
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1981 – 86

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 18, 1985.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Speaker)
His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, Q.C., B.Sc., LL.D., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Information and Leader of the House)
Hon. H. B. St. John, Q.C., LL.B., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning)
Hon. B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education and Culture)
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. L. R. Tull, Q.C., M.A., (Minister of Commerce, Industry and Consumer Affairs)
Mr. L. L. Sisnett, (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office) (International Transport)
Mr. P. M. Greaves, B.A.
Mr. W. O. Franklin, A.I.A.S., J.P.
Hon. A. Truss, (Minister of Tourism and the Environment)
Mr. O. S. Arthur, M.Sc., (Econ.), (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office)
Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, Q.C., LL.M., (Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs)

Prayers were read by Reverend Father I. Harewood.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, June 11, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, June 11, 1985, be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or objections, let the Minutes stand confirmed.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD and Mr. M. A. KING entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay: The Report of the Family Law Council for the year 1984.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of sale of mineral mined in a quarry.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the following Bills were read a first time.

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act.

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act.

A Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of sale of mineral mined in a quarry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

I would like to give the House the assurance that we propose to do Private Members Business when we return from lunch.

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

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES and Hon. H. deB. FORDE entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I may also add that when we start Private Members Business, we propose to do it for two hours.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

THE PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1985 (RESUMED)

Order No. 3 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to the age of retirement and the payment of pensions, gratuities and other allowances.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, I already dealt with the general principles surrounding this Bill on the last occasion when it engaged the attention of this Honourable Chamber. I do not wish to add to the matters I enunciated on that occasion. I would just want to reiterate that the Government has been careful to ensure that no officer who is presently a member of the service will be called upon to retire beyond the present retirement without that officer having a free and independent choice as to whether he wishes to participate in the enhanced age provision in this law.

I also wish to reiterate that, in respect of the scheduled officers, namely, the two constitutionally established offices, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Auditor General, in their cases as well as in the

case of the officers who hold the offices set out in the Schedule, namely, the Heads of Department, their position is that they have to retire in the case of the Director of Public Prosecutions and in the case of the Auditor General at the age set out in the Constitution, and in the other cases at the age limit. So I categorically reject any suggestion that the Government is interfering in any way to the detriment of pre-existing officers or is in breach of any provisions of the Constitution.

The position is that this pension measure has been designed to ensure that in a National Pension Scheme, the position of the Government with respect to employees who come in to the service after a given date, full notice of which was well given in advance, their pension retirement age will be equated with the retirement age of the National Insurance, so that we do not have a situation in which there is a different age and people have a hiatus.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be read a second time. Honourable Members in favour, please say 'Aye'....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, what is the honourable Member on?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking. I am a Member of Parliament and I am speaking on the Bill.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: For many years, but you are too late in getting up. Maybe a little too old also.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I know....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The vote has been taken. The question has been put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The vote for the "Ayes" has been taken.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Have you heard the vote as yet?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You called for it. Those honourable Members at that stage....

Mr. SPEAKER: I said, "honourable Members in favour please say Aye."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No vote was taken. When you got to the stage where you said "those Members," I rose to my feet.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, you were not, Sir. You were not, Sir. You were not, Sir. I think you have lost your right because you did not rise in time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Bill cannot pass anyhow, so it does not matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with me. I have the Rules to carry out and I carry the Rules according to how they are written.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think I drew Your Honour's attention the last time this Bill was put before the House that the whole of Section 8....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has no right to speak at this point.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, Sir. I am at the point of taking....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can only try to save Your Honour from embarrassment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those honourable Members against, please say, "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Divide.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: A division has been called for.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing itself as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. A. TRUSS, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. J. G. ODLE. — (13).

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD,....

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member must not interrupt the vote. It is particularly set out that you can only make comments in a particular way.

Please carry on with the vote, Mr. Clerk.

.....Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. M. A. KING and Mr. L. A. WEEKES. (7).

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

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the amendments to this Bill were fully circulated, I think a week or two ago.

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 1 do now stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, have you put the question? Because I never know in this place whether the question has been put or not. So tell me whether I have the right to speak inside here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. The Right Honourable Member is entitled to speak.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Right Honourable Member knows.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:.....the rules of this House. Please let us hear the Right Honourable Member.

(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: He does not, Sir. He has a big voice.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw to Your Honour's attention that under the Constitution of Barbados, the whole of section 8 dealing with the Public Service is an entrenched provision. Therefore, neither in Committee nor in the whole House can any measure be passed, unless there is a two-thirds majority, and, therefore, we cannot support even a clause in Committee because it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please. We are dealing with Clause 1.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We cannot deal with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:.....which says:

"This Act may be cited as the Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1985."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Even that is unconstitutional.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 1 stand part. Honourable Members in favour, please say 'Aye', those against, please say, 'No',.....

(Aside: No.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Ayes have it.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 2 do now stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: These amendments have been circulated. The question is that Clause 2, as amended, do now stand part.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, quite apart from the very grave and serious question which I have already raised, I am trying to forestall any embarrassment, because this matter can be challenged in the courts of this island.

The honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, I think it is, knows that the union substantially representing the Public Service officers have not been consulted or adequately consulted in this matter. His excuse is that it does not affect certain officers. But there are actually two thousand persons in the Civil Service.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Right Honourable Member is proceeding along the lines of a Second Reading speech. I cannot entertain it at this stage.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No clause here is properly before this House. I will say no more at this stage.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to advert to the point being raised by the Right Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Right Honourable Member for St. John was proceeding along the lines of a Second

Reading Speech. If the honourable Member is telling me that he is going to continue along that line, I cannot entertain him.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I said I was adverting to the point made by the Right Honourable Member for St. John. I would be glad if you would hear the point that I am going to make and then make your ruling.

I am submitting that the Right Honourable Member for St. John is the oldest Member of this Parliament. He is the father of Parliament. He is, in his own right, a constitutional lawyer, and a framer and maker of the Constitution under which we are operating.

(Aside: Nonsense!)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt the honourable Member. True as that may be, it has nothing to do with Broad Street. Please take your seat.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Can I not make that point in order to go on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: to make my point?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: take your seat.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: All right, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I challenge the honourable Members on the other side — as soon as this Bill is passed, let them take it to court.

I am advised that the Bill is perfectly within the Constitution of Barbados and, furthermore, that the Right Honourable Member, when he was Prime Minister of Barbados and responsible for Establishments, passed many Bills amending the pre-existing Pension Act which were well within the Constitution.

It is palpable nonsense to say you cannot have an amendment to the Pension Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I can only advise that when the honourable Member is taking advice, he should not take it from solicitors who are acting as Permanent Secretaries.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:.....but from the legal department. These solicitors will put you wrong. I know the particular person who gave the honourable Member the advice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 2.....

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Right Honourable Member is out of order. I have been advised by the Attorney General's Department.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE (Christ Church West): Sir, there is one aspect of the provisions being amended by Section 2, on which I should like to comment. It is the area of the Law where we seek to remove the discrimination against women as set out in the Pensions Act, which is in the Schedule. Normally, when a lady married in the Civil Service, she was paid a gratuity on her retirement; and in those circumstances she was treated differently from her male counterpart. As a result of the amendments contained in the Schedule, it would now be possible for women in the Civil Service, to marry and remain in the Civil Service and to accumulate their pension rights.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Hear, hear! Is that unconstitutional, too?)

Applause.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the effect it has been having, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir: Is the Honourable Member stating that now, for the first time, married women can stay in the Civil Service? He must be Rip Van Winkle!

Laughter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I would be charitable to the.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Right Honourable Member and assume that he is not hearing very well today. He is probably suffering from a head cold. That is not exactly what I said.

The point I am making is that the existing legislation discriminates against married women. On marriage, if they retire from the Civil Service, as a consequence they have to be granted a gratuity and they cannot accumulate their pensions in the way that other serving officers can. Therefore, the changes are being now made to remove this limited discrimination which still remains within the Barbados Pensions Act, if they are asked to be retired, I make the point that it is an improvement on the existing legislation dealing with pensions.
12.35 p.m.

As I understand the provisions which come under Section 2, the age of retirement is now being extended to 65, with an optional age of 60. But this provision applies only to officers coming into the Service from June 1, 1984, on a permanent basis. I am assured that there are no persons who have been admitted on a permanent basis to the Service after June 1, 1984, and it is my submission, therefore, that the existing rights of existing serving officers are not being affected by the changes contemplated under Section 2 of the Bill. I would further submit that the Bill in that respect complies with Sections 103 and 104 of the Constitution of Barbados. Even so, it goes a little further, it confers an option on officers who have reached the age of 50 so that they can opt into the scheme.

When the Pension Act was amended before, the option was that you had to opt out of the legislation rather than opt into the legislation, and I submit that this manner of drafting the legislation is much more in keeping with the principle of respecting the constitutional provisions set out in the Constitution of Barbados. Whereas I have the greatest respect for the views of the Right Honourable Member on issues of law, I believe that, on a close examination of the legislation, he may find that there is nothing conflicting with Section 103 or 104 provisions of the Constitution. If we sought to specifically alter those provisions by the provisions contained in Section 2, we would have to do so by two thirds majority. But to the extent that the Bill does not seek so to do, but rather complies within the framework of the Constitution, it appears to me, with the greatest respect, that the legislation should stand the test of judicial scrutiny.

I believe that we would have at some stage to regularize the position that affects public and other officers affected by Section 2 of this Bill. The move toward what is being done now was foreshadowed well before the Budget Speech of 1984, and indeed the first tentative decisions and steps were taken when the Right Honourable Member for St. John carried the responsibility for the Civil Service. The effect of Section 2 is to ensure that there is composite pension legislation and, in short, that you cannot be drawing pensions to the extent where you are more favourably off after retirement.

I remember the Right Honourable Member forecasting and talking about this well ahead of this present legislation. It seems to have taken the Government of Barbados, and I am not speaking about political parties, but the Government of Barbados representing the Crown, several years to reach this position. I listened very carefully to the speech of the President of the National Union of Public Workers and at no stage has he said that these amendments which are being effected by Section 2 are in any way.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable Member proceeding along the lines of a Second Reading speech?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: No, Sir. I am talking about the amendments by Section 2, Sir. I am not going outside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with general principles. I think you should stick more to the details.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, what I am saying is that the effect of Section 2 is not, in my view, to disqualify or to make any officer worse off, and this is acknowledged by the National Union of Public Workers. I think that is a great point. The point is that they cannot truthfully say that the effect of this legislation is to make any serving officer worse off, and Section 2 seems to come within that framework. Therefore, I support the legislation.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): I just want to draw the House's attention to two points of this legislation. As to the point mentioned by the honourable Member for Christ Church West (Hon. H. deB. Forde), in respect of the former discretion that was vested in the legislation whereby a female public officer could have been required to retire unmarried, one has to look at three bits of legislation to find that. You will have to look at Section 11 1(c) of Cap. 25, Section 8 1(c) Cap. 30, and Section 8 1(c) of Cap. 56, for the benefit of the honourable Members on the other side who may not be familiar.

There is one other advantage of this legislation, and it is that the Pensions (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act of 1975, introduced when the honourable Members on the other side formed the Government, provided that officers with ten or more years of service could resign and have their retiring benefits stored for them until they reached the age of 55. The benefits would be computed based on the salary of the officer at the date of resignation. The advantage of these amendments in Section 2 is that at present, whereas the benefits did not reflect any increase in the cost of living during the period of storage of the pensions, these amendments will now allow for the pensions to be stored and to attract the cost of living allowance during the period when it has been stored. The person who is entitled will obviously be better off in terms of being able to cope with the pressure of inflation. In other words, what they will receive at the day when they draw the pension will reflect inflationary rate throughout the years in terms of the cost of living allowance.

12.45 p.m.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. A. TRUSS, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE – 12.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. M. A. KING – 8.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that the Schedule be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the Schedule is to Clause 2, so there is no Clause 3, there is no Schedule.

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was read a third time.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the Bill was passed, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. V. L. JOHNSON, Hon. A. TRUSS, Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Mr. J. G. ODLE – 13.

Noes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, Dr. R. C. HAYNES, Mr. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN, Mr. N. K. SIMMONS, Mr. L. A. WEEKES and Mr. M. A. KING – 8.

THE INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES
(EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX)
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

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

THE MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 5 was called – To move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Miscellaneous Controls Act.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, under the Miscellaneous Controls Act, Cap. 329, the expression "Minister", wherever it appears, refers to the Minister of Trade. In accordance with Section 72(1) of the Constitution, the responsibility for miscellaneous controls was transferred from the Minister of Trade and Industry to the Minister of Agriculture in 1977. The Attorney General's Chambers has advised that the Miscellaneous Controls Act should be amended by deleting the definition of "Minister" in that Act. The position at the moment is that whenever responsibility for miscellaneous controls is transferred from one Minister to the other there is the need for an amendment, because the definition defines Minister as Minister of Trade. The amendment before the House today will render this unnecessary. There will now be "Minister" alone appearing, and the Minister who has responsibility for that particular area of governmental activity will be the one responsible.

That is the simple explanation for the amendment, and I beg to move that the 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 the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
12.55 p.m.

On motion of Hon. L. R. TULL seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985

Order No. 2 was called – To move that the House again resolve itself into Committee on a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1981–40.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee. When we were in Committee, this had reached Clause 4, which was then being debated. I would just like to draw this to the attention of all Members of this Chamber.

All the amendments have been circulated to this Bill.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. SPEAKER do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: When we were in Committee last, we were debating Clause 4. I am seeking permission to postpone Clause 4 and have Clause 3 recommitted.

I am dealing with the Objects and Reasons in the Bill and the re-arrangement of the section. The reason for this is that there have been several amendments to it which are consequential to the Bill.

The question that Clause 3 be recommitted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Clause 3, as amended stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 4 and 5, as amended, were called and passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 were called and passed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, the existing Clause 8 will now become Clause 9.

I beg to move that what was Clause 8 be now Clause 9.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 9, as amended, stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the new Clause 8 be now read a first time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 8 be now read a second time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that the new Clause 8 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

1.05 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Objects and Reasons be amended by deleting paragraph (c).

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the consequential arrangement to the arrangement of sections stand part.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BLACK BESS, ST. PETER

Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Black Bess, St. Peter, for the provision of recreational facilities.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew). Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is quite simple and I do not propose to say a lot on it. The Resolution seeks to make provision for the acquisition of an area of land at Black Bess in St. Peter, which would serve to extend the present playing facilities which now exist. That area has been fortunate in producing some very.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the honourable Member would give way, the Resolution for the acquisition of land in St. Peter, according to my Order Paper is Order No. 5, and yet Order No. 6 was called. I should just like the honourable Member to say whether he is doing No. 5 or No. 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 on my Order Paper, which reads:

"The Forty-Sixth Meeting at 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, 18th June, 1985", reads:

"To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Black Bess, St. Peter, for the provision of recreational facilities."

Let the honourable member continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I had the wrong page to the other Order No. 6. You are right.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: As I was saying just now, that area of St. Peter and its surroundings has been very famous in producing some very good athletes, especially cricketers.

There is already a playing field, as I believe is well known, but it is a very small playing area which is very close to the Black Bess Primary School, and we feel that with this extension the folk in the area and surroundings will be able to have a better playing facility.

Black Bess is quite near to Rock Hall, St. Andrew, and I hope that with these additional facilities, the good

people in Rock Hall, St. Andrew, would be able to stretch out in a northerly direction in order to have the benefits which the good people of St. Peter will be having.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, I shall not tarry the House on this Resolution, but I join the debate to support the Resolution and to commend the acquisition to the House as money which will be well spent.

This district in St. Peter has not to date been adequately served by recreational facilities, but nonetheless it has managed to show itself capable of a very high level of performance in the area of sports. The honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) has already alluded to its distinguished record in the area of cricket, and we are also aware of its more recent performance in winning the national BCL Knockout Competition. I am therefore confident that with improved recreational facilities, this district which has shown itself capable of many great deeds in the area of sports will even rise to greater heights.

I beg to second the Resolution.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT GIBBONS, CHRIST CHURCH

Order No. 7 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Gibbons, Christ Church, for the provision of recreational facilities.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this area spans a wide section in the Christ Church area. It covers Thornbury Hill, it covers the whole of Parish Land where it is situated, and that consists of a large amount of people, Pilgrim Road and a number of other areas up there, and because of the large population which it will cover, we seek to make provision for two playing fields as well as a community centre. We hope to have everything combined at one and the same time, so we decided that we would use the resources in a one-shot manner.

1.15 p.m.

The people in the Thornbury/Gibbons area themselves have been suffering very badly for this. I regret that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) is not in his place.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: East Central.)

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: West Central.

Aside.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: If he were in his place, he would recall that on a previous occasion, he spoke about the failure of Government to continue with the project at Gall Hill. I assured him that on a recent visit with the parliamentary representative for the area, the Honourable Prime Minister, we looked at a large area of land, not land that is agricultural and would be going out of agriculture, but a large area of land that you can fill in. The land is now identified and very shortly a playing field will be put in that area of Christ Church quite close to Water Street, Wotton and the very Gall Hill. It is sufficiently large, in my view, that two playing fields can easily be accommodated there without affecting agricultural lands or lands for housing development.

I mentioned that because I know that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and other Members were very concerned.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second this Resolution, Sir, with the greatest of pleasure.

(Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You are still going to lose your seat.)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This once again illustrates this Government's commitment to the improvement of facilities in areas which, hitherto, were regarded as not deserving of such facilities. This will be a matter of great pride to the people in the whole of Christ Church East, the whole of Christ Church East Central and parts of Christ Church West Central, for what we are creating here will be rivalled only by Wotton and Kensington Oval, make no mistake about it.

In relation to Parish Land and its development, I had the pleasure in 1966 or 1967, of moving a Resolution in here asking for the Government to pay a specific amount of money to the Foundation School, the beneficiaries, for the Government to take over that land. Since then, a master plan has been created for the area which envisages a large population centre. Part of the problem with the planning arose from the fact that the noise zone of Grantley Adams Airport cut across some of the areas which one would normally regard as desirable residential areas, and those areas happen to be situated where the existing road pattern is. One of the reasons why part of this land will be used for these facilities is that it is on the border between NS 30 or 40.

I see the honourable Member over there craning his neck. We have not interfered with anything. We are putting this land to good use. The Government bought piece of the land for the Waterworks Department to create a

reservoir. The reservoir has scope for expansion, the development will be on the rocky side, the hill side will be for the houses, and the playing fields will be on this side.

I have no doubt in my mind that it is being regarded over there as a waste of Government funds. Over here, it is being regarded as a legitimate use of public funds for the betterment of people. That is what we will do not only here but all over Barbados, within the limit, of course, of the resources of Barbados. The people who have the authority to give the authority happen to be on this side. When you all were on this side, you all established the priorities. You must not get it in your heads that you all cannot establish the priorities now. If you had established the right priorities, we would not have to pass this legislation today, because Parish Land was an area crying out for development for all of these years. And in the 1960s, I begged for the development to take place when I was sitting on the other side, and I got nothing but a deaf ear, and I was ignored. But, thank God, we are able now to bring the dreams into reality.

There will be nothing but the best, no second best. We must have that, within the limits of our resources. The best within our resources that we can buy, we will get. We do not want any second best. Playing fields today in Barbados have to be of a size that from an early stage people must know that they must have seventy-five yard boundaries. So when they are playing cricket up there, they will reach the First Division, too. Wotton is already in the Intermediate, it is only a matter of time before they get in the First Division. I look forward to Thornbridge, Parish Land and all the teams around making use of the facilities.

What we are trying to do is to get across the concept that we can tie a given number of communities by the common facilities of the highest standards, rather than have a multiplicity of petty facilities. The honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) would understand and appreciate this. The only thing is that he was not able to persuade his Government to do it. He has now to be a spectator and see it being done before his eyes.

I heard the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) say that he wants facilities. The honourable Member for St. Philip South should go up to the Airport and he will see what has taken place up there. What a joy it is to see cricket, football and basketball, all of those taking place.

(Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Charges are up there!)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There are no charges any more. The charges were because of the bad behaviour of some of your people up there. They have to learn discipline. The charges were put on to make them know that

when they go on Government's property or other people's property, they must respect it. When they learned to respect them, the charges were taken off immediately.

Aside.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Ask the honourable Member for St. Philip North. He wrote about it.

People must learn that when they are on public property, it is the taxpayers' expense and you must respect it, and if you respect it, the Government will see that it is kept up to the best standard. All the vandals and those who feel that they can break up matches because they have not got the right to play when they want, all of that is over. Rules and regulations have been put in place and we have a sharing of these facilities. The people in Thornbridge who used to play down in Gibbons, they only have to walk less than 300 yards.

There is no question about it, this Government is not encouraging people in the idea that every 300 yards, you must have a playing field. You cannot have that any more, not if you want the best standards. Boys move from one community and go to the other to court girls and, they should be able to move from one community to go to the other to play games together.

In the other area of Christ Church next door, we used to have a problem. The people in Lodge Road want their own playing field, the people in Gall Hill want their own playing field, Wotton want their own playing field — and in between want their own playing field. We broke that up. We said you had to have a facility which would be sufficiently large that all of the areas can be feeders and you would get a good corps of the various types of people. And it works, the only way it does not work is when the politicians get in and encourage the people, in a parochial manner, to get a few votes, that each little area must have a playing field.

Go up there and see. It is a joy to behold.
1.25 p.m.

I hope the honourable Members for Christ Church East, Central and East are there when it is being opened, because it will soon be opened. It will be a Skills Training centre, too. That is what we are doing. The Government's concept of development is to create these facilities to such a standard that they can be used not only for pavilions, but as community centres and Skills Training centres; in short, a hub for the improvement of the young people. We are doing that all over.

I am very glad, Sir, to second this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish as well to second this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has already been seconded.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Well, to confirm the seconding of this Resolution.

I believe that if anyone looks at the development and the recreational facilities provided in Wotton, one can feel proud of the real proper planning which has gone into providing community development in a rural setting. I do not know how many honourable Members take the opportunity on afternoons or weekends to visit in these areas, mingle with the people, watch them playing at their games, and watch community activity going on. I want to say that if it is proposed, as I understand it is proposed, to do the same at the Gibbons development, it would certainly be extremely beneficial to the community as a whole. You can find at Wotton people who are participating in learning exercises relating to industries, you can find exercise classes going on, you can find cricket going on, you can find football going on, you can find basketball going on, and you can find that the centre is also being used for other community activities. I think that is one of the outstanding developments, which I would like to see, as I understand it, repeated here at Gibbons.

Christ Church has had only, until Wotton was established, one community centre for all these years, and that is the limited one established back in the Fifties by the Barbados Labour Party at Sargeants Village. Although the parish is perhaps the second largest parish in terms of the numbers and in terms of young people, it remained under-developed in terms of recreational facilities and community development for a very long time. That is being transformed under the Barbados Labour Party Government, and I have no doubt that it is appreciated very strongly by the people. I am sure that similar facilities will be established in the Rendezvous area on the playing field that is to be established there, that a multi-purpose building not only to act as a pavilion but for community development will be placed on that site as well and that one will find multi-purpose courts catering to the sports like volleyball, basketball and netball.

I should wish to see the Government have an overall plan for the very crowded St. Michael and Christ Church areas. I believe that we have placed a lot of emphasis on most of the other constituencies in the north, quite rightly, since it is easier, perhaps to rent a building for community activity in the St. Michael or Christ Church areas than it is to do the same in some of the rural settlements which we have. Although this is in a rural area, there is the suburban aspect of it, and it complements the transformation which has taken place in this area of Christ Church, as witnessed by the Oistins Development, the Wotton Development, the development of the airport and now here.

I wish to commend in particular the Honourable Prime Minister for the vision which he has brought in making sure that Christ Church is being properly developed. I think that his constituents and the others of us in Christ Church who represent the people can be proud of the vision which he has shown in ensuring the proper development of this part of Christ Church. I hope that when the honourable Member and myself leave public life somewhere in the 21st century, we can look back with great pride on the contribution which we have been able to bring particularly to the people of Christ Church, but to the island as a whole.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this Resolution. We on this side have no difficulty in supporting the Resolution, but I believe that I will have to make a few comments with regards to the speech made by the Honourable Prime Minister.

I have observed that, for a long time, every time St. Philip South is mentioned in this Honourable House persons on that side always talk about the airport. I am going to put it on the Record again today that the airport is not in St. Philip South. Charnocks became a part of St. Philip South in the last election because the people in Charnocks were put to vote in St. Philip to ease the honourable Member for Christ Church East, (Hon. Dr. R. L. Cheltenham) but the airport is in Christ Church. So because the honourable Members over there realize that they have not been doing anything for St. Philip South, every time St. Philip South is mentioned in here, they say "the airport." The airport is in Christ Church.

A pavilion has been built at the airport for the persons who play cricket on that pasture by the airport, but the authorities have so far refused to open the pavilion. The cricket season has started now for about four or five weeks, and it means that the people who play cricket on that pasture have to change their clothes and put on their gear in the open, on the pasture. The persons from Charnocks who utilize that pasture have asked me to relay to the Members on that side that they would like the pavilion open for people to go in and change their clothes.

Mr. SPEAKER: When will the honourable member get to the Resolution that is before the House?

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am just commenting on some statements made by the honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering when the honourable Member will get to the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Can we not comment on statements made by other people who have spoken on the Resolution? It is the same Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder when the honourable Member will get to the Resolution which is before the House.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: After I have dealt with the points raised by the Honourable Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The method of debate is to deal with the Resolution which is before the House even if comments are made about things other Members have said. The honourable Member has not yet touched the Resolution before the House and, therefore, is out of order. I am only trying to guide the honourable Member.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I have stated at the beginning of my speech that we on this side have no difficulty in supporting the Resolution. I said that I have to comment on the statements made by the Honourable Prime Minister, and it is only natural that when someone speaks before you, it is for you to respond, first, to what he has said.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, there are two aspects of the case put to Parliament for the endorsement and approval of this Resolution, which seeks to acquire a parcel of land of South View Limited situate at Gibbons in the Parish of Christ Church in this island containing by admeasurement 3.2526 hectares or thereabouts — a very significant piece of land, a large piece of land.

There are two principles which I believe have been advanced by the Honourable Prime Minister to seek to persuade Parliament that this expenditure is justifiable and, therefore, should attract the approval of this Parliament. The two principles which he put forward were, (1), the question of priorities, and (2) the question of the size of the catchment area which the facility will serve. I have no quarrel with the principle of a large facility for a large catchment area, because of course the larger the catchment area, on the basis of chance, since all of us have different gifts, the more likely you are to produce people with high levels of skills. I have no quarrel with that argument.

1.35 p.m.

On the question of priorities, I do not believe that it should be the sole prerogative of the executive arm of Government to determine priorities in this area of development, in the area of playing fields and community development such as at Gibbons. I believe that the Government should take into account the views of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in allocating priorities, and I would hope that when the Government gets over what appears to be a very deep-seated matter with them, namely, do unto them what you think they would do unto you — that seems to be the guiding principle — they would carefully reflect that the 27 of us inside

here are perhaps the best persons placed to assist in allocating priorities in Government expenditure for places such as Gibbons and in relation to Resolutions such as this one before this Honourable House.

I would plead with the Government to take into consideration the views of the Opposition in the allocation of priorities in terms of developing playing fields. For example, this deals with an area of Christ Church at Gibbons, and I am surprised the honourable Member for Christ Church West did not deal in this particular area, because as you know, Christ Church is adjacent to some parts of St. Michael, and he would know that in consonance with the principle of a large catchment area, or as one of the deciding factors for priority allocation which forms the justification for the expenditure on this Resolution, a similar development at Valery and in Carringtons Village should be very appropriate, using the very same principles, which of course would be to the advantage of the honourable Member for Christ Church and would help the people of Christ Church to compliment the developments at Gibbons in Christ Church.

We are dealing with population principles of priorities and catchment areas.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing wrong with your analysis.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of explanation: I can assure the honourable Member that Senator June Clarke has put that point very forcibly already to the attention of the Government, and has made very strong representations about Valery. As a matter of fact, I think she was there up to last week looking at the area.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have no doubt that that has been done. It has been done on the floor of this House since 1978 on behalf of the people of Christ Church too, because as a resident of Christ Church I have an interest in seeing proper community development in the area of Gibbons, and also in the areas of Valery and Carrington Village. It is very important.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very short. I, too, am in support of this Resolution. It seems to me that the area about which we are speaking is some seven acres, some 3.2526 hectares.

What I would like to suggest to the Honourable Prime Minister, or the person responsible for Sport, is that we should not only provide the playing fields, but that in order to maximise our efforts some type of coaching should be provided for the youngsters in the area. I keep making this plea. I hope it is not going on deaf ears. Our own experience in the Gall Hill area

would indicate that there is a crying need for someone to supervise sporting facilities.

It is true that most pavilions have caretakers, but my own experience is that, by and large, the caretaker is only a man who can open and close a building. He knows absolutely nothing about the sports which are being played, and if we are to develop the youngsters' discipline in a particular sport, if they are to come along properly — because nowadays the older heads have not got the time any longer to go on the playing fields — I believe that some experiment can be carried out in this area, which is a very large area, to see how best we can use our experienced sportsmen to develop the younger ones. In the meantime, it would provide very much needed work for those who are out of work.

I believe that the idea is a good one, the area is large, because I have always complained that very often when we provide playing fields the areas are not large enough for our traditional sports, that is, cricket and football. I am happy to say that this is large enough for cricket and football, and also we can have other sporting activities on the same playing field.

Mr. M. A. KING (Christ Church West Central): Mr. Speaker, whilst I am happy for the people of Christ Church East Central and Christ Church East about the acquisition of this parcel of land for the provision of recreational facilities, I must express the concern that it is of little comfort to the sports loving people of Christ Church West Central.

I believe the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) lamented the fact when he was speaking that I was not in my place when he spoke, and he expressed the view, I believe, that the acquisition of this land would be some kind of comfort, I suppose, for the loss of the Gall Hill playing field to the people of Christ Church West Central. Let me assure the honourable Member for St. Andrew that these facilities which are being provided in the Parish Land area are quite some distance from Christ Church West Central.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: If the honourable Member would give way, I would just like to remind him that I regretted at the time I introduced this matter that he was not in his place, since I looked along with the Honourable Prime Minister, at an area of land at Wotton which would answer the points which he raised in respect of the people of Gall Hill. It is at the back of Water Street, Gall Hill, and I said it would take in people within that area.

Mr. M. A. KING: If the honourable Member for St. Andrew was referring to an additional acquisition of other lands in the back of Water Street, Water Street is much closer to Gall Hill and would in fact provide some solace to the people.

(Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Water Street is Gall Hill).

Mr. M. A. KING: Water Street is not Gall Hill. How do you mean Water Street is Gall Hill? Water Street is close to Gall Hill, in case you do not know. Water Street is in the constituency of the Member for Christ Church East Central, the Honourable Prime Minister, so we will reach a situation where he has the Parish Land playing field in his constituency, he has the new Water Street one which is to be acquired, he has Wotton, and what will the people of Christ Church West Central have? We have Briar Hall which needs a pavilion badly.

The point made by the honourable Member for St. James South (Mr. N. K. Simmons) about the need for providing coaching facilities at the recreational centres is vital. It is also important that in areas where lands are acquired for recreational purposes, not only should the lands be acquired and playing fields be established, but that a pavilion suitable for the use of these people be established, and where you have small incommensurate pavilions, like at Dover, for instance, that there should be a sizeable extension to accommodate the needs of the sportsmen of those areas, particularly where we find that the young men in the clubs are doing so well and the teams are making a serious effort. I urge the Government then that when facilities of this kind are being provided, the thing should be looked at as an entire situation and provide not only playing fields but proper and commodious buildings so that the sportsmen can make the most effective use of the facilities that are provided.

1.45 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): It was of interest to hear the last honourable Member speak and the honourable member for St. James South. I am glad that they are both expressing the desire to see an increase in the number of coaches, but, of course, for the 15 years that the other side held the reins of power in this country you never heard about coaches and playing fields. I want it clearly recorded in this House that I believe there was one only community centre built by the Democratic Labour Party in 15 years of existence, at Gall Hill, St. John, and that when that was opened by Mr. Joy Edwards, the honourable Member for St. John did not even know.

There was a thing called the Sports Department which used to make sport with sport. The first cricket coach appointed in Barbados was Mr. Everton Weekes, and then Mr. E. A. V. "Foffie" Williams, in the days when Mr. Freddie Miller of the Barbados Labour Party held responsibility for Social Services in this country. Mr. Reggie Haynes, then working at the *Advocate* was one of the first football coaches.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable Member that the Resolution before the House is for the

acquisition of land and the honourable Member has not yet touched the Resolution before the House.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I have not even talked a minute yet, but I will touch the question of lands, because I want to show that under this Government there has been more land acquired for recreational facilities such as those which we are now building in Christ Church, Gibbons, Thornbury Hill, certain people from Wilcox and others in the area, and Black Bess, — I passed there today — than under the previous Government. There are more sporting facilities created, more pavilions and open spaces for recreational purposes created for this country. I do not have the figures on my fingertips, but I think there are at least 51 playing facilities under the sovereignty of the National Sports Council.

I want to say, talking about coaches for the sporting facilities such as you will have at Gibbons, that, particularly between 1976 and the present time, in pursuance of a stated policy in the Manifesto of 1976, the Barbados Labour Party made sure that those Barbadians sportsmen who had reached positions of regional and international eminence were employed as coaches to share their talents, experience and expertise with the young people of Barbados. That is why we can boast, and if it is necessary, we will make provision for one to go to that centre in Christ Church.

The National Sports Council employs in cricket, Mr. Seymour Nurse, an outstanding middle order batsman produced by Barbados. — Mr. Thelston Payne, of current West Indies Cricket fame, Mr. Desmond Haynes — I signed the authority for him to start week before last — Mr. Ricky Skeete and Mr. Richard Straker in cricket alone. In football, the Democratic Labour Party had an opportunity to do something for Mr. "Gas" Clarke, but, instead, they let him continue as a security guard at Holiday Inn. They could have brought him on. Desmond Haynes is playing for the West Indies, but he is working for the National Sports Council today. "Gas" Clarke was brought on to the National Sports Council as a coach, Keith Griffith and Leacock. In bodybuilding, we have a Mr. World and a Mr. Universe Darcy Beckles, Roy Callendar. In cycling, we have Hector Edwards, who represented Barbados at an Olympics and several regional and Caribbean games.

The record is a proud one. Every parish in this country has a playing field. I am not saying that everyone has a playing field with the same lavish facilities as you have at Gibbons. They cannot talk, I can talk. St. Philip North, for 15 years under the Democratic Labour Party representation, never had a playing field until the Honourable Leader of the House, as the then Minister responsible for Sport, brought a playing field to Chapel and erected a pavilion on it, only to be cursed by the Opposition in 1981 and have the pavilion

described as a cow shed. It is there to serve the needs of the people of the Chapel/Church Village area. And just to prove that, even though St. Philip North has a representative on the Democratic Labour Party, the Barbados Labour Party is a charitable party, last year a playing field was constructed at Bayley's in St. Philip North, below Bayley's School. Thank God that that was asked for and promised by me in my circular for the 1981 elections. It is nothing to do with the present member for St. Philip North at all. I gave them that, and I was not even in this House.

The position in respect of sporting facilities is that we recognize that if one tries to encourage mental development, simultaneous with that development one must aim to achieve physical and bodily development. We see sport as a lever to be used in the whole developmental process of the human being. We see sport as a means of giving our young people an opportunity to excel and parade their talents all over the world. It is part of cultural development. We expect that in time these young people will bring fame and glory not only to themselves but, by extension, to Barbados as a nation, and, as a result of that, we all can feel proud.

1.55 p.m.

I am very pleased today to see what is happening in St. Peter by Black Bess, because Mr. Gordon Greenidge, MBE,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will not be allowed to discuss Black Bess. That has passed already.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I withdraw the remarks, Sir.

We have produced in every sphere of athletic and sporting endeavour which is currently coached at the National Sports Council, sportsmen about whom Barbados can be justly proud. As the limits of our resources will permit, there will be further developments. But we are but a small country, I think we have done exceedingly well in eight years, or nine years today, I think, June 18. In nine years we have done well in terms of the provision of sporting and recreational facilities for the young people in this island. Honourable Members on the other side, I think, must be satisfied that a great step forward has been made in sporting development during the last nine years, and they can have Government's assurance that what we have started will be continued and enhanced so long as there is adequate provision of finance.

I would like the Government to be able to meet the plea by the honourable Member for St. James South in terms of provision of additional coaches for every community group, but the emphasis has been to train the young through the school system and then move into the

clubs. We provide coaching at the national level, as the honourable Member is well aware, as a member of the Football Association. The development into the clubs is coming. In netball last year we had two coaches from England who were on assignment to the National Sports Council, with sponsorship through the Insurance Corporation of Barbados, who started programmes with clubs and community groups. In the area of football, the same Mr. Victor "Gas" Clarke is working with community groups in St. Michael. Everything takes time, but the plan is in hand. My friend does not have a point of any originality at all, because the National Sports Council is already providing coaching facilities at community level and club level, so we can rest assured that it will expand as our resources permit.

Mr. J. G. ODLE (St. George North): Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long but I am very much aware of your interest in an area called Fisherpond, which is contiguous to Market Hill, Roach Village and that area which is part of my constituency. I believe you would be glad to know that I am making representation to the Ministry to provide for those areas the facilities which I have discussed with you in private for a playing field to service the people of that area as well as the area of Lemon Arbor, which is also contiguous to your constituency. You know I like, wherever possible, for there to be a coming together, and I am going to suggest that in those parts of the constituency which I represent and which you represent that there should be a coming together and providing of facilities to service those regions. I want to congratulate the Minister and the Government on the steps they have taken, and I will be coming to them soon with this.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I assure the last honourable Member who has spoken, the honourable Member for St. George North, that I will take into account the plea which he has made in respect of the area which he has cited. My task is purely to acquire on behalf of the client Ministries, but I assure him that if representation is made to me, or even without that representation, I will look at an area and invite the Minister responsible for Sport to be sure that something is done on its behalf. This is not, Your Honour, to your own exclusion. I assure you that that is an area that is causing me some concern as well and we will have to look in that area. Too often we only think of bowing to the Speaker without other considerations for his welfare. I assure you that with your humble servant, that is not so.

I want to thank the Honourable Prime Minister, the honourable Member for Christ Church West and the honourable Member for St. Thomas for the very good contributions which they have made to this debate here today. I want to say to the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, who again is not in his place,

that the only pavilion or the only area of playing that he can boast about in his constituency is the one that the Barbados Labour Party provided at Sargeants Village. It is a tribute to the Barbados Labour Party. This party not only on coming into office in 1976 but during its previous period in office has ensured that playing fields and community centres have been built throughout the length and breadth of this country.

In my own constituency of St. Andrew, during the previous period of stewardship in this country, the St. Andrew Community Centre was constructed by us, the only place of recreational activity that could have been found in that constituency, and during our time we were able to build a pavilion in the Shorey Village area and now in the Rock Hall area there is a community centre, and with the marriage of part of St. James to St. Andrew, there is now a community centre and a playing field, and hopefully very shortly there will be a pavilion for those people there. We have quite a lot to be proud about. We have provided in the short period of nine years 56 playing fields.

Do you know what amazes me, Mr. Speaker? During the last by-election, in Bridgefield when I was there, I discovered what had happened with the grounds that we were able to acquire. An offer was made by the then owners of the land to give it to the then Government of the day, but after we came in we were told that the offer was no longer there and that we had to buy it if we wanted it. But I was so happy to think that even though Mr. Packer decided that he was not going to give it again, the Government thought it had an obligation to the people whose expectations were extremely high that they should have a playing area for themselves, and the Government acquired the area there.

2.05 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that in these matters the Government should consult with the Loyal Opposition and get their views. I recall that when we came in, very full of noble ideas, willing to co-operate and to assist wherever we could, when we invited the Opposition to do a number of things with us, even in the Estimates to call the Heads, they refused. We sought in every possible way to get their co-operation in terms of consultation, but we did not get that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what to do. We do not consider that it is our prerogative to do anything. It is the people's prerogative that has put us here, and they expect us to govern in the best way possible. Therefore, we operate as the instrument of the people's will. It is not that we want to exclude anybody from anything.

With respect to Valery, the Government is looking at Valery to see what can be done and what is the best

use that Valery can be put to, bearing in mind the needs of the overall country. We are also looking at what can be done, as mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, for Carrington Village. But when you think in terms of what is at Weymouth, what is just next door in Queen's Park, and what is at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, you are only a stone's throw away. I do not think it is so difficult in terms of a playing field to have something presently within that area. I believe that there can be accommodation for the people who are in Carrington's Village in either of those areas.

What I would want to see is Government looking at certain areas where there might be small spaces, not only in Carrington's Village but in Speightstown and in other areas of Bridgetown, where you can have basketball or something. It might not be possible, given the density which exists in St. Michael, to have playing fields at every point or in every village. You have to be practical about your present resources and your capacity to do things, and these are matters which have to be taken at all times into consideration.

I believe that 21 pavilions have been provided and 24 hard courts, in addition to the 56 playing fields. I would like the other side to quite honestly tell me how much they have done within the time that they were in office, for 15 years. Somebody said that provision was made in St. John and something was done for those good people there. But I do not feel that in these matters we are looking at an area because it might be represented by any particular person. I take it that wherever the need is, it is the duty of this Government to provide, and this Government has been looking to find areas for recreation not only in Christ Church but throughout the length and breadth of this country.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.30 p.m. today for lunch.

Of course, the dining hall is still under repairs and we would have to take lunch once again at Queen's Park.

I am informed that maybe in another two or three weeks it should be available to Members once again.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly at 2.12 p.m.
2.12 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: On the undertaking given by the Honourable Leader of the House, it is now Private Members Business Time which shall be conducted for two hours today.

When Private Members Business came to an end last week, the last Member who spoke was the honourable Member for St. Lucy, who finished at 4.18 p.m.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the motion of the Resolution that we are discussing here is a very simple one, and I would like to start by saying that the Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King) presented the issues very clearly, very cogently, and very persuasively. He set out the facts and the arguments relating to the points in such an incisive manner that I believe Members on both sides of the House, and the public generally, are well seized of the issues involved here and of the general thrust of the Resolution.

Let me say how I exactly see this matter. It relates, as the Resolution states, to the provision of a road system in Trents Plantation Tenantry, and for purposes of ease of understanding, I view that road system of being provided in four sections. The first section relates to what I call a "stem of road" leading from the public road, which passes by the St. Lucy Secondary School and which goes through the plantation tenantry and joins up to the road known as the Swampy Town Road. Then there is, roughly speaking, a triangle of road, which touches that particular stem at a particular point, and we have, therefore, four sections of road.

Our contention is abundantly clear — but I have to repeat it because of the criticisms that have been made and the statements that have been made that the Opposition does not wish the people in Trents Plantation Tenantry to get a proper road. That statement was made in last week's debate, the debate last Tuesday by no less a person than the Prime Minister, the Member for Christ Church East Central. He is happy to acknowledge that he said so, he is bowing in acknowledgement that he said so.

Already twice in the debate statements by the Prime Minister have had to be refuted by the Member for St. Michael North West (Mr. L. A. Weekes), and I am now refuting again the statement made by the Prime Minister to the effect that the Democratic Labour Party does not wish the people in Trents Tenantry in St. Lucy to obtain a tenantry road. That statement is based

on a feeling that the tenantry development in this country started with the Barbados Labour Party, or with the 1980 legislation, or with statements in 1976. Nothing can be farther from the truth. I would like to know why the 'Henry Christophers' of this world or why the members on that side are unable to get up and say that the major social piece of legislation relating to tenancies in Barbados was the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act of 1965 which gave security of tenure to persons on tenancies in this country.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Please, no shouting across the Chamber.

Please carry on.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying that that particular piece of legislation gave security of tenure to persons living on tenancies in Barbados. I am saying further that the policy relating to tenantry development and the provision of the infrastructure such as water, electricity and other services was clearly enunciated and spelled out by the then Premier of this country, the Member for St. John. This is what he said on that occasion, and I am using the words from Hansard — I will give the exact reference shortly, but these are the words which he said, and I quote directly:

"What this Government intends to do with the consent of the owners, because the land is still theirs, is to repair all of the tenantry roads in all of the tenancies throughout the island, regardless of whether the roads are private or public. We will have to put the Barber Green machine on those roads because the people are entitled to get to their houses at night without breaking off their toes on the roads as I see them in some of these tenancies."

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you now give us the reference so that we can have it recorded?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is the debate for 22nd June, 1965. The speech starts at page 841 and I think it ends at page 843. It is within that speech that those words are contained. I think that will identify it. I will find it precisely for you, but I quoted accurately, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would have been better for the honourable Member to use his own words than to tell us he was quoting Hansard and now cannot give us the particular passage.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have given the debate, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said that it is between this page and that page. The honourable Member is well aware of how to give quotations.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I will give you the exact....

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have said already it is between pages 841 to 843.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have often said, when Members are going to quote from documents, they should note the rule to give specifics about the document so that it can be traced.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. I am fairly specific here. I said the date on which the debate took place, I have quoted exactly, and I have given the pages within which the speech in Hansard has taken place. I will be even more precise and get that into the Record.

Now that puts pain to any statement, or view, or belief that the Democratic Labour Party was not interested in the development of tenancies, because that kind of security was given. We acknowledged that there were problems involved, such as legal problems and infrastructural problems in delivering those services, and, therefore, the tenants could not be moved off their lands while all of those problems were being sorted out. I want to make it clear that in terms not only of the security but of the delivering of services to the tenancies in this country, the Democratic Labour Party has a proud record and there is no point talking about the Democratic Labour Party being in power for 15 years and not doing anything about these problems. We did a lot for this country while we were the Government of this country.

3.40 p.m.

We were in power for 15 years and the Barbados Labour Party has been the Government of this country for 22 years. Sometimes that is forgotten, that the Barbados Labour Party assumed the reins of Government of this country from 1948, roughly speaking. They formed a majority in this country at that time, from 1948 until 1961, a period of 13 years, and then again from 1976 until the present time, approximately 22 years you have been in power. So every time you say that we have been in power for 15 years and did not do anything, we ask you, you were in power for 22 years and what have you done about those problems? So there is no point coming to say that we did not do anything about these particular matters. We did, we enunciated the problems, we gave the security to the tenants on the tenantry lands, and we proceeded to lay the foundations whereby there could be an upliftment and social improvement of the standards of living of people in this country.

Now that I have dismissed that particular red herring, let me turn to the other point, why this particular Resolution has been brought by the Opposition. Let me make it clear, first of all, it has nothing to do with any witch hunt of the Member for St. Michael West Central. This is not a witch hunt. This has everything to do with the protection of the political integrity of the system of Barbados. Anyone in this country who attempts or who by his actions, whether deliberate or fortuitous, impinges or impacts on that political integrity in any way, then the Opposition has a duty and has a right, by virtue of being an Opposition, to point out the problems that are being presented for our political system.

Sir Herbert Duffus said as much in his report – and I have that in my hand, the Duffus Commission of Enquiry 1977–78, Report Volume I – and I am quoting from page 101:

“Parliament and its Members have maintained the highest reputation of any Parliament throughout the Commonwealth and in all the countries of the world where parliamentary democracies are still cherished. May this be so for a long time.”

Then he continued at page 102 where he says:

“It must be borne in mind that the primary purpose of an enquiry is to satisfy the public that a proper investigation has been made into matters about which there is a great deal of public disquiet.”

That is when the shoe was on the other foot, when the Barbados Labour Party Government was accusing the Opposition of all kinds of infelicities and all manner of corruption, and set up the Duffus Commission to enquire into them. But this is what Sir Herbert Duffus said in his report at page 106:

“There was no evidence of anything corrupt or fraudulent on the part of any Minister or any official of Government, or by any of the persons or companies concerned with the matters which I enquired into.”

The position is clear, that it is important that the integrity of our parliamentary system and the integrity of our public life must be maintained. Those are the views of a Government-appointed Commission.

I turn to another Commission, which is the report of the Commission appointed.....

Hon. A. TRUSS: On a point of order, Sir: If the honourable Member is going to quote from a document, I believe he should not quote out of context. He quoted from page 106 of the Duffus Report, Sir, but there is a fundamental point which I would like to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member will have ample time to make his rebuttal to anything which has been said on this side.

Hon. A. TRUSS: I am not making a rebuttal, I am just simply.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has no right to intervene in this part of the debate. If what has been quoted was incorrect, he is entitled to draw the House's attention to the incorrectness of that statement, but he cannot proceed on that debate.

Hon. A. TRUSS: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: In this report of the Commission appointed to review the Constitution and to consider a system of national honours and a national table of precedence, this is the Cox Commission, that particular Commission was very concerned about a number of matters, and I refer to some of them in the section I am going to quote here. I quote from page 43, and this is what it says:

“One of the causes of concern to the Commission was that the presentation of annual and timely budgetary proposals was not obligatory. Another was the apparent ease with which the Government could expend large sums on the purchase of properties or services without prior knowledge or approval of Parliament as to the very properties or services so purchased.”

The specific point that I am underlining here relates to the fact that the Commission appointed by the Barbados Labour Party Government itself adverted to this question that when services are being purchased by the Government, the knowledge and approval of Parliament as to the particular properties or services so purchased should be made available.

We are talking about the provision of infrastructural services in the Trents Plantation tenantry.

Aside.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: If you want to take a very narrow and myopic and short-sighted view, you are free to do so. I believe that is why you are not Attorney General today.

The issue raised by the provision of the road system in the plantation tenantry is basically this, and these facts have not been disputed, that the roads have been put in by the Member for St. Michael West Central in his capacity as Minister responsible for works; that it is also the policy of the Government to put in roads in

tenancies, and I have pointed out that that policy was adumbrated way back in the mid 1960s when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, and I have quoted chapter and verse to point out that that was the policy of the Democratic Labour Party.

3.50 p.m.

I visited that plantation tenantry road system, like the Prime Minister, on two occasions at least.

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: *I went thrice.*)

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: He went three times but I went twice, and I must say that after those two visits, I am still left with a considerable amount of disquiet as to why the road system was put in in that particular way and why was it necessary to have two sections of the road which, apparently, are serving only two houses, because there is no quarrel on this side with the provision of the road to serve the majority of tenants in the plantation, no quarrel whatsoever. Indeed, a former representative of the constituency for St. Lucy, who is now in the Other Place, drew attention to the need for the development of these tenantry roads, and in the newspaper article, an editorial in the *Advocate*, sometime during the 1970s, he was praised for the brilliant contribution he had made in terms of proposals for rural development in this country.

There is no doubt about the concern of this side for it, but any Member of this Parliament visiting that plantation tenantry and seeing the way in which the roads have been put in, I say must have doubts, concerns and disquiet about the way in which those sections of those roads have been provided. Because of the two sections which form the V of the triangle, we could only find one section serving two houses, and we query whether that was the best way to provide the road system for the people there. The other section apparently only serves plantation lands. I could not see any allocation on that section of the road so I am saying that it has left me — and I have freedom of speech in here as a Member of Parliament — with concerns, doubts and many questions. The only trouble is that there are many questions but apparently, so far, few answers to this particular matter.

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is what you are saying.

I am sorry, Sir. I wish to put it in the Record that the quotation from the Hansard 1965 Debate, which I quoted in respect of the debate on the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act, was page 853, lines 28–34.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you are now satisfied that your first reference was incorrect.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, if it was incorrect, there was no intention to be incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree with you.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is on the Record.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this. When we have this kind of public disquiet, when we have members of the public and Members of Parliament itself having concerns and doubts to the extent that the Opposition feels constrained to bring this Resolution, we are saying that nothing but a full-scale enquiry into this particular matter could satisfy those doubts. I am saying that no simple debate in here with a vote on that side and a vote on this side can satisfy that public disquiet and that public concern. I challenge every Member out there on the Government side to get up and say that they have no doubts about the way in which these road services have been provided.

I would like to know whether alternatives for the provision of the road services went to Cabinet — get up and answer this — if the Cabinet of this country was presented with the proposals for the development of a road system in that tenantry and was presented with three or four alternatives and priorities for providing the road system for those tenants and whether Cabinet took that decision. I want to know whether the body known as the Planning and Priorities Committee — Planning and Priorities is bare foolishness? — of the Government examined the need for the provision of these roads and looked at the alternatives and priority ways for providing that road system and then chose the best and most efficient method for providing those roads.

I am not asking about Parliament itself, because this Parliament, apparently, is given no kind of information on these kinds of matters. That is another problem and it is a matter that the Cox Commission referred to, and that is why I read that into the Record. I can answer “No” for Parliament, because the provision of the road system inside of that plantation tenantry was not brought to Parliament, which is the place for the people’s representatives. Plans were not brought in here. Possible alternative ways of providing it were not brought in here.

So far, I have not heard that Cabinet considered the priorities and took decisions. I have not heard that the Planning and Priorities Committee debated it. I do not know if there is a Planning Committee in the Ministry of Transport and Works. If there is such a committee in the Ministry of Transport and Works, I would like to know if the members of that committee sat down at a full meeting, examined the different alternatives for providing a road system and found the most effective and efficient method of providing that road system. This is the time when we should be asking for chapter and verse.

Tell us the dates on which those meetings were held. Let the Minister, when he gets up to speak or whoever is going to defend on that side, come with the plans and the alternative proposals, Priority A Proposal, Priority B Proposal, Priority C Proposal, so that there will be no cover up and everybody in this Parliament will be able to see whether the alternative methods for providing the road system were thoroughly canvassed, and that the taxpayers of this country were therefore getting the best value for the money expended on the road system.

As far as the question of resignation is concerned, let me put it this way. No vote inside of this Parliament is going to clear up those matters. There is need for a full scale public enquiry and this is in the interest of not only the political system, but the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central also, because he is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: And that.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. I am winding up.

He has a reputation as being a man of high integrity and probity and no vote on this side is going to clear his good name. It has to be cleared by a full scale public enquiry and that is the proposal that I put on this Table. We on this side are going to support the Resolution.
4.00 p.m.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George South): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I missed the debate last week, and, therefore, I have neither the feel or the knowledge of the run up to this debate. If, however, the very lacklustre contribution by the honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is any indication of what has gone before, I can only say that the mountain has laboured and produced one little ridiculous mouse. What started out, as I understand it, as a motion of no confidence and censure, and asking for the dismissal of the Minister, boils down to nothing more now than a matter of discretion and judgment, a right to do so and so. That is what I heard and that is what I read that the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) has said.

I want very early in my contribution to make it plain that I share with the sanctimonious and self-righteous Members on the other side the feeling that we should preserve the integrity of public life in this country, and this connotes not only raising a lot of havoc over what they perceive as an error of judgment, to use the words of the honourable Member for St. Philip North, and it is nothing more than that, but goes to the root of the public conduct of every one who is involved in public life in this country.

I believe, that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central (Mr. M. A. King), poor fellow, has

a penchant for picking up a lot of sorry causes. It is only last December that he came in with the most ridiculous Resolution about crime in this country when there were a few incidents in St. George, but he seemed not to have thought anything was happening in Gall Hill in Christ Church, the constituency which he represents. If he were interested in what was happening in his own constituency, he would have known that there was a massive increase of crime in the Gall Hill area, people's daughters were being raped and people's houses were being broken into.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to this Resolution.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will come back. You have given everybody a little latitude and I will take a route and come back.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get back to this Resolution.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The honourable Member for Christ Church West Central did himself proud in his tradition of bringing this Resolution before Parliament today. He is always like the boy on the burning deck. All the honourable Members on the other side now are jumping off the ship and leaving him with a Resolution that is nothing in terms of its seriousness or content. I believe that the Resolution is a follow-up of what was a very sinister and crass attempt by the Democratic Labour Party to use this business in Trents to influence voters during the St. Thomas by-election. It failed dismally, and I would have thought that they would have had the good grace, having been turned back on that occasion, to let the matter rest, but they do not know when to stop.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the role of the Right Honourable Member for St. John (Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow) in this whole sorry episode, and indeed the role of the honourable Member for St. Philip North. The Right Honourable Member for St. John is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. As such, he has a constitutional role to investigate the improprieties of public expenditure. He can call any witness he likes; he can do like a judge. He can summon any accounting officer in Government, he can summon any Permanent Secretary, and he can ask the same questions that the honourable Member for St. Michael South asked. He has that power according to the law of Barbados, and in having that power, he has to exercise his power judicially. You cannot pick up a car load or a few car loads and a busload of people and carry them down in St. Lucy and carry along the television cameras and create a spectacle for a bunch of curiosity seekers, including people over on that side whom I thought would have known better. I was ashamed to see them on the television like a bunch of crows going after carcasses. You have a role as a judicial officer to make sure that justice appears to be

done. You cannot go down in Trents and get on a television camera and radio and pass judgment on a matter that should come before you as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee even before you hear the evidence, and I hope the honourable Member will do himself a little justice by disqualifying himself or not hearing anything to do with this road when it comes to hearing before the Public Accounts Committee. You have already passed judgment, you are in no position now to listen to any evidence and come to any fair conclusion.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North, I feel sorry about what he did. He is a man whom I had a lot of respect for. He has perverted his profession by going down there and walking around with a lot of lines and a lot of poles and using his profession for, I almost said, corrupt purposes. But it is a cause that was not worthy of him and he will hear a lot more about that, and he will be sorry that he did it.

The honourable member for Christ Church West Central I do not know why he gets himself in these things, but he knows best. He is like a father, and in the fullness of time he will pay for a number of these indiscretions.

I represent a constituency in Barbados that has the most plantation tenancies. I also have the constituency that contains the largest plantation tenantry, Drax Hall Plantation. The Right Honourable Member for St. John is familiar with Drax Hall. It is owned by a man called Commander Drax, a little, wheezy Englishman who comes down here every year or two and tries to gouge out the eyes of the tenants on the plantation tenantry in Drax Hall, and the Right Honourable Member for St. John has on a number of occasions over the years gone into Drax Hall, not with the people of Drax Hall, not with me, the representative up there, but with Commander Drax himself and discussed with Commander Drax what he could do and what he could not do about people who were building wall buildings up there and the like. I also know, Mr. Speaker,.....

Certain remarks made at this stage by the Right Honourable Member for St. John were ordered struck from the Record by Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable Member for St. John has been into Drax Hall in my presence. I have seen him in Drax Hall with Commander Drax and I have every reason to believe the people who spoke to me immediately after we left. This is not a law court. I do not have to talk about any hearsay evidence. The people told me immediately after he left that he was advising Commander Drax that people had no right to build wall on the tenantry land and how it could be bulldozed down. That is what people in Drax Hall told me. I am challenging the Right Honourable Member for St. John to come up in Drax Hall with me and have a

public confrontation with the people up there and see who is the liar.

I want to get back to Trents. All that will come out in the wash on the platform. When they are ready, I am ready to go out there and make the noises, but I will deal with other issues in here.

They talk about probity. What probity are they talking about? What do we think of persons who encourage public officers to steal Government documents and put them in their hands, and they walk about and boast that they have Government documents? That is something that we hear from that side all the time, and they talk about probity! What do we think about people who would lie and distort facts all the time and would go about proselytising and trying to convince the people of this country that there is greater merit in perceptions than in the truth? That is the standard that they live up to, and come in here talking about probity on this side! You are talking about conflict of interest? When the Democratic Labour Party was the Government, they made it possible for people to go and buy plantations for \$400, \$500 and \$600 an acre, the same plantation lands where all these poor people made their living and so on, cut them up into four acre lots and have speculation by their friends, and indeed by one honourable Member on that side that I know of, who bought a plantation up in St. George, in my constituency, for a few hundred dollars and then sold it back to the poor tenants, in fact tried to, for \$10 000 an acre. And they come in here today talking about probity!

4.10 p.m.

Let me tell you something. I represent plantation tenancies. I have seen a road built up in Drax Hall and I have seen a road built from Byde Mill, up through Drax Hall Woods, up through the main tenantry and out towards the other end by Drax Hall Hope. And there is a stretch of land where there is no dwelling house, from down by the bottom by Byde Mill up to the top when you are going up by the church, a long distance where there are no houses. I did not hear them come in here and make any noise and say that the Englishman was getting a road built up there and that he could stand to benefit from it. I did not hear that at all. But they know who they stand for.

During the last by-election in St. Thomas, I went up in a place called Canefield, and the road from the entrance to Canefield to where the first house is almost a mile. There are no houses at all, not a single house. A road almost a mile long and I have not heard anybody in here get up and say, "How can you build this road all the way leading into there?"

The arch priest of dishonesty and his sidekick are reacting against that. But I know there is a house at the

entrance, I think it belongs to Williams or somebody, and then there is a long road down inside, round the bend, a way down inside before you reach the first dwelling house. I have not heard anybody say that you should not build the road for the people to get down inside and get out.

Aside.

Hon. L. R. TULL: What I am hearing today is that you should not build a road unless you have a hundred people. The honourable Member for St. Michael South outdid himself today because he talked about the majority. He used the word, "majority" twice. He is concerned about the majority of people in a tenantry. He is not concerned about the minority. That is the nature of the policies of the Democratic Labour Party. Put the road up where there are a lot of houses, but where there are not many houses, do not give them any road. That is the gist of what the Democratic Labour Party is saying. I want the Democratic Labour Party to come into the places where there are real plantation tenancies, up in St. George South, come up there and use those arguments and see how long you are going to stay up there.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Transport and Works should probably set out these things in greater detail. But what I understand is that when the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act was passed in 1980, it made provision for house spots. We subsequently came back to Parliament and made provision for agricultural holdings, land that the tenants were working already from the plantation. Some people have nothing to do, they do not have any family to look after and no children to sit down and talk to, so they drive down into Trents like they are going to an excursion. The honourable Member for St. Michael South goes down there. There is something really attractive down there, like a Coney Island, so he has to drive down there, every evening, as if he has nothing more useful to do. I have not been down there and I do not intend going down there. All I know that where the road is that is in dispute, the road they are talking about, there are a number of agricultural holdings, land rented from the plantation by the tenants, and that the road in dispute passes along where these people rent the land from the plantation so that they can carry out their agricultural duties.

I am hearing that you should only have a road if people have a dwellinghouse, but if they have land and they have to go and fork it up and plant yams, you must not have a road leading up to there. That has not been the situation. We have seen the roads all over Barbados. I can rattle off, off the top of my head, thirty different tenancies in the identical position. Yet, we hear this kind of argument — only because they smell blood.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South talked about how we have to preserve the political

integrity of the system. I think what he meant was the integrity of the political system. I agree with him one hundred per cent. But we have to be careful, and that is why this thing caused me a great deal of dismay. We have to be careful that we, in seeking short term political gain, do not cause the whole system to come falling down. I believe that is what the Opposition is doing.

People in politics are subject to the greatest public scrutiny. If you are a politician, people watch every single thing you do and they criticize every single thing you do. The members of the Opposition know that as well as we do. We know, all of us, on both sides, that a politician as a public figure has to be like Caesar's wife. Your life has to be beyond reproach and you have to go the extra mile to satisfy people who are out there ready to tear you down. It is one of the dangers of being in public life, that people are going to try to pick your flesh off your bones. And I think that it is disgusting that members of the Opposition, in their quest for narrow and short term political gain, which they have not achieved and will not achieve, will try to destroy the image of people in public life, and, indeed, thereby to destroy the quality and the standard of our institutions that have made this country as good, as stable and as progressive as it is.

I remember some months ago that Prime Minister Mitchell of St. Vincent was addressing a group of businessmen in the United States. During the course of his address, he referred to Barbados as "that citadel of common sense and balance". That is a neighbouring Prime Minister talking about Barbados. These things were not easily earned, and they certainly were not earned by the shortsightedness, the arrogance and, indeed, the arrant stupidity of people who would take something like this and try and make it into an issue way beyond its size.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The DLP was in power?)

Hon. L. R. TULL: The DLP was not in power. I know you are trying to get anything you can hold on to, but that would not do.

The trouble with the members of the Opposition is that they always get into things they know nothing about. The Right Honourable Member for St. John has warned them, time and time again, and on one occasion he warned them publicly for the whole nation to hear, like the Psalmist David, that they should not exercise themselves in matters that are too high for them.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South knows a lot of things. He knows a little bit about literature, a little bit about political theory and a few other things. But he knows nothing about law, and he cited the worst possible example of legislation in this country to show any intention of the Democratic Labour

Party to look after people in the tenancies. He cited the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act of 1965. I used to practise law one time, and I am sure Your Honour will agree with me that one of the most difficult aspects of the law was the fights you get in tenancies that fall under the aegis of that piece of legislation.

4.20 p.m.

I can be corrected if I am wrong — because unlike other people I do not like to mislead Parliament, if it happens, it is not because it is deliberate — but I understand that Mr. Erskine Ward of recent memory was the person who drafted that particular piece of legislation at the request of the then Premier of Barbados. It was done hurriedly. It was done by a good lawyer, but one who had been removed from day-to-day practice and unfamiliar with the day-to-day problems involved in tenancies in Barbados, and the piece of legislation did not meet the needs and caused a great deal of problems. My recollection of the practice of law in relation to that Act is that the only thing it achieved was very substantial fees for lawyers. The poor tenants had to fork out money over and over again to keep lawyers going over these disputes and interpretation of this inadequate piece of legislation, the Tenancies (Control and Development) Act. So the honourable Member should really stick to what he is good at and leave out the things he knows nothing about.

The honourable Member also read from Hansard something which had really nothing in it to help his case one way or the other. He used the words of the then Premier of Barbados, the type of words that are inspirational; the stock in trade of politicians — tell people good things, promise them the sky and you are going to get by. What the honourable Member for St. Michael South was doing was showing up the Right Honourable Member for St. John saying how he got in here in 1965 and made these fancy promises — he is going to liberate the people in the tenancies, he is going to give them services, roads, lights, and water, everything. I believe the honourable Member for St. Michael South read that part out for a purpose. You have to look around the bend and see what he intended, but he certainly was not saying anything in favour of the honourable Member for St. John. Because all of us know that between 1965 and 1976, the tenancies, and we are talking particularly now of the plantation tenancies, were completely ignored, disregarded and neglected by the Government of the time. The honourable Member for St. Philip North, if there is a residue of decency in him after his unprofessional conduct in Trents in St. Lucy, he can admit that the plantation tenancies in Barbados were neglected and starved of services between the period 1965 and 1976.

He heard about Trents, I am going to stick to Drax Hall, the biggest one. When I went into Drax Hall as

a political candidate, there was no electricity. I held public meetings by gas light because there was no electricity. The roads were so bad that Your Honour will remember what you told me the night when you came in there to speak on my platform. You were concerned about the state of your car axle even though you used to drive the biggest, heaviest and most expensive car in Barbados in those days. The honourable Member for the City (Hon. B. A. Miller) who came up there would remember that the roads were so bad. There was no water. The nearest pipe was three quarters of a mile away — a stand pipe. The pipe cock was broken off and the water used to spout through the hole, and if you wanted water, you had to fight with the whistling frogs to get water. There were no telephones in the whole of Drax Hall, the biggest plantation tenantry in Barbados. If you wanted to call a doctor, you had to go down in the night in the plantation yard and fight off the Doberman's and Alsations if you wanted to call the doctor. Those were the conditions, those were the conditions that obtained in almost all of the plantation tenancies in Barbados. And the honourable Member for St. Michael South has the colossal gall to get up in here and read an outdated statement made in 1965 and talking about what they were going to do — even though they did not do one thing at all! The situation that obtains now is that this Government has taken the bold and enlightened step of taking over the lands from the plantation people and said, "These people have worked hard as hell as slaves and as beasts of burden for over 300 years and are entitled to have a little comfort. No more chattel houses. They want to build on wall on the back so that they can take a shower inside. They want to have electricity in these things and we will make sure that they will now earn the benefits of the patrimony of this country, and the benefits of their hard work through the centuries." We took that decision, and all of this is part of our plan to bring quality services to plantation tenancies in Barbados. All the harping, cynicism, pettiness, narrow-mindedness and the open spite of people on the other side cannot turn back the tremendous surge in progress made by the people who live in plantation tenancies as a result of the enlightened policies of the Barbados Labour Party Government.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that you are looking at the clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member has three more minutes to finish his speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Thank you, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Begging! Do you want to know if I am begging? I would like to have another hour on you, but you will have it out there.

The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central must be pilloried by a lot of jackals who smell blood and smell corpses, and they want to eat all the stinking flesh off the bones. That is what is happening, and people in this country have to understand what is happening — they are greedy for power. The Right Honourable Member for St. John knows that his days are numbered in terms of politics in this country and he is making his last final gasp, and he has a lot of young men, who I thought had a little more in them, to go along and be led by him so that he can pull them down to ruin.

I bitterly resent the way in which the honourable Members on the other side have gone after the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central is something which, I am saying, he is innocent. There is nothing in his conduct that would suggest the outrageous things that the honourable Member for Christ Church West Central has put in the Resolution. I think it is shameful today when politicians get to the stage in this country where you lose all objectivity, when you are concerned not at all about the interest of the people or the durability of the country's institutions — you just want to go after people because you are so greedy for power. That is what has happened in this particular case. A road have been built where people have land and where they plant yams and potatoes, and these people on the other side are saying that those people must not have proper access to their lands. That is what they are saying, do not build anything up there.

The prosecution's case is failing, it was weak at the start. We know what has been done. A road has been built, or a set of roads, and what came out initially is, to whose advantage? That is the crux of this matter. Has the Minister benefitted financially by the construction of this road? The answer is a resounding "No." I challenge any honourable Member on that side to get up and say that he has.

Let us deal with the potential benefits. The Government of Barbados, through legislation that they made, can impose a Development Order if you put in the services. The honourable Member for St. Michael West Central, according to what I have been told, and I am speaking on advice, has not been a supplicant nor an applicant to Government for any services or to have a waiver of any Development Order, and indeed.....

Asides

Hon. L. R. TULL: I see no point. When I stand to be advised by the honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves), it makes it almost as bad as the honourable Member for St. Michael South, who expressed his concern, worry and dismay because he had problems coming from my left.

One final sentence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Very quickly, very quickly.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The prosecution has failed with its case because it has not demonstrated in any way that the Minister has gained, or stands to gain, from any development in Trents, St. Lucy. And even if he did, the case which has been put by them has not even addressed that problem.
4.30 p.m.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN (St. Philip South): Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is time we got back to Trents. For 30 minutes and 20 seconds the honourable Member who just spoke, spoke, and 17 minutes of that 30 minutes and 20 seconds were taken up with Drax and Drax Hall. Three minutes exactly were spent only peripherally with Trents, St. Lucy, but the problem and the theme today is Trents and it is time we get back with it.

Before I get to Trents let me just respond to a few statements made by the honourable Member. He started with Canefield. He said that at Canefield the road goes for quite some distance before you come to the tenants. There is nothing wrong with that and we are not against that. As long as the tenants cannot get in or out, you have to provide the facilities whereby they can get in or out, and I am going to show to you that Trents is a completely different kettle of fish from Canefield.

The honourable Member who just sat down, in trying to make out a case for Trents mentioned the Agricultural Holdings (Option for Purchase) Act, 1982. Mr. Speaker, would you believe that the honourable Member was Attorney General when this Act was done? The honourable Member for St. George South knows full well that Trents is not one of the plantations that qualify under this Act, but he was misleading this House.

Hon. L. R. TULL rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two Members on their feet.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is misrepresenting me, because at no point in my contribution did I make any reference to the Act of 1982 to which he refers.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is true the honourable Member did not refer to the Act, but he was speaking about agricultural holdings, and I have the Act in my hand. The Act says the Agricultural Holdings (Option to Purchase) Act, and it was done under his Ministry. He was the Minister, and the three plantations in St. Lucy which benefit from that Act are Bromefield, Husbands and Bourbon B; no Trents at all. So he was misleading the House. There is no question of any road for the benefit of agricultural holdings on Trents Plantation, full stop.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members of the public are in this House by the pleasure of the House and are not permitted at any time to take part in any debate. If I should hear any more clapping coming from the Gallery I will ask that the Gallery be cleared. Let that be understood.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation: The honourable Member gets hot under his collar and gets carried away.

Asides.

Hon. L. R. TULL: You can bark or howl, I am still going to make my point. I do not know that is wrong with the honourable Member for St. Michael North.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member completely misunderstands and misrepresents what I have said. I am saying, and I said it at least four times during my contribution, that people who have agricultural holdings in tenancies are entitled, like anybody else, to have services run into where they have the agricultural holdings. If the honourable Member is against that, let him get up and say so.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue. I am going to respond to a few statements made by the Honourable Prime Minister last Tuesday. For your benefit, Mr. Speaker. — I am not drawing you into the debate, but I do not know whether you went to Trents or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to tell you now. I do not get in political matters and I do not go to Trents, and I have no reason to go to Trents. My position in this matter is to make sure that the Rules of this Honourable Chamber are obeyed, so please do not draw me into the debate at any time.

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not drawing you in, but we have to put the Trents business into the right perspective. The impression I got about the Trents Development is similar to this. Let us take Bridgetown, and the houses were on Broad Street and you told the person it is okay if you develop Broad Street for the benefit of the tenants on Broad Street. That is all right. But then the person went ahead and developed across High Street, down through Swan Street, right across by Woolworth and came back out to Broad Street and there was only one house by Barbados Hardware, and I am getting now to the speech made by the Honourable Prime Minister last Tuesday.

In that speech, one of the statements he made which was very alarming to me was that we are only complaining over here because the Minister is benefiting from Government policy. That is precisely why we are complaining, because the onus on Ministers to behave properly and accountably is considerable. A Minister has to behave and he has to appear to behave in an honourable manner, and that is why we are complaining.

The Honourable Prime Minister said that it is not the policy of the Barbados Labour Party Government to remove houses. I could not understand whether he was speaking about this Barbados Labour Party Government or the former one, because if there is one thing this Government will go down in history for, it is for removing houses. They have removed persons from Emmerton, persons from St. Barnabas, they have begun to remove persons from the path of the Industrial Access Road and they have not yet got the money for the road, so I want to know how can the Prime Minister say that the Government does not believe in removing houses.

They say they could not have removed that house. The contention of the Democratic Labour Party is this. To move that house up to the amenities would have cost about \$12 000. It might be less, but I am going to the limit. To build one stretch of road to that house, my information is would cost \$97 000. That is just one road. I have not got to the other one yet. But they could not have removed that house from where it was to bring it up to the amenities, because had they removed that house from where it was, it would have turned this situation today from one where it is shady to one of outright dishonesty, so they could not move that one house. You had to keep that one house there in order to say you are taking the road out there for that one house, so nobody is going to be fooled that you took the road out there for that one house and you could not move it. If you wanted to move it, you would have moved it. You moved dozens on the St. Barnabas route. You are going to move dozens on the Industrial Access Road route. Why could you not move that for just \$12 000 instead of spending \$97 000 on one road and \$110 000 or \$114 000 on another?
4.40 p.m.

The Minister and the honourable Member who just sat down said that their information is that the Honourable Minister has made no application for Town Planning permission and all of that. That is a non-point, because there is nothing to prevent the Minister, if he wants to, from asking for permission tomorrow. The roads are in now, the roads were not in before, and there is nothing to prevent it.

My point about this whole business is that I believe that the situation at Trents is just an example of what can take place in a country when Parliament is being

avoided. I believe that over the past number of years Parliament has not been treated in the way Parliament has been accustomed to being treated. I do not believe that it is a deliberate policy of the Prime Minister to by-pass Parliament, because he has not been the Prime Minister for that long, but I believe that this situation in Trents is just one of the recent abuses of power in this country by Government. And these abuses of power, including this one, are not isolated and unfortunate blunders; there is evidence of fundamental and serious flaws about how this country is being governed.

We have a Constitution which depends, to a large extent, on how we respect the Constitution. The Constitution is dependent on respect, and once upon a time Parliamentarians steadfastly and fervently respected the Constitution. Nowadays, the Constitution in Barbados is being manipulated by this Government. What you have happening is that parliamentary sovereignty since 1976 has become a fiction in this Honourable House, and there are many many examples that can be quoted to show how Parliament is being by-passed, where you have large sums of money being collected in Barbados without any parliamentary sanction and no parliamentary control. This is the reason why these sorts of things are taking place in Barbados.

You have levies being collected and Ministers in charge of millions of dollars. I believe that if there is one bit of money or tax that should be put in the Consolidated Fund, it should be the money from levies, because at least, with direct taxation, you may get back a piece at the end of the year. The levies come off the top, and no levies should be put in charge of any single Minister, no matter who the Minister is.

I am saying that what has taken place in Trents is just an example of what is taking place in Barbados under the Barbados Labour Party. Are you surprised when speaker after speaker over there gets up and does not touch Trents at all? They talk about Drax Hall, Christ Church, all over the place, and we are dealing with Trents. You have to come out and tell us whether what was done in Trents was right or wrong, whether you feel it was right or wrong or if it was done in accordance with what you believe is good Government, whether you believe money was spent properly. All of these things we want to hear.

To say that the Democratic Labour Party did this or did that before 1976 is irrelevant. The people of Barbados have already said what they had to say on the Democratic Labour Party in 1976, so there is no sense going back and saying that in 1961 we did this or in 1967 we did that. Nobody is going to judge you on what the Democratic Labour Party did before 1976, and what you are saying is no comfort to the Honourable Minister. To say that the Democratic Labour Party did something

in 1964 is no comfort to the Honourable Minister. You have to come out and let him know if you are behind him in what he did this time. I want to hear you all tell him what he did was right. There is no sense spending your time in St. George, or St. John or "St. Anywhere;" we want you to spend some time on Trents in St. Lucy, because that is the issue today.

What has happened is this. My information is that what was done for Trents was to come to about \$210 000. My information is that the final figure came to over \$400 000. We want to know whether Government funds were properly accounted for, if they were misused and why was the house at the corner not brought up to the amenities. All of these things we want explained to us. When you say that it is just a matter of opinion how you would do it or how the next person would do it, I say that Government has to operate in a certain manner, and that is why the honourable Member for St. Michael South mentioned the Planning and Priorities Committee, because you cannot take the taxpayers money and use it willy-nilly, you have to have people sitting down and deciding on the priorities.

I heard an aside coming from over there to the effect that they do not do things like that. I believe to do it like that is the best way, because you make people accountable for people's taxes. To say that you do not do it that way is saying that you no longer believe in doing things properly, but once you decide to do it, it is going to be done regardless of any Planning or Priorities Committee. We do not believe that it should be run like that in the Democratic Labour Party.

I would like in this Honourable House to hear if all of the safeguards that were there before the Barbados Labour Party took over the administration have suddenly gone by the board and now people are acting as they feel like acting, because when Government has come to that stage, then something is radically wrong in Barbados. There must be some sort of accountability, and for any member, whether he be Prime Minister or not, to say that the Democratic Labour Party is complaining just because a Minister has got a benefit because of Government policy is a very, very, damaging statement because it opens all sorts of possibilities. It opens possibilities where Members or Ministers can see an opening and can make a benefit from that opening, and I do not believe that is how Members should be operating, I do not believe that Ministers, especially, should be operating that way.

Mr. Speaker, I started by saying that we cannot go all around Barbados if we are dealing with Trents. We have to deal with Trents as it is, not as it should be. We are dealing with what we see in Trents where a road is built, where most of the houses are, and then a road is carried out to one house and then carried around the other side of the house. We want to know if it was

proper spending of public money not to have brought that house up to the amenity, but to build what, to all intents and purposes, constitutes a triangle, and if you believe that that is the best way to do it and the best way to spend public money, well, we want you to show us how that is the best way of spending public money.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, the honourable member for St. Michael South.....
4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. James North has given notice that he intends to call the names of the following persons:

One Sydney Burnett Alleyne, in connection with cement and a banker's Licence;

One Carlton Brathwaite, in connection with Mangrove Plantation;

One Sir Lionel Luckhoo, in connection with Bath Plantation;

One Michael Simmons, in connection with Barbados Home Centre and Barbados Foundry;

One G. Bull, in connection with acting on behalf of Government as real estate agent, shipping guns to South Africa;

One the late Trigger Smith, Trinidad - Haynes paid \$2 000 deposit and sold him for \$32 000 - (4) four acres;

One Barrow who had eight acres at Neils Plantation.

He has complied with the Standing Orders and therefore he may now proceed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Philip South (Mr. H. A. Blackman) said he wanted to know if the money was well spent by the Minister. To that question the answer is "yes". He wanted to find out if it was advisable to take the road through by the Barbados Hardware, down James Street, across Swan Street, up Broad Street. The answer to that is, "No, that is not in it; that would not be advisable." He wanted to find out if we should have carried the road past the houses that are there and about the additional piece of road to two houses. He wanted to know if we thought this was right. Yes, that is right. That is in the Minister's discretion. I think that is all you had to say and I have answered you. You have a ministerial statement on that.

I do not mind the first four paragraphs of the Resolution; that is a bit of waste paper. What I am concerned with is paragraph 5, that side challenging the integrity of the Government. That is the body of the

Resolution, nothing else and whereas the Minister of Transport and Works took it upon himself to use up funds to his own benefit. Well, I believe in facts and not in fiction. Nothing has been said on the other side to determine that the Minister of Transport and Works - do not leave, I am going to talk about you just now and Trigger Smith. Trigger Smith relates to you; do not go outside - did anything for his private use.

I am going to deal first with the honourable Member who introduced the Resolution. He said that in his opinion - that was the basis of his argument and his contention, not that it is a fact - in his opinion the Minister misused the funds to carry a road beyond the original distance which would have serviced two houses, and, in his opinion, what they could have done would be to bring the two houses closer to the road. What is a fact is that because of the tenants on the land where the road was originally supposed to stop, the Minister's intuition and his heart-felt feelings for the tenants carried that stretch of road to the two houses simply because there were agricultural holdings along that stretch of road. People have been renting land where the road passes along going to the two houses that they would have brought to the original site - long before the Minister was the owner of Trents plantation.

There is no argument as to whether the Minister misused public funds, because there is a built-in mechanism whereby the accounting officer in the Ministry is responsible for the funds. The Minister can give a directive as to what he thinks fit to build or what he thinks fit to demolish in the interest of the public, and that is his ministerial responsibility, and that responsibility he has carried to the hilt, that he feels within himself, in keeping with Government policy, that the plantation tenancies that suffered for hundreds of years should be given the infrastructure which the people in the suburban areas have, water, roads, light and electricity. For \$27 000 or \$30 000, I am told this additional piece of road was built, which I am told was marl fill rolled in. There are no slipper drains in it like the original road, there are no water mains in it, nothing like what was originally set out to be done, but it is the remainder of Barber Green or whatever little material was left over, that is what it is, the ends of the Barber Green and some marl fill. No well was sunk and there are no slipper drains, no water mains, nothing carried to these two houses. What he had done is made it accessible for those people.

You challenge the integrity of the Government after voting against the integrity legislation in here. I want to say a few things about the Leader of the Opposition in particular. He has been going around this country for years blowing hot and cold. He will also go down in history as the person who initiated independence for this country, and the Leader of the Opposition will also go down in history as the man who gave Sydney Burnett

Alleyne a licence to be a banker in this country and a contract and licence to bring in cement, a man who has been jailed all over the world for gun running, shooting, stealing — his personal friend — and selling black people. And you talk about integrity of a Government!

Certain remarks made at this stage by the Honourable Member for St. James North were ordered struck from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A former Government Minister now the Chief Judge of a Commonwealth country, received cheques from Sydney Alleyne, a gun runner. And a former Ambassador to the United Nations and to the Court of St. James, and a former Minister and Deputy Prime Minister of this country received cheques which we gave as facts and made them documents of the House. The Leader of the Opposition was presiding as chairman of the Cabinet and came in here and defended them. But now you talk about integrity, because this is what the Resolution is all about, the integrity of my colleague.

The Leader of the Opposition, as Cabinet chairman, made it possible for lands to be cut up in this country. The Resolution was brought in by Mr. Lloyd Smith, a Member at the time, and Sanford Plantation was the first to be sold, then Neils and Rouens. Good agricultural land was cut up and the Leader of the Opposition received eight acres, and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central paid \$2 000 down on deposit, bought four acres, and sold it to this man — and I will give you the address — Gordon Williams Smith, 26A Nutmeg Avenue, Hallolow Park, Maraval, Trinidad. Get up and deny it! Those were the speculators of the agricultural land of this country where your father and my father and great grandfather gave their blood and sweat, and now in the evening of their years, when we set out to give them only a ray of hope, water, as my colleague said, so they can have a bath, lights that they can switch on and plug in a fridge, and roads that they can go to church in peace and praise their God, we get this kind of Resolution.

5.00 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Every Member in here is honourable.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: They walk about this country doing everything in their power to reduce my colleague in public. They cannot help targetting people. It was Bradshaw of 1978 fame. He was in it, the leader. No wonder he said to my colleague on the back bench in here, "Wash you finger. You might have something on it." In the evening of his years, a man who I thought

should be now sitting down in the comfortable chair that I made available for him on the back bench, reading a Bible, now finds himself in a cross fire in the country, and trying to pull down not push up, as he did in the past, but now pull down, pull down, with a blood thirsty set of young Turks on his right.

They talk about impropriety and integrity. You took lands, paid \$2 000 on it and sold it for \$32 000 in an hour, by way of a telephone call. And talk about your heart is out there with poor agricultural workers? Poor agricultural workers of which your parents were once?

I remember Bath Plantation. Trents is plantation land, so I am dealing with Bath Plantation, about which the then Prime Minister of the country, now the Leader of the Opposition, had the gall to say that he was holding shares for Sir Lionel Luckhoo. Hear the conflict of interest — presiding over Cabinet, presiding over the selling of the lands, presiding over the cutting up of them and presiding over the speculators! And he was involved in Turners Hall on one occasion.

I have not heard a case made out. I like to deal with facts. What I have said this evening are facts. I will say them publicly and I am going to say them publicly, as God is a justice of the people. I do not deal with fiction. What do we hear from the other side? That, in their opinion, they would not have built the road at all. Thirty-two people, they must suffer when they have to get their canes out of the land they have been working all the years.

Two thousand dollars? Carlton Brathwaite bought Malvern Plantation, paid down on it — and the Leader of the Opposition was in that deal — and sold it to the Barbados Workers Union. You know it is a fact of life, man. I am talking about "Keek" Brathwaite, Carlton Brathwaite that owns the Jensen, Gerry Bull's good friend. I am talking about integrity.

So you challenge this Government today and my colleague in here about the integrity of the Minister. You had Gerry Bull up in Canada selling land and going to jail after, a real estate agent in Canada for the Government of Barbados and going to jail. And he was going up there to try to bail him out of jail. That is the problem you had in this country. No wonder when he said he was Economic Adviser to Burnham's Government, the whole Caribbean today is in turmoil.

I see absolutely nothing in the Resolution. I want to hear the facts. What are the facts, Sir? That the Minister built a road for the tenants at Trents, as he has built for other plantations, as a policy of the Government. What we did not hear is that a Mr. Greaves' secretary wanted him to bring a little piece more road to her house. A Mr. Greaves. I do not know who the Greaves is, a Mr. Greaves.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, there are a lot of Greaves, as you know. I did not say Evelyn Greaves. I would not say that. A Mr. Greaves. Or I did not say Philip Greaves. I would not say that. I would have to say Senator Greaves, I would give you his name. But a Mr. Greaves from St. Lucy wanted the road brought further to his secretary's house.

They had the gall, on the Sabbath Day — and most of the people in St. Lucy are Adventists — to set out to disturb the Christian feelings of those people on that particular day. And what did they do? They met me at Belleville in George Street, with three or four minibuses of people there. We could not do that.

I make no apology for masterminding the GIS programme that came the Monday night before the debate. I, as Minister, gave a directive to GIS to go to Trents and interview the people at Trents to determine whether or not they were satisfied with the road. They interviewed Dems, BLPs, CRDs, any of them at all. I felt happy and proud of a woman called Miss Kate Griffith, who was able to say — I mean, that really hurt me inside — she was chasing black birds at four cents a week and, thank God, she has lived long enough to get a road to come up to her home.

The mover of the Resolution called on all the churches, all the organizations to go down. You have not got to call upon them. They went down and they made a decision on that. You did it during the by-election in St. Thomas and they answered you in St. Thomas. They gave you the answer in St. Thomas, because that is when it first came about, to try to convey that my colleague here was such a schemer, that he did something wrong, that he stole money from the BMC, he stole buses — and now he is stealing a whole road.

Laughter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All I know he set out to do is to steal the joy and the hearts of the people in Trents in St. Lucy.

The Leader of the Opposition built a road almost a mile long, not for Barbadians but for HARP, at Paragon, to ship arms to South Africa, about which he knew. HARP broke up people's houses, their windows, all the agricultural workers' homes at Parish Land and Coverly by the guns that were fired. And he passed legislation that you could not carry them to court! What do I hear at all about integrity and that Barbadians are hard? That a citizen of Barbados cannot take anybody to court because legislation was passed, under the direction and the jurisdiction of the Leader of the Opposition, that

HARP could bring a gun to Barbados, lick up people's houses, ship arms to South Africa and a Barbadian could not carry them to court! That is the sort of legislation that you brought to this country and now talk about the integrity of a Government!

(Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Shame! That is terrible in truth.)
5.10 p.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I told my colleagues only last night at a meeting that I hope the day will come when I can sit down in here and pay some kind of respect to him and say that I feel this is a proud father and a proud parliamentarian, and that I can be like him, someone who has made a contribution to this country and now in the evening of his years we see him as the father of Parliament.

Certain remarks made at this stage by the Member for St. James North were ordered to be expunged from the Record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am going to kill you dead, dead, dead!

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that we can allow those threats to be made in Parliament.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You know what I mean, Sir. I mean politically.

I believe that there have only been two speeches on this, one by the mover and one by the seconder, and I simply say that is the end of the matter. Because unless you can present evidence that the Member for West Central, the Minister for Transport and Works has at any time in his life applied for Town Planning permission to develop anything in Trents, then I would say you have a case. As a matter of fact, I will go further. I make very bold statements, at age 56 anything can happen to me. If tomorrow that you can present any evidence in Barbados that is authentic, that the Minister applied for permission to build houses or anything along the road which has been built, I am prepared to hand in my resignation. That is bold. You present it.

On Sunday night, for example, you heard about T 21 and L 52 and the Member for St. Michael South Central calling on the people in St. Michael West to come up in the thousands. Come up to see who? Did you see them in the thousands? He also went on to tell them that my colleague had two trucks working, L 52 and T 21, that they were owned by him, that they were to be used by two people and the people were drawing money at \$1600 a week, and sometimes, he said, the trucks did not work. I checked out the information: L 52, owned by Fairfield Investment Limited, Mount Gay, St. Lucy; Directors,

E. Lisle Ward, Darnley DaCosta Ward, J. Ward, E. Llewelyn Ward and Carol Ann Ward. You should be ashamed! T 21 is owned by Evelyn Thompson from Grand View, St. Thomas, since 1972; an old, broken down truck. But this is what he can go into a district and tell Barbadians, and some of them would cheer the gossip, rumourmongering and things said on a public platform — a man who had the advantage of the goodwill of this country at my father's expense, and even at mine as a taxpayer, and his only contribution today is to pull down, gloom and doom, destroy, nothing constructive coming from him!

Barbados is to collapse! When we look around, you see a modern bus terminal, something, Mr. Speaker, you ought to go and see. In times of recession when whole countries go into recession and collapse, we have a modern bus terminal that you believe that you are at some modern airport when you hear, 'Route 13 — board at gate so and so,' a credit to the Minister. We have miles and miles of road and side-walks to protect the pedestrians in this country from the heavy traffic as it rolls along. In times of recession in England, there are some 3000 doctors who are unemployed. In Canada, there are bankruptcies at one hour. But in little Barbados, where we should all be proud to see how well we have been able to dictate and steer the ship of state, we have the clowns of Barbados preaching gloom and doom and dishonesty — and they cannot back it up with the facts.

All we say to them is to present the facts, that is all we ask for. We do not want to hear, "In my opinion the road should not have been that long," and that "In my opinion the houses should have been brought up." Because in the Minister's opinion, the road should have been that long, and in the Minister's opinion he felt that he should not have brought up the house. That is the prerogative and duty of a Minister. You tell me where in this Resolution it says otherwise. Have we heard for one single moment in their presentation that this is a fact of life? Not once!

I do not mind the Member for St. Michael South. He is a difficult "Ruby Corner talker." I know him well, we are friends. Give him a bottle of Cockspur and he will kick off. We know him. He is a "Ruby Corner bird."

Asides.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Member for St. Philip South, that is who I mean; not St. Michael South. Give me a chance. I know that we are not friends. You have to tell me what you have done for those 15 years, though. You have to answer that question. You better start and think it out. It is like a Chinese puzzle. What have you done for them in 15 years? That is the Chinese puzzle that you have got to figure out. Get up and tell them

what you have done for 15 years and I am going to take my seat and then we will take the nominations. Tell them what you have done. I am going to tell them what you have attempted to do, Minister of Education and Sports!

Mr. SPEAKER: Two minutes more to go.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: A lot of damage can happen in two minutes. Do you know what earthquakes can do in two minutes, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is true.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Move mountains in two minutes!

The policy of this Government, as enunciated from 1976, has been one of providing a better way of life for the people of Barbados, and people from overseas, living in highly industrialized countries — he was the architect, he was part of the building of it — I am not going to deny the Leader of the Opposition that — marvel and say what a wonderful country you have got, while your protegee is outside telling them that my colleague is dishonest. But the people will tell you that they went into the bus terminal and will ask you if it is a monitoring station in Switzerland, or if this is a Pan Am waiting room in Toronto — clean and modern in times of recession. I have to wonder where they get the money from. You say that it is the National Debt; we see where it has been spent and we know who will pay for it, the generations of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is a Resolution built on hearsay "I believe" is a song — "I believe for every drop of rain that falls a flower grows." Hearsay — I hear that the road should have been here. I believe the road should have been there! Bring the facts that my colleague will benefit materially and financially from it. Bring those facts and I will support you.

Mr. SPEAKER: That brings us to the end of the two hour period set for the Private Members Business today. It is now time for Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I gave an indication earlier today that we will have Private Members Business for two hours.

I am seeking the leave of the House to extend it until 6.00 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is being sought for the extension of Private Members Business until 6.00 p.m. today.

Asides.

5.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I made my ruling last week that the submission for extension should have come before the expiration.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Clerk that we started at 3.30 and therefore the two hours are not yet up. Checking on my notes, I notice we started with the Member for St. Michael South at 3.32 p.m. today. The honourable Member's half hour ended at 5.22. We still have ten minutes to go.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In which I can continue.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The honourable Member cannot continue. The honourable member is within his right to make application for leave to continue, but the honourable Member has already used his time. The honourable Member for St. Philip South did not use half an hour and therefore that is left.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am getting mixed up. I thought that in the light that the honourable Member for St. Philip South did not use up his time, I could have the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders provide 30 minutes for each Member speaking. Leave has been requested for the extension of Private Members Business. If it is the wish of the House, leave will be so granted. Do I hear any comments on the extension of Private Members' Business?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, how long will it be extended for?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am waiting to get the comments on the extension first. Are there any comments on the extension of Private Members' Business? I hear no reply, and therefore.....

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be quite clear about what is happening. Are you saying that the time may be extended?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the House at the beginning of Parliament said he would take Private Members Business for two hours today. We started Private Members Business at 3.32 and we are still within the period allocated for Private Members Business. The Leader of the House has asked that leave be granted for Private Members Business to continue until 6 o'clock.

As I have said before, I will ask if it is the wish of the House that we continue Private Members Business. That is what I am asking. Is it the wish of the House that Private Members Business be continued?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is the wish of this side, Sir. I think that Private Members Business should be extended.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to tradition, Private Members Business is in the domain of private Members.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I can appreciate that. I am only putting our case, that we are quite happy to have it extended.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is in the domain of private Members. Are private Members willing to extend Private Members' time?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I must say I am puzzled by quite a number of inconsistencies. This is a Resolution brought by an Opposition Member and the Opposition is supporting that Resolution. It is in Private Members Business, private members' time. Last week I sought to have Private Members Business extended.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well after the time had expired, and May's Parliamentary Procedure quite clearly states that any application for the extension must be done within the time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It was at the same time that the two hours had expired, Mr. Speaker, or virtually expired, and that is what this is. It was at this particular time. We are told that the time today would be for two hours. We were not told that last week. This week we were told it was for two hours, and I assumed that any extension would have been for the five or six minutes remaining in Private Members' time.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are still within the two hour period. If the honourable Member will check the clock, he will see that we are still within the two hour period for Private Members Business.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I just want to be quite certain that we are operating on fair and sound principles. If you are saying that Private Members Business is being extended or will continue until the two hours go, I can understand that on the basis of the principle which we are following. If we are going beyond that, I would like to hear further arguments on that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put the question, Sir.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: You believe everything can be decided by numbers.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Put the question, Sir. Put the question that the Resolution do now pass. Put that question, Sir!

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: It is the quality of the argument, not numbers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not put a Resolution. We still have two minutes to go. Do I see anybody who wants to speak?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make sure that in such a historic.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the honourable Member begins, I ask for the last time, is it desirous that Private Members' time be extended this evening?

Pause

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member may continue.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, it is my clear perception that this debate is one of historic significance in this country. It is a question as to whether those who are readily identified as the representatives of the body politic in this country will by their voices and their votes speak out in a clear voice and say we are prepared to defend the integrity of the institutions of this country, to defend the integrity of our inheritances, or whether we are to associate ourselves with things that are corrupt.

I have heard the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) speak before. On this occasion all I can say is that he did not say anything that is worthwhile replying to. He talked about Sydney Burnett-Alleyne, he talked about private citizens. Even if it were true that a private citizen paid \$2 000 for an acre of land and sold it for \$4 000, \$8 000 or \$20 000 as a private citizen that is his constitutional right. He is not a Minister of Government, and the tax position of Barbados recognises capital gains in Barbados, and if it is done as a business, it is taxable and is completely irrelevant as far as.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And equally immoral to cut up plantation land and speculate on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

It is now 5.32. That brings us to the end of Private Members Business. It is now Government Business.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would say I am the most amazed person to see a Private Member's Resolution come into Parliament, and the Members who brought in the Resolution do not want to have the time extended to have the Resolution debated. When we were in the Opposition, we were glad to have Private Members Business, as you, Sir, would remember, and we never had

it. Look at them! A bunch of shameless parliamentarians! We are begging you to extend the time.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken, we were in Government time.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, last week we were asking for an extension of time and the Government ran away from the debate, and you had to use your vote to break a tie.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is your Resolution again. We are not running now. You have to debate it.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Government almost got defeated on the floor of the House last week. You ran away from the debate last week.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But it was a draw. It is now one all.

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both Members take their seats.

It is now Government Business.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as the last.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am on my feet.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I thought you were sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 8, Sir. It is Government's Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet.

Order No. 8.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I have been watching the....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am trying to tell you what I am rising on.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the honourable Member rise?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am rising as the last person to be in lawful possession of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: No. We are doing Government Business and you are not a member of the Government. You are not a Minister. Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: How can he introduce Government Business at a time when you were adjudicating as to which of us had possession of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I do not understand that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You were in the process of adjudicating.....

Mr. SPEAKER stands.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable Member now please take his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

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

Order No. 8 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Parkinson and Grazettes Roads, St. Michael, for the purpose of Housing Development.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is just another measure in Government's programme of providing sites and services for people, particularly in the St. Michael area. This land, as you will see, is 9,877 sq. metres or 3.44 acres and it is hoped to have 22 spots for rental, sale or lease, preferably the last two in order to assist people who are in search of this facility.

I suppose the policy of Government is well known, and I do not think I need to go at length in introducing these Resolutions. They have nothing to do with the Access Road leading from the Airport to the West Coast.

These are just straightforward matters where we seek to acquire land, wherever we can find it, for this purpose.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Speaking to this Resolution, the acquisition of land at Parkinson and Grazettes, it was about four years ago that I, together with the honourable Member for St. Michael South East (Hon DeL. O. Bradshaw), went through the area of Grazettes and Wavell Avenue seeking to identify parcels of land that would serve to provide housing accommodation for those people from the central St. Michael area who are disadvantaged in so far as house spots are concerned. The area in Parkinson was a dreary, desolate piece of land which provided cover by night for those persons who were lawless then, and it substantially disfigured the place and the environment in that particular part of St. Michael West Central.

I am very grateful on behalf of the residents of that constituency that the honourable Member for St. Andrew, Minister for Housing, has taken the proposal up that I put to him that this piece of land should be acquired for the purpose of housing. The only regret that I have is that the total area which was originally contemplated was not able to be acquired. Originally, we had looked at about ten acres, which would have taken in what is now Simmons Land, Gibbons Land and Jordan Land, and we would have had plans for a substantial development complete with an urban green, a little area where the residents would be able to congregate, a very small and miniaturized recreational facility in the centre of the development to provide not just play, but the kind of quiet, contemplative, pensive recreational opportunities for persons who did not particularly feel like being actively involved in games, but who would have wanted a breath of fresh air as opposed to sitting before a television set. Because of certain developments involving Simmons Land, in particular, it was not possible for the total area to be acquired, and even though I deeply regret that we were not able to do that full development in the way that it was originally conceived, I am, nevertheless, grateful that a little in excess, as I remember it, of 20 spots have been provided where people can now find a suitable place to put their houses.

The infrastructural development has taken place with commendable speed. I believe that the private contractor was able to put in those roads in what some people believe to be less than six weeks, quite a good deal faster than the Ministry of Transport and Works has been able to do their own projects. I am deeply grateful, and I am sure that the residents of St. Michael West Central would be wanting me to pass on our appreciation to the Minister of Housing for his efforts to bring this land to them.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): I realize that one of the most difficult things today is for persons to find spots on which to site houses which they already have or intend to purchase, so I can never be opposed to the provision of land for the provision of houses.

This is land, as we understand it, in Grazettes Road, and the representative of that area, the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works, has expressed his thanks to the Minister for Housing for this, but, I am hoping that this land is used not only for siting houses for St. Michael West Central, but that there will also be provision for houses for persons from nearby neighbouring contiguous areas, including Grazettes. For that reason, I believe that I too, can thank the Honourable Minister in anticipation. We hope that when some of the persons from the Grazettes area, whom I happen to represent, present themselves in quest of a house spot, some house spots will be made available for those persons.

We have heard quite a bit about sites and services but I am still not quite sure what precisely Government is providing in terms of services. I can understand sites. I am not quite sure what are the services, whether it is just a service lot in the terms of roads, water and light, whether it is a service lot in the terms of the foundation, or whether it is a service lot in terms, say, of a toilet and bath. I would like to know precisely what are Government's plans for land like this which is offered for sale as service lots.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: To reply to the last honourable Member, while Government has been more than generous in terms of resiting people who have been uprooted from areas, Government does not have a bottomless pit in terms of money and so it cannot provide, say, toilet and bath and foundations for every tenant who has to move on land. That is impossible to do. Government has to put a number of financial institutions in funds so that this assistance can be given. There can be no question of not assisting but we are not in a financial position to give everybody so we make provision for them to get help. We do not give wells either. If a person has any difficulties and we have to give some assistance somewhere along the line, we try to do this, but we are making provision whereby finance can be made available. 5.40 p.m.

I have said already in Parliament, and I will repeat it again if it is not clearly understood, that the Prime Minister has recently approved my wish to have the General Workers' Fund restarted, and that will make provision for a group of people who would not otherwise be able to satisfy the banking criteria for a loan, but would satisfy the requirements of the General Workers' Fund. I want to go on record as saying that the fund will not be abused as it was abused in the past. In other words, we are going to put people in there with the

necessary experience in banking to do the necessary follow-up on defaulting clients, and defaulting clients will be black-listed if they come back in future for loans. That is going to be a strict criteria. While we are prepared to give long terms, say, fifteen years for repayment and concessional terms by way of interest rates and what-have-you, we expect people to fulfil their obligations.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WAVELL AVENUE, BLACK ROCK

Order No. 9 – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Wavell Avenue, St. Michael, for the purpose of Housing Development.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this is another area of land. It is not very large. It has an old house on it which is not of any particular utility. We have to push down the old house in order to make provision for an additional few spots within the very crowded St. Michael area.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): The area in Wavell Avenue is again near and dear to me, and this goes a long way, although I believe there are only going to be approximately six house spots out of this, towards filling in an area of Wavell Avenue which was crying out for development. It is contiguous with the Belfield Park, Cheltenham Land, which already was developed in order to provide accommodation for persons who occupied the Belfield playing pasture, but now this residence and the curtilage belonging to it belonging to the Kings, which again the honourable Member is acquiring on my representation, will remove an eyesore, this old great house, off Wavell Avenue. It will give us an opportunity to take a bottleneck out of the road, because the landmark for this property is quite a way into the road itself and it causes the road to narrow dangerously at that point.

When these lands are acquired and development takes place, it will also have the effect of providing for an additional safety improvement at Wavell Avenue. It will give Wavell Avenue a complete face lift, because the area of land at the top that is a resiting area for the residents of Spring Garden now, together with this, will go a very long way towards transforming Wavell Avenue from the way we used to know it, and the way we would wish to forget it, into what will now be a really impressive modern development in that part of St. Michael West

Central, and again I am very pleased that the Minister has been able to move with such speed towards acquiring this property.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South (Mr. L. E. Sandiford) is enquiring about Fairfield Great House. I have also made representations to the Honourable Minister with respect to Fairfield Great House, and I hope that, in due course, that will be also acquired to remove a blot on that part and open up what is now, I think, a little over an acre of land for further sites and services development. I think that would go a long way towards answering some of the urgent needs for house spots in that St. Michael area, and again I would like to urge the Minister to put that on his front burner, the acquisition of Fairfield Great House, and I thank him deeply for having acquired the two parcels which we have just referred to and particularly this one in Wavell Avenue.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER

Order No. 10 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for providing a playing field for the Alexandra School.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, again this Resolution is quite straightforward. The playing facilities at the Alexandra School are rather cramped, and in an effort to give the students more flexibility in terms of space, we have decided that we will acquire this additional land for the purpose, and this Resolution seeks to do such.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to second the Resolution and to commend the Government for the initiative it has taken in this matter. I see this as part of a general plan for the coherent development of Speightstown, including the provision of a sites and services development at Golden Mile, the construction of a new bus stand and the provision of a fish market, among other things.
5.50 p.m.

I want to issue two caveats in relation to this present development. I have had a meeting with the CERO Committee in St. Peter, and I am advised that a part of this new playing field has, in fact, been constructed in what was formerly a natural waterway, and that the wells which have in the past taken water from that part of Speightstown are presently choked. I want to urge the Minister responsible for CERO to rectify this

particular difficulty so that the investment in this field would not be wasted.

Secondly, there is at present no playing field in the Speightstown area as such, and I do feel that some amicable relationship could be worked out with the Minister of Education to ensure that the residents of the Speightstown area, particularly the members of the Queen's Street Baseliners Group, to have access to this playing field under controlled use, until such time as Speightstown has its own playing field near to the bus stand.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CRAB HILL, ST. LUCY FOR RECREA- TIONAL FACILITIES

Order No. 11 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Crab Hill, St. Lucy for the purpose of providing recreational facilities.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to acquire a piece of land which will complement the Government's general proposals for the development of the area along the north east coast and which would lend itself to a park in that area. We have started with this area of land and, hopefully, we will come back at a future time to look at the general area of Crab Hill. That is the idea which was proposed.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the honourable Member for the speed with which he dealt with my request as far as the parish of St. Lucy is concerned. I realize that this would be a strange act for that parish, because the last time we had an acquisition such as this was all the way back in 1954. From 1954 up to this time is approximately thirty years that we did not have proper acquisitions.

I believe that that parish is responsible for one of the international cricketers of this country, Charlie Griffith, and now we have the great bodybuilder, Loffus Roach. I believe that this acquisition would be a means to help encourage the young people. I believe it is time enough that we should have some person taking the footsteps of those in the past. I am sure that the folks at Crab Hill, Avis Town, Archer's Bay, Grape Hall, Salmon's, Cold Cave would be very happy to hear about the facility.

I should like to make another request to the one responsible. I think it is the only parish which does not have a hard court. Having given me this facility — I do not want to be avaricious, I should like to be very fair — I feel it is time that the parish of St. Lucy should have some kind of hard court so that we could be represented as the other parishes.

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

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER, RE
SPEIGHTSTOWN BOYS'
SCHOOL**

Order No. 12 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Speightstown, St. Peter, for the purpose of providing a playing field and an agricultural science plot for the Speightstown Boys' School.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this not only relates to the provision of a playing field, it is also to do with an agricultural plot of land. I am happy to think that the people in the north are looking at agriculture, and I hope that all schools would do so, because I think that, for a long time to come, we have still got to look at our agriculture.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: A seconder.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Yes, Sir, I beg to second it.

The way how things are going in here today, I would have thought that some honourable Members would be reminded of the Northern District Council. Nevertheless, I am sure that the obvious, sincere attempt of the Government to redress the historical imbalances that were evident will be appreciated, particularly by the people of the north.

We genuinely believe that there should be decentralization of amenities and services in Barbados and that we are carrying into effect the policies necessary to bring all of these to fruition. It does not matter to us how much the Opposition opposes us, let them oppose us. We know that we are doing the right thing, and that is why we are fortified in our efforts to bring to fruition the policies for the benefit of the people in the north who had nothing for a long period of time because this Government was not in a position to deliver. Since we have been in a position to deliver, there are many joys to behold in that area.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable to see how successful the lady of St. Peter has been without being physically present. All the things that she has drawn to the attention of the fellow members of her party, who are representatives in this Parliament, we see these things coming before Parliament, being brought by the other side, and certainly not opposed by us.

(Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Which lady?)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I notice that the honourable Prime Minister seems to be signalling to the nation that the concept of a playing field with a piece of land adjacent to it for agricultural sciences is a new development by the Barbados Labour Party, opened in the north. I can recall that 45 years ago, when I went to St. George's Boys' School, the school was there, the pasture that George Clarke played on was there, and about a quarter acre of land adjacent to it was there for agricultural science. Forty-five years ago — that is what you are saying now is a brand new policy of the Barbados Labour Party for the north.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Anyhow, the point I am making is that the concept of involving a plot adjacent to a school in order that children can get some kind of exposure to the agricultural sciences is something that has been part of the Barbados educational system for a long time. I am sure that the honourable Member for St. George North (Mr. J. G. Odle), the representative of that parish, will well remember that when a six was hit, if you were batting at the school end, it used to end up in the garden at the other end. People like Parky and Yam Foot and those fellows used to hit the ball back up there. He would remember all those characters in those days?

The point I am trying to make is that we cannot oppose the concept, because it was there before any of us went to school. I think that what is happening now is that there is a recognition now that there is a need to get our people at a very early age to appreciate the value of training in agriculture, and that I can support. In fact, I will support the thesis put forward by, I believe, Frank Alleyne sometime ago, on agriculture in St. Michael itself, that there are sufficient small spots of land in Barbados, even in urban areas, that if people really got down to the business of growing tomatoes, limes and such, our agricultural output can be increased considerably, even in places where you would not recognize that it is agricultural land. He was attacked on the floor of this House by the predecessor of the honourable Member, because he had done a survey showing the extent to which land in St. Michael had been used, particularly in places like Eagle Hall, Bank Hall, and Grazettes, for agricultural purposes.

6.00 p.m.

If our younger generations who are coming out of schools now should have some exposure to agriculture early in life, because they are the children of the future, they might well be able to supplement their incomes even although they are living in the housing developments of the future. I have gone to certain parts of the world where I see a lot of agriculture going on in traditional housing developments with no visible land at all. You see sometimes just an area outside of the front of the house with a bit of mold in it, and you would be surprised to see how, in the appropriate season, that bit of land can be made highly productive. So I think that is a step in the right direction, which was pointed out to us by our forefathers years ago and is nothing new. That is the whole point I am trying to make.

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

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HAGGATT HALL, ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 13 was called – To approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall, St. Michael, for the purpose of re-locating the headquarters of the Transport Board.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is one which has been to some extent long in coming, not the actual Resolution itself in terms of the specific area, but the decision relating to a site for the headquarters of the Transport Board. It was extremely difficult over a long period of time to decide where the Government would want to set up the headquarters for the Transport Board. At one time it was thought that Weymouth was the best place, and a number of "experts" had given their impressions on that. Some felt that it was a good place, others felt that it should be a little out from there, some thought at one stage in terms of Warrens and at one stage they thought in terms of Lower Estate. Members will recall that a piece of land was acquired for that, but then the Government bowed to advice or wisdom and decided that we should allow that area to remain in agriculture, since, in a study which was done at some previous time, it was stated that that area should not go out of agriculture.

However, on looking at the whole situation to do with the Transport Board and its headquarters, its proximity to Bridgetown and its relationship to the total area of Barbados, we came up with a solution, and we think the area we are now looking at will be the best place and that will be at Haggatt Hall, which is somewhere near the roundabout. The Ministry of Transport and Works proposes to put up an administrative block, a proper workshop with the necessary facilities, training centre and playing field. You will get in a lot of things in that complex, because you have to think in terms of the total

well-being of the worker whenever you are looking at places of work, and there will be areas for the parking of buses overnight and areas for testing drivers.

The Town Planner has examined this area and is in agreement that it is an area that will serve the purpose which it is expected to serve for many years to come. It actually has a good siting for the linking up of St. Philip, St. John, St. George, St. Thomas, St. Lucy, and what have you, of course, bearing in mind the plans of the Transport Board at the moment and what the Ministry of Transport and Works has in mind with the proper development of Speightstown and, hopefully, Haggatt in St. Andrew; at one stage I was hearing something about Haggatt going out, but I hope that the Minister will have a change of heart with respect to that.

He was rather glowing in his praises for my work in his constituency not so long ago and I hope that I will be similar in my compliments to him with respect to Haggatt being alive, because the people in St. Andrew are not as affluent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as yours in St. Lucy with a good network of roads and the possibility of getting out in bad weather. If we do not have buses in St. Andrew, the whole place would be marooned, we do not have that amount of cars to get people out. It is certainly one of the poorest areas in terms of worldly goods and, therefore, I have to always be pressing to ensure that public transportation is always available to it.

I hope that, with the purchasing of this site for the improvements which I have just spelled out, we will also see a general improvement, not necessarily with a big administrative block, because we do not want that, or a large playing area either, but that we would see some comfortable layout so that the workers will feel happy with the surroundings in which they work.

I have great pleasure in commending to this Honourable House this Resolution, bearing in mind that it seeks to correct a historical problem, a problem that has been plaguing the Transport Board for many years, and a problem that has been adversely pronounced upon by a number of people over the years.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON (St. Michael West Central): Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. Andrew and the Minister of Housing has been very generous to me today, because he has brought before this Honourable Chamber three Resolutions in which I have some interest. It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I note this Resolution for the acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall for the siting of the new Transport Board headquarters.
6.10 p.m.

For many years now, the Ministry of Transport and Works has been seeking to upgrade the level and quality of the transport service in this island, and succeeding

Ministers in this Administration since 1976 — the honourable Member for St. Andrew (Hon. L. B. Brathwaite) first presided for this side, subsequently the honourable Member for St. Joseph (Mr. C. L. Bolden) presided, then subsequently the honourable Member for St. Michael East (Dr. D. G. Blackman) and now myself — have continued in our search to find a mechanism through which the public of Barbados could come to reasonably expect a level of transport service that is commensurate with the aspirations and expectations of all of us who form part of this speedily developing society. So it was with a great deal of expectation that we waited for the first development which came about primarily through the introduction of the Transport Levy funds, funds which have been much maligned in this House in recent times, but funds which have gone towards the provision of a quality of service, both in terms of roads and infrastructure for roads, as well as rolling stock and infrastructure for the Transport Board itself.

We have purchased 152 new buses over the last two and a half to three years, we have built what, I am sure, honourable Members on either side of this House would have to admit, however grudgingly, is the finest example of a departure concourse for mass transport on the ground that can be seen anywhere at all in the world. That might sound as if it is excessive, but I have travelled a great deal, in most of the cities in North America and I have travelled extensively in Europe. I heard the honourable Member for St. James North (Hon. L. S. Craig) refer to Switzerland. I believe I have visited all the principal cities of Switzerland and have had to come in contact at one time or another with the mass transport service, and I am telling you quite emphatically that I can think of no on-the-ground facilities that can surpass what we have here in Barbados in the new departure concourse at Fairchild Street.

Our feelings about mass transport go deeper than just providing a bus with a driver, with only manual dexterity to get people from one place to another. We have studied the whole mass transport economy and we have concluded that the people of Barbados are entitled to what is the finest in mass transport, because mass transport is indispensable to the swift and certain development of the industrial base of our society and to the growth of our economy. If people cannot get to and from work, regardless of where they live in Barbados, then it will mean that those industries which depend upon labour in fairly large numbers will be handicapped in their search for persons who can be relied upon to get to work on time and at a particular time. We believe that if in their quest for selection of a suitable base for the installation of a new factory or for any other service, if a new company is interested in coming to a particular region, one of the first considerations that go into their mind is whether or not they are going to be able to find a mass transport service which they would like, we will have to ensure that we have such a system.

I was recently in Washington and I had an opportunity to go and look at the new metropolitan subway service, integrated now with the surface transport, all computer operated. When I was a university student in Washington some years ago, none of this existed, so it was with a great deal of fascination that I allowed my son to take me on a wide and far ranging excursion in the Washington underground so that I could have a full appreciation of the level of service that the nation's capital has. He, knowing of course that I was interested in transport matters, laid it on thick and made sure that he took me to all the centres of interest that would help to inform my own thinking as to what we should be doing down here in the area of development of a mass transport infrastructure.

When I came to the Ministry in February 1983, I found existing in the Fairchild Street bus stand a set of plans calling for the upgrading of what was a very inadequate shed shelter, and when it was presented to me for endorsement, I commented on the file that these plans are uninspired and uninspiring and they do not do credit to my dreams for the mass transport service in Barbados, please let us sit down and discuss. I would like to compliment the officials in the Ministry of Transport and Works, and in particular the young and very, very gifted architect who was the man responsible for the design.

(Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: What is his name?)

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Do you want his name? Mr. Speaker, I say I thank the young and very gifted architect in the Ministry for the design which he was able to produce for the new bus terminal in Fairchild Street.

We will in another couple of weeks move to the north of this island, where we will be putting in a new mass transport terminal for the northern area at Speightstown. We have already done the soil tests, dug the bore holes to measure the load bearing capacity of that particular area. We have to do some anti-flood designing so that we will not have the bus terminal exposed to any unusual rainfall that may result in that area, so that terminal is going to cost us a little more than we would have liked to spend, but nonetheless we believe that if we are upgrading the mass transport service of this island, the people of Barbados have come to expect nothing but the best, and it is our determination to make sure that we come as close to satisfying those aspirations as is reasonably possible. So the situation where passengers have to wait in the rain and in the sun, and generally push about, what we would regard as inhuman circumstances to get to and from work, those things are going to be days of the past.

I hope that as we systematically develop this service with the introduction of new buses, new terminal

facilities, a newer and more aware management structure — because that is one of the problems we have always had at the Transport Board, we have not been able to identify and recruit the kind of employee profile that we feel is essential for handling mass transport situations. Most people can work in various environments, but it takes a special kind of person to deal on an on-going basis daily with a public who is not always easy to deal with. One has to have the best in diplomatic skills in order to be able to sometimes ignore what might be just a short retort from a tired passenger, but which in itself was not particularly loaded with any malice, but which could easily turn into malice if it is met by the same kind of situation. Therefore, we need people who have the capacity to soothe the gangled nerves of passengers rather than exacerbate them, and we are in the process of identifying that kind of individual to assume the responsible management and supervisory functions at the Transport Board.

6.20 p.m.

With respect to the fare handling mechanism, we have spoken already at other times at great length about the fare boxes which were introduced not too long ago, and we have also spoken about the electronic fare-handling system that we have put in place, so that it is now going to be not so much of a chore of handling fares. The computerisation of the functions of the Board, those functions that can easily be computerized and which, in themselves, do not lend to any serious dislocation, are the kind of things we are introducing with the purpose in mind of reducing the level of subsidy required to eventually manage the Board.

We have a situation where the next step we are going to take will be the introduction of tokens. My own time-table had called for the introduction of tokens by July this year, but we had some technical problems relating to the adapting of the electronic counter to accommodate the tokens. We have received a specimen token which will be a metal coin which passengers can buy in quantity and which they can buy at a reduced price. We do not intend at all to go in the direction of raising fares. We believe that there is bound to be a combination of economic activities that we can do, the introduction of better management techniques, the introduction of more informed marketing approaches, the business of selling our service, will allow us to maintain the bus fare. That is our objective, and in that exercise, we would need the commitment and dedication of all employees of the Transport Board and, indeed, we would need the co-operation of the public, because if they use our services well, then our expenditure in the area of maintenance would be reduced and it will not be necessary for us to look at means of subsidizing these kinds of what I would categorize as inefficiencies.

The tokens will go a long way towards solving some of the problems that we now have in the ticketing system by providing riders an opportunity to purchase their tokens in bulk at a discount price. We have not yet fixed how much discount one would get for buying, say, a week's supply of tokens at a time, but, at least, when he purchases those, he would be able to keep them on his person, and whenever the need arises to ride a bus, he would not have to go out to look for change nor would he have to worry in his mind about whether or not the conductor would accept a note or whether he must have three coins or any other combination of coinage.

The headquarters' building to which this Resolution relates is long, long overdue, and I must express my gratitude to the workers of the Transport Board for their patience in waiting for these services to come. I believe that when people are satisfied that promises are not empty, they will wait, and they have been waiting. They noticed that we have been promising a new bus terminal in Fairchild Street; it has come. We told them that we were going to improve the quality of the Lower Green and that has been done, because we have knocked down those old sheds and we have put in their stead a modern new kiosk.

It is interesting to note how one's mind begins to get locked into a particular system. Once people think of mass transport as an activity and that it is an activity that does not have any quality to it, an activity that is uninspiring, an activity that is mundane, their own attitudes are going to reflect those kinds of sentiments and feelings. When we asked the Ministry of Transport and Works to design a facility for the Lower Green, they went and brought to me a little board hut with a galvanized roof. I sent them back. I said that is not what we want. It is not that the architects are not capable of designing something with imagination, but the Transport Board has always been regarded as a dump where you have nothing but shacks and shanties to conduct your services from, and therefore they said that anything would do. We sent them back with that, as we did with the Fairchild Street terminal, and the result is that we have a very fine looking miniature office down at the Lower Green site. When that site is no longer used as a staging area for buses, and when it returns to what we expect it will be, that is a green in lower Broad Street, an urban garden in Lower Broad Street, that little kiosk can be used as an information booth for visitors to the island who would want to get information regarding Bridgetown and other areas of interest.

6.30 p.m.

We have promised to put down a new terminal in the west of the existing bus stand, in the area of the BMC, and these plans are coming along nicely.

In so far as this new headquarters project is concerned, we are pleased to be able to say that this new facility will be located in the Haggatt Hall area. We had looked at a number of sites all over the eastern and northern part of St. Michael, but we had to abandon all of them for various reasons. We settled on the Haggatt Hall area because it offers the high ground that we wanted as a staging area, and it also has space and the advantage of not being too hemmed in. To give a precise fix, it is off Cutting Road in Haggatt Hall and will occupy an area of about ten acres slightly east of where the slave is at the roundabout at St. Barnabas. It will also have the facility for ease of access to central Bridgetown and the parts that adjoin central Bridgetown.

I am very pleased that we have been able to bring this programme as far as we have been able to get it, and I look forward with a great deal of anticipation to the time when we will be breaking the soil for the construction of the new Transport Board headquarters, with all the modern facilities for staff and equipment, and for the delivery of services that a mass transport service warrants and which the people of Barbados have come to expect.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): We have had quite an extended debate on this particular item, but I would like to make just a few comments here.

I noticed that the Minister here, the honourable Member for St. Michael West Central started out by disclosing his interest. He was very grateful to the honourable Member for St. Andrew for bringing this Resolution, because he had an interest in them. I take it that the interest was an official interest, so apparently he is getting so scared now that he has to disclose his official interest. We know you have an official interest in these matters. You do not have to disclose that, so there is nothing to get worried about on that score.

To be serious, I believe not so long ago, maybe at the opening of the new facility at Fairchild Street, the Minister is reported to have said that when he took over the Ministry of Transport and Works, it was a dead Ministry. I would sit and allow him to deny it if he did not say that, because I would not like to use any incorrect statements. I believe he said he took over a dead Ministry.

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable Member is reflecting on a statement that I made and I will correct him. I am sure he knew what I said, but just in case he is not familiar with my exact words, I said that many person regard the Ministry of Transport and Works as a dead Ministry, but never before have so many dead people done so much.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I understand that and I now understand the words of the Minister. The point I really wish to make is that I would like someone on the Government benches really to explain to me the policies that they are following in respect of agriculture and in respect of transport in terms of any conflicts which may be existent. I recall that in the past, and even today, there was a lot of talk about land being taken out of agriculture for non-agricultural purposes. Today we heard about Neils plantation, although Neils, as far as I am aware, is still in agriculture. Even although they are four acre lots, I believe the owners of these lots still engage in some form of agriculture. I think the honourable Member for St. Thomas (Hon. D. A. C. Simmons) is a farmer of some kind of grass, but at least the opportunity is there for those who own these lots to plant fruit trees or to engage in some kind of agriculture. I heard reference about Sanford.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker: Am I right that this Resolution has to do with the acquisition of land for the erection of Transport Board premises? All this kind of thing about fruit trees at Neils, how does this get in this Resolution, Sir? I submit that the honourable Member is irrelevant and you should bring him back to the rail.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: The point I am really making is that here we have the acquisition of land at Haggatt Hall which was agricultural land, and it is now being proposed that it would be alienated from agricultural purposes for the purpose of providing facilities and headquarters for the Transport Board. Lower Estate was also alienated for non-agricultural purposes.

I recall that in 1976 and before, there were very strong arguments put forward by the Barbados Labour Party that one of the failings, they said, of the Democratic Labour Party was that land was being alienated from agricultural purposes for housing and other purposes, I am asking the Government now to explain whether land is being alienated from agricultural purposes for non-agricultural purposes specifically in relation to Haggatt Hall. We are not really querying the need for the provision of adequate headquarters for the Transport Board, but I am wondering if there is a modification of Government policy in relation to land utilisation, its land use policy, because anyone looking on will be seeing what was good agricultural land being taken out of agriculture by a Government which accused the previous Government of taking land out of agriculture. I believe that there is some explanation due from the Government in terms of its land use policy.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will reply to the honourable Member for St. Michael South. In respect of plantations like Neils, Frere Pilgrim, Turners Hall and others, the criticism of the Barbados Labour Party with the policy of the Democratic Labour Party when it was in power was that good agricultural land was being taken out of production and sold out to individuals in four acre and two acre lots for collateral purposes, namely, to line the pockets of members of the Democratic Labour Party and their friends. Earlier today, certain allegations relating to that were made in here on another matter. I will not refer to them now; they will come up again next Tuesday.

The second criticism that we made was that it was never a requirement of the Town Planning rules in those days that the services should be put in to those lots. I can give you a classic example. Neils plantation where I live — I have four acres at Neils which were bought in 1975 August — had a checkered history before I became an owner of one of the lots. In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I will not give the history today. I will give the history next Tuesday or whenever we meet to continue the debate on the Private Members' Resolution, but, quite briefly, that plantation had been owned by a family, the MacKenzie family, who had applied to cut it up in four acre lots, using the company name Neils & Rouens Limited. That application was turned down. A new company was formed and that company applied for the same permission and was granted the permission, and I will say more. As a result of the grant of that permission certain people got land, not on the Barbados Labour Party side, on the Democratic Labour Party side, when the Democratic Labour Party was in power and when they had authority to order the subdivision.

6.40 p.m.

Names were called in here today, amounts of land were attributed to people, and there was not one single denial from the other side. But what was wicked about the policy, as it existed under the Democratic Labour Party, was that permission was given for the blanket subdivision into four acre lots. There was no requirement for a road. There was no requirement for the installation of water. There was no requirement for the installation of street lights.

I said I bought my land in 1975. It is ten years since I have owned that land at Neil's and seven years since I have built a house and lived at Neil's. I had to install my own four-inch main, \$3 504 it cost me. I have

no good road. My road is worse than any tenantry road that one could think of in this island. I have no street lights. And I have asked for these things since 1978 when I became a resident down there!

— This Minister has not given me street lights. My representative, the representative for St. Michael East (Dr. D. G. Blackman), I have written letters to him. The residents in Neils have all written and asked for a few street lights. The place has been measured several times by the Light and Power. We do not have street lights in that area, very near to Haggatt Hall, Sir.

I had to put in my own water, I have no street lights, and I have a road of which I can be truly ashamed. That was the policy of the Democratic Labour Party. They allowed the land to be cut up and the people who bought the land have not got the benefit of any of the utility services in this island. If you wanted them, you had to put them in privately. The policy that we complained about was a policy which allowed that kind of behaviour to take place in Barbados, where land could be sold out without the services being installed and persons connected to the decision-makers and those in authority became beneficiaries of that distorted policy. That does not happen any longer.

The honourable Member for St. Michael South said that he found that this particular acquisition seems to run counter to the stated policy of the Government in respect of agricultural land. Let it be recorded that before this site was chosen, a number of other sites were looked at and discounted. I can identify them, Clermont in St. Michael, Husbands, the Pine, Lower Estate. All of these in St. Michael were examined and discounted.

The Chief Town Planner himself was asked to identify as a suitable site for the construction of the headquarters of the Transport Board. It was not the Government who chose the site, the Chief Town Planner himself identified the site and recommended this parcel of land at Haggatt Hall to be used for the purpose.

I go further, and I quote from a document here:

"In recommending this land, the Chief Town Planner advised that it formed part of the area earmarked as a green belt..."

true....

"but that its release was recommended for the following reasons:

"(a) The Transport Board provides a public service for the benefit of the entire community."

Neil's and Rouens Plantation or Frere Pilgrim did not provide any such service. It benefitted a few individuals, not the entire community.

"(b) Most of the area will remain open.

(c) The operations will not be readily visible from the major highways"

The honourable Minister of Transport said that it is off Cutting Road on the left, down in the back, as it were.

".... and the area could be easily landscaped by planting.

(d) access would be obtainable from an improved highway system."

Here is the Chief Town Planner justifying, on his own motion, the change from green belt activity to light industrial activity.

My friend, the honourable Member for St. Michael South, who is not in his place, need not worry that this acquisition ostensibly is at variance with Government's stated policy. It is not. The difference is that this is to enure to the larger public benefit, whereas a policy that allowed individual private plantations to be taken out of agriculture and be sold to private individuals for politicians to get a "take off" did not enure to the entire public good. That is the point of difference.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The question.

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

Order No. 1 was called — To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the Island.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. J. G. ODLE in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86, No. 2

Head 39 — Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Sport.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): This is a budgetary proposal which the Minister of Finance, during his Budgetary Presentation, set out to give a high priority to the improvement of the Home Help Service, especially in the rural areas.

The programme, of course, has received great acclamation by the aged in particular. I think Members are well aware of the fact that the Home Help Service is one where there are a number of trained persons who go into the homes of the aged and look after them. I think part of this whole concept was to move away from the district hospital aspect of life, where there are so many strong people who, just because they are living alone and have no one to look after them, found themselves more or less in the district hospitals. The Home Help Service, therefore, is a service where women, in particular, go into the homes of these persons and take care of them. It is a concept which I believe that every single Member of Parliament would be justly proud of.

I beg to move that Head 39 do now pass.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

(*Aside: No, Sir, No, Sir.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Alright.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second this Resolution, and in so seconding, I should like to supplement some of the things that have been said by the mover of the Resolution. It is our aim to provide for the old people a variety of services, using the Ministry of Health and Social Services, as the principal instrument for the delivery of these services.

There are some people who believe that the totality of Government's effort for senior citizens consists of the old age pension or the non-contributory National Insurance Pension, as some now call it. That is far from the truth. That is but a parcel of the total provision that is made for the old people. In addition to the Non-Contributory Pension, there is also the Home Help Service, there is the repair of old people's homes, there is the provision of transport services and soon, and I mean very soon, there will be delivery of medical care, free at the point of delivery with the doctor of your own choice.

6.50 p.m.

When one takes all of these services into account, one begins to see the enormity of the services that are provided — and, naturally, they have a financial consequence. I would hope that the integration of the delivery of these services will be enhanced by the fact that they are under now a single ministerial administration, that the focal point of the delivery from which

these services will be delivered will be the polyclinics where they have been built, and that the public will understand the aim and intent of having a comprehensive programme for old people.

We know that our average life expectancy in Barbados is increasing. That will bring with it some problems of financing Social Security for this age group. It will bring problems of the provision of the variety of services for old people, but I believe it is the duty of all of us to pay special attention and to give special consideration to the provision of that wide variety of services which has developed to the extent which we have developed in Barbados and have to provide. That is why the Government has realized that it is far better to provide a small unit for an old person to live in the community, it is far better to provide home help for those who need it, and it is far better to ensure that medical services can go to them, than to have that person placed in an institution where they live in what some people describe as "a faceless situation." That is why we will be increasing the variety of services and delivering it at the community level.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without making a comment on this. Of course, the concept of the provision of home help service is one which would find support on both sides of the House and in the country generally. I know that a former Minister of Welfare in this country, the Member for St. Michael East (Dr. D. G. Blackman), were he here and were he participating in the debate, might very well be pleased to know that this service is being expanded because he himself had a keen interest in the provision of services for people. I wish to say from the outset that this is a service that is desirable and is a necessary service, and so we are going to support this Resolution.

There are those who believe that the initiation of social sector policies started at a particular time, let us say 1937, with the provision of old age pensions. We must keep all of these things in historical perspective, because as the situation in a country improves, one criterion by which it may be judged is its delivery to the aged, handicapped and to those who are in special need. So a progressive and forward looking social sector policy is really a necessity for any modern Government, and in this area Barbados has been blessed over the years by a core of well-trained and committed professionals who have been thinking about the problems of those who are in need and who could think through, elaborate, and enunciate policy proposals which might well be accepted or not accepted by the political executives.

I recall sitting in the Ministry of Welfare in the mid-1970s and discussing proposals for the establishment or

expansion of a Home Help Service. These were proposals

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I see the Member for St. Thomas (Hon. D. A. C. Simmons) appealing to the Lord. I do not think we should invoke the Lord in this. This is a matter of record, and I am saying as a matter of record, even though it might come as a shock to you

Asides

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am not talking about any manifesto.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable Member address the Chair, please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, it may come as a shock to the Member for St. Thomas and to Members over there, but it is a fact that within the Ministry of Health and Welfare, as it was then designated, the whole concept and need for a Home Help Service was discussed in the mid-1970s, and a decision was taken that that particular service would be established and developed. That is a fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please. Honourable Members order please.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I am saying that government is incremental. You build upon the base that has been left, and all I am saying is that a base of ideas, proposals and suggestions were there. It was the same public officers who thought these matters through and those who are knowledgeable in these areas

Asides.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: I do not want my friend and colleague, the Member for St. George South (Hon. L. R. Tull), to accuse me now of stealing any government papers. I am saying that these matters can be found in the record, just as the concept of the development of the St. Michael District Hospital into a specialised geriatric hospital was part of the proposals to provide additional services and facilities for the aged. That is all part of, let me call it, the spirit of the age and the ideas that were prevalent at the time. Soon after that, of course, there was a change of Government and, quite wisely, the present Government proceeded to implement the ideas of a Home Help Service, and I commend the Government for taking that particular decision.

7.00 p.m.

This is not the occasion in which I would want to elaborate on our social sector policies. That will

come in due course, but I am saying that as far as this particular Resolution is concerned, we are happy to support it. It is a step that I would term progressive, and therefore it meets with our support, because it is building on the ideas and the proposals and the kind of social conscious government that this country deserves.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES (St. Michael North West): Mr. Chairman, I think the relevance of the Home Help Service is important due to two important changes in our social development, particularly when you are dealing with the older people. In the first instance, many old people are no longer able to get access to institutions that formerly existed. The almshouses have disappeared and we have converted them into district hospitals, which has meant that the number of people who were in need of some assistance at that level formerly resided in the infirmaries. What has happened is that a number of these people are now left alone and very often they need a service little better than providing washing or dusting or sweeping, but they need a much higher level of quality service in terms of medical assistance.

As you would realise, many of the old people are usually the ones who suffer from chronic ailments and require additional knowledge from some of the people who usually attend them. The question I want to raise here is how are the Home Help Service officers selected, and to what extent are they trained to take care of some of the problems that are likely to confront some of the older people. I believe that they need to have an increased number of people, because since these people are living alone, their problems may not only end at 11 or 12 or one o'clock, but I have had the experience after four or five o'clock in the evening of some old person needing some kind of assistance of that sort. Obviously that would mean that if you are going to provide an extended time of service you will probably need additional people to work in the service. My query really is, are we going to have a halfway system where the home help is only available to a limited time of the day, or whether we are going to have a service that is more suitable to those people at a reasonable time so that they are able to get the assistance that is necessary?

As I pointed out, these are people who will have nowhere to go because of the closure of the infirmaries, and rightly so, but at the same time they are left alone for longer periods, and are likely to need assistance longer than two or three o'clock in the evening. My plea then is to make sure that the service has an adequate number of workers, and that those workers are trained to the point where they go beyond just the additional house chores, but have some kind of medical training as well.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: To answer the query of the Member for St. Michael North West, we are going to

increase the number of home helpers. These people go through some form of training and many of them are people selected. You may recall that many years ago you had Dr. Wiggins and these people who used to train a lot of young girls in practical nursing, like nurses' aides, not to give you an injection, but to be able to make sure you got your medication on time. Or perhaps they could rush down by you and buy two camphor balls and some cold drawn oil.

That probably no longer exists, because you have mentioned on more than one occasion the infirmaries. We know that your approach to that type of service was to upgrade the infirmaries by changing the name to district hospitals. The name was changed from almshouses to infirmaries and then you upgraded the whole thing by calling them the district hospitals, so you still had the aged, those that were strong but had nowhere to live, living in the district hospitals.

We do not see it in that light.

This is a project which we are putting out there. We are watching it carefully and we are going to extend it across the country at some given time. We cannot do all now, no more than you did not give all the schools in Barbados school meals when you first started. St. Peter and St. James did not have any for years. You started it in St. Michael and went into the areas where you had seats. You were Minister of Education at that time and you would have known your policy and how you operated the school meals system. We are not operating like that, we are making sure that every single old man and woman in this country who cannot help themselves, and particularly living alone, are going to benefit from this scheme as we go along.

I would like to laud the former Minister of Welfare who had conceptualised this. I do not know what was in the Ministry, because I have heard all the time of moral victory. The Barbados Labour Party won a seat in St. Peter and it is a moral victory for you. You are moralists, we are winners. We are doers, you are thinkers. You always have the ideas while we get the ideas and implement them.

I hope I have answered my colleague's query, and I sincerely hope that this service will have the blessing of all the members, and that all the constituencies in the whole of Barbados will benefit somewhere along the road from this scheme.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 7.10 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86 No. 2

Head 77 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Hon. L. R. TULL (St. George, South): In 1984, the Government decided to buy a property in London at Tottenham Court Road for housing the offices of the Barbados High Commission in the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom-based offices of the Board of Tourism and Caribbean Airways. Money was voted in last year's Estimates for refurbishing of that building, but very little of the work that was to be done was done by the end of the financial year and, therefore, the bulk of the money lapsed.

This Resolution is to make provision for the funds of over \$1 million to carry out the work of refurbishing that building in London. Work is going on at the moment and I believe the prediction is for the work to be concluded by October this year.

The lease on the current building at Upper Belgrade Street where the High Commission is housed comes to an end in 1987, and when one considers the cost of leases in that part of London at this time, one sees that there is no economic sense in continuing to lease high-priced property in London and that much more sense is made by acquiring a permanent home for our missions and our offices there. This money is merely to carry out the refurbishing work at that office in London.

I beg to move that his Resolution do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the passing of two money Resolutions in Committee was reported, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Sir, this brings us to the end of Government Business for today. I would think that when we return next Tuesday, although there is not very much work on the Order Paper, that the Resolution which the Opposition refused to take time out today to complete - their own business - with the assistance of the Government members, can be completed next Tuesday.

It is on that premise that we probably will be going on a recess. We have to get the building repaired. The work has to be carried out and I am just alerting Members that on next Tuesday, we are hoping that you will finish the Resolution, and even if we ask for an extended time that you agree for an extended time for yourself.

There were the days, and my colleague, the Prime Minister would recall, that almost some 18 Resolutions remained on the Order Paper and 137 Questions were unanswered because they never gave us the time. We are offering you time, we are giving you love, we are courteous to you, and I am sick of hearing about the political - of course, that is a big word in your mouth now - institutions, the democratic institutions, the parliamentary institutions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a debate on.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. This is the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this a debate on the adjournment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. I am just speaking on the adjournment. I am just telling them what we are hoping for next Tuesday. We are prepared to agree with the Opposition to finish the Resolution. It is your Resolution, not ours, but I am reminding them, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the rough days they gave us when we had brought the wrong thing in the wrong place at the wrong time by the wrong people. We do not see it so. What happens is that you have brought the right Resolution with the wrong content in the right place to the right people for the right people and we are giving all opportunity to you, so do not let me down, please.

I beg to move that the House do now stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on June 25, 1985.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion do you want to speak?

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD (St. Michael South): I want to speak. I believe that somewhere in the Standing Orders there is a particular clause which refers to the fixing of the Order Paper for the next Tuesday by the House. That particular aspect of the Standing Order is noted more in the breach than the observance.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I may say to the honourable Member, it has never been noted, and I have been in this Honourable Chamber from 1970 and I have never seen a fixture of an Order Paper.

Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD: That is exactly what I am saying. It is noted more in the breach than in the observance. I am agreeing with you, Sir.

The point I am making is that if the Government says next Tuesday we will be allowing ample time or X number of hours for the debate, or we will be providing sufficient time so that the debate will be concluded, we on this side, will be in agreement with that. There would not be any quarrel on that so long as we know what the ground rules are.

On the first day, we heard the debate would be for two hours during that particular day. Then, today, we heard it would be two hours. Later we heard that it will be extended.

I want to refute, first of all, any impression that we refused to debate anything today. We debated, under Private Members Business, during the period of time allotted for Private Members Business, and the Record will show that when that time came to an end, one of our members, I believe it was the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, was on his feet speaking. I believe he probably had spoken for about two minutes or so, and he was on his feet when the time expired, so I do not think that we can come and twist matters in any particular way.

If you say that there will be time for finishing the debate next Tuesday, it is our Resolution and we will be

in here for that particular debate. It is not the Opposition running away from its own debate. I just want to make that quite clear and refute those statements which you are making. You are not going to get away with that on the Record in here.

7.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fixing of the Order Paper does not actually appear in our Standing Orders as one of the provisions in May's Parliamentary Procedure. From my experience, we have never had an Order Paper fixed for the following sitting. Further, as far as I am concerned, and while I have the authority to rule this House, Private Members Business remains in the domain of Private Members. If Private Members care to move for the extension of Private Members' time and have the leave of the House, so will it be. If Private Members do not care to debate their motions, so will it be. That is how I intend to rule. Private Members Business belongs to Private Members and it is their decision how they deal with it.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, June 25, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

7.21 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of
Tuesday, June 11, 1985. 2660

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN. 2660

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS. 2660

The Report of the Family Law Council for
the year 1984

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2660

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act

A Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of sale
of mineral mined in a quarry.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG 2660

A Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act

A Bill to amend the Health Services Act

A Bill to impose a tax on the proceeds of sale
of mineral mined in a quarry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Suspension of Standing Orders 2661

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

PENSIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT,
1985. 2661

Mr. St. John, 2661; Mr. Barrow, 2661; 2662,
2663; Mr. Sandiford, 2663; Mr. Forde, 2664;
Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2665.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COMPANIES (EX-
EMPTION FROM INCOME TAX) (AMEND-
MENT) ACT, 1985 2665

MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS (AMENDMENT)

ACT, 1985. 2666

Mr. Tull, 2666.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1985 2666

Mr. Craig, 2666.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BLACK BESS, ST. PETER 2667

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2667; Mr. Barrow,
2667; Mr. Arthur, 2668.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
GIBBONS, CHRIST CHURCH 2668

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2668, 2674; Mr. St.
John, 2668; Mr. Forde, 2669; Mr. H. A.
Blackman, 2670; Dr. Haynes, 2671; Mr. N. K.
Simmons, 2671; Mr. King, 2672; Mr. D. A. C.
Simmons, 2672; Mr. Odle, 2674.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
PARKINSON AND GRAZETTES ROADS
FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. 2692

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2692, 2693; Mr.
Johnson, 2692; Mr. Greaves, 2693.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
WAVELL AVENUE, BLACK ROCK, ST.
MICHAEL FOR HOUSING DEVELOP-
MENT. 2693

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2693; Mr. Johnson,
2693.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER FOR A
PLAYING FIELD FOR ALEXANDRA
SCHOOL. 2694

Mr. Brathwaite, 2694; Mr. O. S. Arthur, 2694.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
CRAB HILL, ST. LUCY FOR RE-
CREATIONAL FACILITIES. 2694

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2694; Mr. R. E.
Brathwaite, 2694.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER FOR PLAYING
FIELD FOR SPEIGHTSTOWN BOYS'
SCHOOL. 2695

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2695; Mr. St. John, 2695; Dr. Haynes, 2695.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HAGGATT HALL, ST. MICHAEL RE HEAD-QUARTERS FOR TRANSPORT BOARD. . . . 2696

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 2696; Mr. Johnson, 2696; Mr. Sandiford, 2699; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 2700.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86
No. 2 2701**

HEAD 39 - MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL SECURITY AND SPORT. 2701

Mr. Craig, 2701, 2703; Mr. St. John, 2701; Mr. Sandiford, 2702; Mr. Weekes, 2703.

HEAD 77 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS. . 2704

Mr. Tull, 2704.

PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

**CENSURE MOTION RE HON. V. L. JOHNSON
(d.r.) 2675**

Mr. Sandiford, 2675, 2690; Mr. Tull, 2679; Mr. H. A. Blackman, 2683; Mr. Craig, 2686; Dr. Haynes, 2691.

(d.p.)

SUSPENSION. 2675

ADJOURNMENT 2704

Mr. Craig, 2704; Mr. Sandiford, 2704; Mr. Speaker, 2704; 2705.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)
BLACKMAN, H. A. (St. Philip South)
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)
BRATHWAITE, His Honour R. E. (Deputy Speaker)
(St. Lucy)
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)
JOHNSON, Hon. V. L. (St. Michael West Central)
KING, M. A. (Christ Church West Central)
ODLE, J. G. (St. George North)
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)
SANDIFORD, L. E. (St. Michael South)
SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)
TULL, Hon. L. R. (St. George South)
WEEKES, L. A. (St. Michael North West)