the maximum of the P3 scale being 32 028, is substantially larger than the differential between the P3 and the P4. The differential between the P3 and P4 is the difference between $32 000 and $29 000 while the difference between P3 and P2 is 32 000 to 39 000.

I wonder if there can be an explanation as to why the differential is so inconsistent between P2 and P3, and P3 and P4.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This matter has been the subject of a long negotiation with the relevant people and I think that the differential between P2 and P1, which would be the Commissioner, carries that relationship which was in existence before.

What happened was this. In April, 1982, it was decided to consolidate the housing allowances of those people who were in the top posts in the Civil Service and who had housing allowances. Having added the housing allowance to the salary of the Commissioner of Police, it created a tremendously wide gap so that adjustments had to be made from the post below the Commissioner of Police down, P2, P3 and it ended up with a regrading from P3 – P4. But the aim was to place P2 in much the same position as it was before in relation to the highest post, and the P3/P2 relationship is roughly the same as it was before the regrading. That is it.

The consolidation of the housing allowance on the 1st April, 1982 itself had an effect throughout the Service.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, just a question here on page 3.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a minute please. I will have to stretch the Rules of the House to allow you to ask a question, because it seems to me that the Minister has replied. We are not in Committee.

Leave is granted to the honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The section under Ministry of Finance and Planning, page 3 of the Resolution, Audit Department says at the bottom:

> "to restore parity between these posts and the various Accounting posts."

You get the same thing over at the Ministry of Health, Senior Public Health Engineer.

I wonder if the Minister can indicate to this House whether or not these regradings will be taken back to 1981. The reason for that is that if they are not taken back to 1981, any persons appointed in a similar post before 1981 would now be two years senior to these people both by service and by salary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable Member through?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Yes, I am through.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are there any other honourable Members who would like to participate in this debate at this time?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to stress the point which was being made by my colleague here in respect of the Police Department. I can well understand what has been the motivation in this particular exercise, but it does seem to us that the differential between the P1 and the P2 – P1 is about $44 688 and the P2 now becomes $39 228 – and between the P3 and the P4 was about the same, but there is a very wide gap being created now, or too wide a gap, between the P2 and the P3.

I do not know if he, first of all, understands the point that is being made, that there is a wide gap. Whereas you are trying to close one gap between P2 and P1, it appears that you have now opened up too wide a gap between the P2 and the P3, and the differentials therefore do not seem to be equitable in this particular case.

I wonder if the Minister takes the point that we have been making.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I clearly do take the point and I will draw it to the attention of Establishments. As the honourable Member would be aware, these matters are worked out between the Establishments Division and the various Heads of Departments.

It is not a union matter at this point. After you have reached a certain grade in the Service, it is dealt

with on the basis of a Departmental Head and Establishment matter, and sometimes, very often, – I am not saying it is in this case – the Departmental Head's position, in an attempt to keep his position intact, although the relationship is not taken into account until later, causes an anomaly.
4.50 p.m.

So in other words, what we have always heard is that sometimes in solving one anomaly you create other anomalies. That is a well-known possibility. I am not saying that it occurs now, but I will draw it to the attention of the Establishments Division. That also relates to the other point raised by the other honourable Member.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION No. 80/1982

Order No. 4 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to amend the Resolution No. 80/1982.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is very simple. There were actually two companies in existence, one called Aero-Services Limited and the other Aero-Services Barbados Limited. The Resolution came down in the name of Aero-Services Limited; it should have been Aero-Services Barbados Limited.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition is not in his place, but I am sure he will recall that Aero Services has always been a company which seems to periodically have to succeed itself. This is to allow the coming forward with the agreement to purchase.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE EXPATRIATE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983

Order No. 7 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal and replace the Schedule to the Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980–20.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, honourable Members will recall that this is a matter that came before the House previously. I think it is part of the Independence agreement. The pensions of expatriates were scheduled and constitutionally entrenched. Consequent to Independence, the British decided that part of their programme for the former colonies would be to assume responsibility for the payment, in the future, of expatriate pensions.

The Expatriate Pensions Act, 1980–20 provided for the agreement of transfer to the British Government the responsibility for payment of pensions earned by expatriate officers who worked in Barbados. The agreement had to be amended to conform with certain protocollary agreements. The amended form of the agreement was signed this year. It is therefore necessary to amend the Bill to have retrospective effect so that the amended agreement would become part of the original agreement.

It is purely to tidy up some legal matters, but since it is a Bill which has a scheduled agreement and you are amending the agreement, you have to amend the Bill so as to amend the Schedule. That is all.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have two more items on the Order Paper, but in consultation with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I discovered that they only received their papers last night. I received mine yesterday, and this was due to working late over last week. We worked until Thursday last week, and therefore it was a bit difficult to have these printed.

The Resolutions are not very difficult ones, but since George Lamming says that he is internationally decent – and for praise coming from George Lamming,

you must be aware of the Greeks when they bring gifts, because he is as much communist as Castro himself, and if he likes you, you don't know where you may be heading.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the honourable Member inform me what we are discussing at this point? Are you discussing the proceedings of the House? If you are, then stick to the proceedings of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am dealing with the proceedings, and I am saying why my colleagues cannot really entertain these Resolutions though they are not difficult. I would have hoped he would have entertained it. I am not saying he is an internationally decent person as described by Mr. Lamming. That is all I am saying. I am not associating myself with Mr. Lamming in saying he is internationally decent. I know he is not a bad chap.

However, on this occasion in the light that they raised objection, this seems to bring us to the end of Government Business for this evening. It has been a very interesting day.

I recall today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I seem to be around these things all the time, that when we wanted somebody to say prayers in the absence of the Chaplain of the House, that the Clerk, with his years of experience when we suggested that we should ask the honourable Member for St. Lucy (Mr. R. E. Brathwaite) to say a prayer, reminded both of you and I that on the last occasion, Mr. Gladstone Smith had said prayers, the House had erupted. I am not going to condone on any other occasion any Member at all saying prayers in the absence of the Chaplain. You may simply have to say a word or two, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you are in the Chair.

Sir, today has been a very interesting one, but my years of experience in here and yours have taught us that Parliament is like the seas, rugged and turbulent today and then calm tomorrow. The evening has been well spent. The morning was a little dusty, it tested your nerves. I think we have seen you for the very first time with a bit of pressure applied, and you handled the situation as masterly as you would have done in the past, and as you handled your Ministries when you were a Cabinet Minister.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 29, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

5.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

Minutes of Tuesday, November 15, 1983 deferred . . . 145

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 145

A Bill to amend the Police Act.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE 145

Resolution to compulsorily acquire 30.7 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

Resolution to compulsorily acquire 222 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

Resolution to compulsorily acquire 233 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

Resolution to compulsorily acquire 55.3 square metres of land at Speightstown, St. Peter.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 146

A Bill to amend the Police Act.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS 146

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT IVY, ST. MICHAEL 146
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 146, 151; Mr. D. G. Blackman, 147; Mr. A. Truss, 148; Mr. Franklin, 150.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OISTINS, CHRIST CHURCH 153

Mr. Brathwaite, 153, 155; Mr. Franklin, 154; Mr. King, 154, 155; Mr. St. John, 154, 155; Mr. Sandiford, 155.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHEAPSIDE, ST. MICHAEL 156
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 156.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HOLETOWN, ST. JAMES 156
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 156.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BUSH HALL, ST. MICHAEL 156
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 157; Mr. Sisnett, 157; Mr. Franklin, 158; Mr. Sandiford, 158.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT QUEEN'S STREET, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER 159
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 159; Mr. R. E. Brathwaite, 159; Mr. V. L. Johnson, 159.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER. 159
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 160; Mr. Sandiford, 160; Mr. Johnson, 160.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FONTABELLE, ST. MICHAEL. 160
Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 160.

HEALTH SERVICES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983. . . 160

Mr. Craig, 161, 163; Mr. St. John, 161, 164; Mr. Weekes, 162; Mr. Sandiford, 163, 164.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1983 164

Mr. St. John, 164, 165; Mr. King, 165; Mr. Franklin, 165; Mr. Sandiford, 165.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION NO. 80/1982 166
Mr. St. John, 166.

EXPATRIATE PENSIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1983. 166

Mr. St. John, 166.

SUSPENSION. 150

ADJOURNMENT 166
Mr. Craig, 166.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Dr. D. G. (St. Michael East)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (St. Joseph)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
BRATHWAITE, R. E. (St. Lucy)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SISNETT, L. L. (St. Michael North East)
TRUSS, A. A. (St. Michael Central)
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael West)