

THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

SECOND SESSION OF 1981-86

---

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, January 14, 1986*

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, January 14, 1986.

### PRESENT

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

His Honour R. E. Brathwaite, (Deputy Speaker)

Hon. L. S. Craig, (Minister of Information and Telecommunications and Leader of the House)

Hon. B. A. Miller, (Minister of Education and Culture)

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

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)

Hon. DeL. O. Bradshaw, (Minister of Labour and Community Development)

L. L. Sisnett, Esq., (Parliamentary Secretary, Prime Minister's Office) (International Transport)

Dr. R. C. Haynes, Ch.B., F.R.C.P., (Edin.)

Hon. A. Truss, (Minister of Tourism and the Environment)

O. S. Arthur, Esq., 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 the Rev. I. M. Harewood.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

### MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 17, 1985.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, December 17, 1985, be taken as read.

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

### ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I have received Accounts and Statements for the month of November, 1985, as prepared by the Accountant General.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$902 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$148 790 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 21, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$5 000 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86, No. 22, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bourne's Land, St. Christopher, Christ Church, for the extension of the playing field at

Saint Christopher's Boys' School and the relocation of houses.

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act.

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

*Mr. B. M. TAITT, Honourable H. B. St. JOHN and Mr. J. G. ODLE entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

#### FIRST READING OF BILLS

*On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, the following were read a first time:*

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of Judicature Act.

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

#### CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

##### OBITUARY SPEECHES RE THE LATE

MR. T. O. BRYAN

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, since our last sitting, we received the news of the death of a former Member of this House, Mr. T. O. Bryan, familiarly known to all of us as Orrie Bryan.

Mr. Bryan was a Member of this House from 1946 and served for some 10 to 13 years as a Member for the parish of Saint Michael along with Sir Mencea Cox. He was a member of the Barbados Labour Party, and those of us who are familiar with the historical development of politics in Barbados would appreciate that anyone who was a member of the Barbados Labour Party during that period of time would have been a person who made a significant contribution to the political development of Barbados, for it was in that period that the great steps were taken to democratise Barbados and to usher in the modern era of political independence in Barbados.

St. Michael, as a metropolitan parish, was a battleground in the political wars, and Mr. Bryan, who was a small businessman, was able to partake in the epic struggles for the constituency of St. Michael. He did not rise to ministerial rank in the ensuing Parliaments that occurred; he, I believe, was the Chairman of Committees, and that was the highest office in Parliament that he held. Certainly, as a young member of the Barbados Labour Party then, I can speak of the esteem and respect with which Mr. Bryan was held in the inner circle of the Barbados Labour Party. To have been a Chairman of Committees was not any insignificant post in the Parlia-

mentary system. We are familiar today with a consideration of the estimates of public expenditure in Barbados under new and restricted rules, rules that are designed to curtail the period of time during which debate takes place. When Mr. Bryan was Chairman of Committees, it can truthfully be said that it was a virtual free-for-all; any Head could be debated, any number of speeches could be made, any number of hours Parliament could meet. Those were the rules under which he had to preside and keep order. That he did so successfully is evidence of the qualities that he brought to bear on his office.

After his retirement from politics, he continued in his business activities and became the Managing Director of Self Help Enterprises Limited, which ran a gas station business in Tweedside Road. I know of the very high standards that he set in the management of that institution. Unfailing courtesy and great attention to the needs of his customers were the hallmark of the operation that he ran in that area.

I am sure that all honourable Members will join with me in moving a Resolution of condolence, and I ask that the usual Resolution be prepared and, after passage, be conveyed to his surviving widow and the members of his family.  
12.25 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT (St. Michael West): Mr. Speaker, in keeping with past traditions of this Honourable Chamber, it falls to me to rise to second this Resolution of condolence that has been moved by the Prime Minister and to pay tribute to a man who has made a significant contribution to the development of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously cannot boast of having been a colleague of Mr. T. O. Bryan, because his was an era which occurred at the time when people like me were small children. But I well recall that on occasions when I would be in the company of a man who I had the honour to be his godchild, Chrissy Brathwaite, that from time to time my life would touch with that of Mr. T. O. Bryan, who would call on him from time to time for discussion and things which were not vouchsafed to tots like me. And yet, from that period, one became aware of the unfailing courtesy and the unfailing good manners which the gentleman we are now honouring would display.

I also came in later life to know him in his capacity as a shopkeeper on Tudor Street, and there, from time to time, I would observe arguments, I would say of a very high quality, which would ensue between a number of persons who frequented that establishment. And one of the things that always impressed me was that while T. O. Bryan was the big man in the shop, the man who held

office and was near to power, he seemed always to be the one who would be the most quiet in the arguments and who would listen the hardest. It was an experience which I never did understand until much later — that those who would speak ought first to learn how to listen.

I also came to know his lady reasonably well, since, for the reasons I talked of earlier, she would have contact with the same gentleman. She would always enquire about people who in the course of their lives you would not expect T. O. Bryan or his wife or anyone so close to power to enquire about.

Again, Sir, I am not in a position to speak of his performance in this Honourable Chamber, except from the vantage point of one who has examined the record. T. O. Bryan lived in an era that will long be remembered by Barbadians, and especially those of us who are called upon to carry the torch.

There were two kinds of Barbadian politicians from the indigenous position. There were those who, through their good fortune or their abilities, had been exposed to higher levels of training, and so one thought of them in terms of being the intellectuals. Then there were the others who, by dint of sheer ability, capacity and interest, rose to what in essence must be the highest levels possible for a human being to serve his country. One thinks of the Ernest Mottleys, the Lloyd Smiths, the Owen T. Allders and the Frank Walcotts and the people of that era whose debate, even now, as we come towards the end of the 20th century, still reads as if they were steeped in the highest tradition of the English Parliament. There are debates which can be found in the Records of this Honourable Chamber which can stand the test of examination and compare with debates for any Chamber of its kind anywhere in the world. Some of us have been able to learn from the likes of the T. O. Bryans, the Mottleys, the Lloyd Smiths and the Frank Walcotts.

So, Sir, on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party, we are able to say with profound regret that we join in honouring the memory of this humble and yet mighty man who was able, through courtesy, through interest and through a participation that must have required a lot of commitment, to make his contribution to Barbados and to the people of the Caribbean. Sir, I join with the honourable gentleman in the passage of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I, too, would like to join in the expressions of condolence and sympathy to the family of the late T. O. Bryan. I had the opportunity to meet this man on several occasions in recent years, not in the political arena but more in business activities, and I can say that up to probably 2 months before his death, he was still very much aware of what was happening in Barbados and would always enquire about political happenings in Parliament.

My understanding of the man was that he became Chairman of Committees during the time when politics was pretty difficult and he had many difficult Members to deal with because of the changing attitudes in Barbados. But his rulings were always respected, and he was always considered to be a fair and reasonable man in his political dealings. I am sure those who have had to deal with him will miss him, and I join with the Members on both sides of the House in expressing sympathy and condolences to his family.

With that I ask that we stand for one minute in silence in passing this Resolution.

*The Chamber stood in silence for one minute.*

Mr. SPEAKER: You may sit.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be the Instant Order of the Day.

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

### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

I may add at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that I gave notice of a few measures and I would hope that during the course of the day, I could have these measures dealt with, Sir. I am just saying this to Members on the other side, hoping that — do not shake your head, you have no control over this. You are like a teddy bear already man — it would be possible to have these measures dealt with in all their stages today, Mr. Speaker.

*The question that those several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 1, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1

### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF PARCELS OF LAND AT HARRISON'S PLANTATION, ST. LUCY

*Order No. 1 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Harrison's Plantation, St. Lucy for use in agricultural training in the National Youth Service Scheme.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would wish to invite this Honourable House to bear with me slightly on the matter here before us. This matter was on the Order Paper for a little while. We were giving thought to the terms of the Resolution, and looking at it, we realized that the format as set out here was not the most appropriate format, and I would wish, with the approval of the House, to make a slight amendment to this Resolution. That is for the purpose namely for the use in agricultural training — I am just reading from that part on — to delete, “and recreational purposes”.

12.35 p.m.

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution before the House does not contain any such words. The Resolution which I find reads, “for use in agricultural training in the National Youth Service Scheme”.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to add — thank you for your correction — after in the National Youth Service Scheme, “and for recreational purposes”.

*Asides*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: This is purely, Mr. Speaker, to broaden slightly the scope of the Resolution. As it was, it was very restrictive and that is the reason why we seek to do that. The purposes are about the same, but it was thought that we should spell out the full meaning of what is involved in this scheme.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which is before us has as its object the making of facilities available to the youths in this country. The youths for the past years — well, within recent times — have been the butt of widespread attacks in this country, and I suppose far beyond, because it was felt that they had taken a turn for the worse. There was a proliferation of drug abuse, hostility to authority, and a number of indictable cases involving youths in the courts. And the Government being conscious of its responsibility to the youths in this country, decided that it should embark upon a skills training youth service training scheme for the young people in this country.

I do not know how much it is known, but there are approximately 5000 children, I mean youths, who are put onto the employment market on an annual basis — school leavers I refer to. Some of them go to universities abroad, institutions of higher learning at home, some of them are readily snapped into jobs locally, and others who cannot easily fit into jobs or go to universities abroad or the university in Barbados are left by the wayside. We thought that in preparing these youths for employment, you will have to give them the necessary training which is required of them. As a matter of fact, we are seeing in

today's world a question of people who in their lifetime are going through several processes of training and re-training. In this technological age one must learn several things in order to survive. Technology is becoming obsolete overnight and, therefore, it is not only the question of training the youths, but it is also the question of training the older folks.

So the Government has looked very carefully at this total aspect of the labour force, since it is estimated that about 50% of the population is under 25. That is a significant number of people, and when we take figures into account, we have to consider that Barbados is a very youthful country. To this end, the Government has decided to put at the disposal of the youth, the centre down there which used to be occupied by the United States Government for certain operations, and also to acquire areas of lands which are surrounding the complex at St. Lucy. There are two parcels of lands which we are acquiring, the piece which is owned by Harrison Estates and an additional piece which is owned by the Websters, a small portion of land. The land owned by Harrison's is 13.337 hectares of land.

It is thought that in the training of people, we should not escape allowing them to understand the need for training in agriculture. I was told by some person a few months ago that if you were in a plane flying over certain areas in the Middle East and you were flying over certain territories, you wondered at times if fire had just passed there. And then contiguous to the dry and arid land that you would see, you would then see a type of greenery, like an oasis in the desert, and then when you asked, ‘well, what is this we are now seeing?’ Somebody will tell you — well, we have now passed over the Arab land, the dry and arid piece you see, and this piece that you are now looking at is the piece the Israelis have developed.

12.45 p.m.

This is not a statement or a speech to advertise the Israelis, I only speak of them in terms of their knowledge of agriculture and their ability to produce, because as far as hard work and determination are concerned I do not think anybody could fault the Israelis. They have now become self-sufficient in a number of food products in their country and the net exporters of agricultural produce, which speaks a lot for them, bearing in mind that, only a few short years ago, the area that they now cultivate food on was regarded as barren land. So we feel that much as agriculture is looked down on by a number of people — and many people continue to feel that they should not cultivate their plots of land and allow them to be barren and fallow — the Government has the duty to ensure that all lands are put into production and that, wherever possible, we should try to encourage people to look at their resource, and in Barbados land is a precious resource; be it for agriculture or for building it must be considered as a very precious resource.

I made a statement on this whole matter since I consider it to be important to do so. I believe that all of us agree with the purpose of this Resolution and, therefore, I do not have to go on to speak forever on it. I will be quite willing, if questions are asked on this matter, questions that are within my capability to answer, to answer in any reply, if one is necessary at all.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution, as amended do now pass.

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

Mr. R. E. BRATHWAITE (St. Lucy): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my deepest gratitude to the Minister of Housing and Lands and the Government of Barbados for acquiring this parcel of land in the parish of St. Lucy for skills training.

As we are all aware, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people in this country who go into agriculture who do not know anything about it, and I believe that this is a move in the right direction. There are some owners of plantations, some of whose children are trained as lawyers or doctors, and as soon as these children go overseas and they fail, they bring them back and put them on the plantations, and you know for sure that such untrained people cannot succeed in the management of plantations. There are a few names you would know from here in the centre of the island — Mr. Wakefield and the gentleman from St. George with the production of vegetables and so on — who are trained men, and I believe that those people are still making money.

Land is a very important commodity and I believe that you should have trained people in it, so that we will be able to take care of the food and economy of this country. We realise, Mr. Speaker, that the boys and girls of today will be the men and women of tomorrow, and I am sure that we have a number of projects in the island of Barbados, but because these people are not trained, things are not moving in the way we would like them to go.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister that there is a parcel of land on the other side of this same plantation which I believe the owners would be glad to get the rid of, because it is a piece of rocky land, and I would like to appeal to the Honourable Minister to look into this for me. I would not like to appear to be arrogant or unreasonable, because, as you know, you just acquired a few acres of land in the parish of St. Lucy, which is around 65 spots. But that is only a drop in the bucket, because we are suffering down there for house spots.

The last acquisition of land we had down there for house spots was in 1955, so you would know that is a lot

of years that we did not have an acquisition down there, so we are desperate. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it is the only parish in Barbados that does not have a housing area. I am not so desperate to have a housing area. I do not mind a few houses that, in case of a disaster, we can put the people there for a limited length of time, but the people of St. Lucy do not like living between partitions, they do not like that attitude. Each man likes to have his own roof and his own house where he can take care of himself.

I would like to appeal to the Government, as they are dealing with this land at Harrison's Plantation, to look into it. The poor people at Crab Hill are in desperate need of house spots and they are not even quite willing to come over to Checker Hall where we have the 65, but I am sure we have over 400 applications waiting for lots in the parish of St. Lucy.

I would like to thank the Honourable Minister in advance for all that he is going to do for the nice people in the parish of St. Lucy.

I thank you.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN (St. Philip North): Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Minister in bringing this Resolution before Parliament sought and did get the approval to add the words "for recreational purposes" on to the acquisition, but the one I am interested in is the earlier part, "for use in agricultural training in the National Youth Service Scheme." I would like to stop there for a little while, because I think that this is a good opportunity for the Government benches to enlighten the people of Barbados, and the Opposition, on what is the position with the National Youth Service Scheme, since it seems to me, from this Resolution before us, that the whole concept is still evolving, because you are at a stage now where you are adding an agricultural training section to it. There has been a lot of dialogue — there has been a lot of open debate on whether or not the scheme should be under the Defence Force or under the Ministry of Education — and since, as far as I know, no definite decision has been made, or at least it has not been announced, on what is the format for the National Youth Service, I would be very grateful if this occasion could be taken by the appropriate Ministry to bring this House up to date with a few things.

First of all, when is it proposed to have the scheme on the road?

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask the honourable Member what is the subject matter before the House?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter before the House is the acquisition of a parcel of land for use in agricultural training in the National Youth Service.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I am not going to let that Resolution be extended into a debate on the National Youth Service. The substantive matter before the House is the acquisition of land.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, with the limitation of the Speaker, I would like to know exactly what type of agricultural farming is proposed for the scheme, if it is irrigation which is going to be used, if it is going to be vegetable crops, who is going to do the training for agriculture, how it is going to be tied into the Land Lease Scheme, how it is going to be tied into anything to do with the Rural Development Project, how it is going to be tied in with the Agricultural Department, and how it is going to be tied in with the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. I want to know what is the format for the training of the youth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get from the other side a bit more information on the proposed training for the National Youth Scheme for which this land will be used.

12.55 p.m.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW (St. Michael South East): Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution I think that it is necessary to explain that the Defence Force will be participating in the Government's Skills Training Programme, and this acquisition will provide the land on which some of the programmes will be conducted by the Skills Training.

We feel that the Defence Force has a role to play in the execution of our National Training Scheme, and agriculture is one of the schemes which has been identified as one that the Defence Force could ably conduct and assist in executing. So the acquisition at St. Lucy will provide a vast area of land for the youth of Barbados to have that sort of agricultural training, and, at the same time, it is hoped that those persons who are presently in the Cadet Corps of the Defence Force will also benefit from having the experience of knowing something about agriculture.

We have heard several criticisms about the role of the Defence Force as it relates to the youth training programme, and this will surely explain why the Defence Force should receive our compliments, because it is not only there, as some persons have thought, to do a military sort of exercise, but it will also now be fully involved in training and inculcating in the youth of Barbados the sort of agricultural habits which I really think, and we feel, that they should have.

It is also hoped on this land that other classes, for instance, some training in auto mechanics, auto body and auto electrical repairs, will be conducted, and it is hoped that some sheds will be constructed to facilitate this

sort of training which the Defence Force will be conducting down there.

In supporting the Resolution, I hope that that sort of explanation is clearly understood. There are other programmes which I would not, at this stage, want to get involved in, but as this debate should be confined to the relevance of the programme, I thought that I should give that explanation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS (St. James South): Mr. Speaker, I feel obliged to respond to something which the last speaker just said, and it is in relation to the fact that the Defence Force, as I understand it, will be involved in the training of these young people. I cannot understand how the Defence Force could be better suited to train young people in agriculture than the Ministry of Agriculture, which has more doctors in it than anybody else.

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

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. What I did say was that this is a complementary sort of programme, the involvement of the Defence Force, but the honourable Member knows that the Skills Training at Sayers Court, for instance, conducts a similar programme. We are aware of the Ministry of Agriculture and other agencies, but the Defence Force is one other agency that will assist in carrying out the National Training Scheme and Programme.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Even if that were so, I am still opposed, absolutely opposed, to the Defence Force having any say in the training of the young people in a National Youth Service, and all youth groups in this country have expressed that view. Or is it that the Government is going ahead and not listening to the views of the young people of this country?

Mr. SPEAKER: We are debating the acquisition of land.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was responding to my friend, the Minister, so I thought that I was within my rights so to do. I thought so.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are trying to move this debate into a debate on the Defence Force and the National Training Service. The honourable Member will have ample time to debate that whenever any Resolution to that effect comes before the Chamber, but, at the moment, we are dealing with the acquisition of land.

Mr. N. K. SIMMONS: I shall be guided by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but possibly the Honourable Minister

who introduced the Resolution could give us some indication as to the suitability of the land for the project.

I, myself, do not know much about agriculture, but I do know that St. Lucy is one of the driest parts of the country and, therefore, I would like to know what type of agriculture we hope to teach these youngsters. Whenever I go to St. Lucy and I look at the canes, I always think that they are in the wrong part of the country. I always associate St. Lucy with nuts rather than any other form of agriculture. But that is from my limited knowledge.

I am saying that it seems to me that the location of this agricultural training project is in the wrong place — unless you want to deter youngsters from doing agriculture — so I would like to know the suitability of the area for the project. That is my main concern. I would also like to know if we can have some indication of the numbers that you will be training over a period of time, and the period of time which the training should last.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN (Christ Church East Central): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we should really prolong this, because, obviously, a mountain is being made out of a mole hill. The position is that the acquisition of this piece of land is taking place in order to rationalize an area of land in St. Lucy, part of which is already owned by Government and part of which is not owned by Government.

The St. Lucy Base, I believe, during the war time, was acquired by the then British Government for handing over to the Americans for the purpose of an obligation that was entered into by the late Sir Winston Churchill. This particular piece of land is next to this area.

#### *Asides*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This is part of Harrisons Plantation, and it was pointed out to us that if we wished to develop the land that we have now, it would be better for us to have the land that we have now plus this additional piece of land, so that the whole area could be treated as a unit. On part of that unit, agricultural training will take place, on part recreation will take place and on the other part the existing activities of the Defence Force will continue. That is all that is happening. It is set out very clearly that we do not want to interfere, at the present moment, with the existing activities of the Defence Force in respect of that part of the land which is situated near to this, but we wish to have some of the youth training activities carried on there.  
1.05 p.m.

I want to say very clearly that this Government is firmly convinced that there are a number of young people

in Barbados who wish the opportunity as part of their training to spend a period of time with the Defence Force. We are going to give them that opportunity, because they will be doing it voluntarily, and they would be able to use the equipment that they have. That is our policy, and I know of no youth group in Barbados that says that they disagree with that. So do not let us fool ourselves. That is the policy enunciated by this Government and that is the one we will be using.

As far as agriculture is concerned, it is time that we should think of agriculture not only in terms of cane growing. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been trying to point out that to the honourable Member for so many years and he still comes in here and makes a speech which indicates quite clearly that, notwithstanding the tremendous efforts of his teacher, the pupil has not grasped the point yet. So that is the position.

Israel has agriculture in a desert. Are we to deprive the people of Barbados of the possibility of learning agriculture in dry land? Are we to deprive them of that? The point is that part of this land would be used. The whole object of the Youth Training Scheme is to have centres where people in the surrounding areas will be able to go and see practical demonstrations of what is new. In agricultural training you can go down there and you can teach them tractor repairing. That is an integral part. You can teach them cherry-growing, you can teach them nut-growing. Nuts always grow in St. Lucy. The whole thing is there.

So we are only buying this piece of land because it is convenient for it to be joined to the rest of the land, and rather than having it there sticking out like an eyesore, under no control, we want to buy it. In any event, it is known that agriculture used to be carried on at Harrisons Plantation. You could also teach them poultry rearing, pig rearing, all kinds of activities. You need dry land for pig rearing. The drier the land the better. Roy Ward has a farm down there very near to this area. Do you mean you are going to tell the former Senator Ward that he cannot carry on agriculture down there, that it is too dry? Black Belly sheep, I am told, will grow even on rockstone land. So let us be wide in our view of these things. This piece of land is just a convenient piece of land to join to the other piece. That is all.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up one or two misunderstandings about the area which is the subject of this debate. Barbados was never any part of the agreement which was made between the British Government and the President of the United States during the war. The land at St. Lucy — I represented the Webster Trust Company in the other Chamber in the arbitration — was sought to be

acquired by the United States Government between the year 1954 and 1955, some 9 or 10 years after the war was over, for the euphemistic purpose of a naval facility, which was never divulged to the general public of Barbados. There is an Act on the Statute Book which granted certain extra-territorial concessions, both with the civil and criminal law of this island, to the users of that "facility."

The land comprised between 51 and 53 acres of sub-marginal, rocky land on the cliff near North Point Lighthouse, and, as a Member of the House at that time, I objected to the United States Government acquiring any land in Barbados. I said at that time that if you allowed a foreign Government to acquire land, it would mean that the Russian or the Japanese Government could come and buy up all the non-agricultural land in Barbados, having the resources to do so, and then we would either become a Soviet colony or a Japanese colony by dint of ownership of the land.

The British Government took this to heart, and then they, themselves, negotiated for the British Admiralty, since we were still a colony, to purchase the land. It was at that stage that I entered into the negotiations under the Land Acquisition Act for a fair market value to be paid by the British Admiralty for the land down there. It is there I come from, and I know about down there.

Some very interesting observations were made by the Prime Minister about growing Black Belly sheep and other uses of sub-marginal land, because the land in St. Lucy as a whole, but this land in particular, is not necessarily the most productive land in the island. That is an understatement to say it is not the most productive land. If I were going to encourage youngsters to go into agriculture, the question of irrigation would be one of the first things that we should look into, and certainly some land which, by the returns, would encourage them to feel that farming is a useful pursuit.

We have Bright Hall down there raising chickens, we have next door to Harrisons Northern Poultry Farms raising chickens, pigs, sheep, but particularly milch cows and so on. I know, I sent some milch cows down there, so I know milch cows can be raised, and I also sent about 15 breeding sows down there at one time when I no longer had space to raise them. So there is no doubt that farming in the cane farming sense is not compatible with the nature of this land, but farming in the general sense of mixed farming is something that can be carried on on any land, even rocky land in the parish of St. Lucy.

During the time of the Federation, Mr. Jock Whitney came around here — an American millionaire who was representing the President of the United States — to negotiate the lease agreement which had been entered

into by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain during the War, and Barbados tried to get into the act, and it was pointed out at that time that the naval facility down there — and I will tell you now what it was used for — the naval facility, as far as I know, was used for very low frequency underwater communications for submarines — it was not used for any sinister purpose — and I should like to say now that after the Ceebees departed, with their night club activities, the people who were stationed at the base in St. Lucy fitted in very well in the general community and assisted the farmers in St. Lucy with cane fires. They were very active in the Boy Scouts' Movement, and generally I think were a credit to the United States of America and kept a very low profile.

There was a misunderstanding by the Government of Barbados as to the nature of the facility, and the Government at that time, that is in 1959/60, tried to renegotiate the agreement. But it was an agreement made between the Barbados Government and the British Admiralty, and there was an Act on the Statute Book, which subsequently was repealed by the present Administration when they tried to get \$20 million for the use of the base from the United States Government. Far from charging the United States Government \$20 million, I think you are very lucky to get the land and the buildings for nothing, and I say that the United States' personnel — and I am no great admirer, as you know, of some aspects and features of life in the United States — performed a useful service, as the honourable Member for St. Lucy will attest, he being an owner of tractors and other vehicles which were compatible with the presence of the base in that parish. He would be able to attest that, generally speaking — he would tell you, Sir — they were not obnoxious or objectionable to the people of St. Lucy. They did assist with cane fires and so on, but they were not part of the base review.  
1.15 p.m.

Anyhow, what did come out of these renegotiations, in which Chaguaramas was the main point of dispute, was that the Premier of Barbados was given a ride up to Cape Caneveral in Mr. Jock Whitney's plane — because they had room on board, not because he was necessarily part and parcel of the negotiations — and I went and saw him off when they went to Cape Caneveral at the time when these negotiations were actually going on.

There does not seem to be a clear perspective on the Government side as to what this land is required for. We heard an explanation from the Minister of Youth Affairs, which brings back into the picture the Defence Force of Barbados, which had been extracted from the training scheme by the pronouncements of no less a person than the Commander-in-Chief, the Brigadier himself, not very many weeks ago. We now hear that the Defence Force is back in the training picture, and then, probably

on instructions from no less a personage than the Attorney General himself, that it is the Cadets who would be trained in agriculture rather than the Defence Force training the personnel. I said "probably," I did not speak with certainty. It is just that the honourable Member was covering his mouth at the time when the Minister was speaking so I could not tell what was going on out there. He was reading the Gospel according to St. Mark.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: Getting some enlightenment.)

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I am saying, Sir, is that we are not sure, and when the members of the Government speak with different voices on the purpose for acquiring the land, we wonder if there is not some other purpose which has not been disclosed here at this page. I do not know who owns the land. Squaring up a boundary is not justification for spending the taxpayers' money, to say that you are squaring up a boundary and making it look good on paper because it would be in a straight line. That is not a sufficient justification.

But if we come to agriculture, this is what I want to say, as a person who is probably better acquainted with the workings of the Ministry of Agriculture than any of us in here — I only live close to the Ministry but you were actually in the Department of Science and Agriculture — and you will know that we had Jerusalem, we had Haggatts, we had Bullens, we had Sayers Court, we had all of these places which were prominent examples for the peasants and the people in the surrounding districts of how to do mixed farming and every kind of activity, sheep breeding, cattle breeding and everything else. All of those have gone into decay. Jerusalem is not — I do not mean Jerusalem the Golden, I mean Jerusalem on the borders of St. Peter and St. Lucy — very far away from North Point, and even if you had people at North Point, they could travel to Jerusalem and revive the training at our agricultural stations, which so sadly need reviving today.

We chased out the people from Taiwan who were operating in St. Philip at Sayers Court and we brought back in people from Peking or Beijing, as they call it — not "Beijang" but Beijing — and said that they were to buy all our milk products and build a new road on the East Coast for us. All of that has gone today. It hurts my heart when I drive through Gibbons Boggs and see the deterioration, under the present Minister, — it is a pity he opened his mouth, because he drew attention to himself — the deterioration in agriculture at the agricultural stations, and now we are buying some marginal land to say we are going into agriculture.

Number one, you have got a problem with irrigation. Wells in St. Lucy around there — the honourable Member can tell you — if you can dig one, it is 256 feet

before you begin to get damp far less water, 256 feet, the minimum depth for a well there! It is not like up here in St. Philip at Hampton or at Golden Grove or any of those areas where the Government has put in irrigation schemes. So when you are doing agriculture there, you know that you are ploughing a very hard furrow, and that is not going to encourage the young children.

What I would enjoin the Government to do is to try to put some life back into our agricultural extension work and the stations like Jerusalem, Bullens and Haggatts, and take the workers to the work rather than take the agriculture to the workers. I think you have an infrastructure which already exists and you would be able to do a better job.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Just one final thing, Sir. The honourable Member has ....

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member ...

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Can I not speak again?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The honourable Member has not got the right to speak again.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I just want to say that Sayers Court is an excellent example of an agricultural training centre.

(*Aside:* Mr. B. M. TAITT: He just wound up.)

*Asides.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is ....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: He just wound up.

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Order No. 2, Sir.

#### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S TENANTRY, ST. PETER

*Order No. 2 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Six Men's Tenantry, St. Peter, for the purpose of a housing development.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, in moving this Resolution, I am going to make a few points. Six Men's Tenantry is one of the larger tenancies in Barbados. It has a population of 181 persons and there are something like 77 houses there. In addition to the people who are on the land that the Government is responsible for — or, rather, who would be entitled to the

purchase of lots under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act — are a number of persons who are on the foreshore and are excluded from that arrangement for tenants. The Act does not give them any protection, those who are on the foreshore. However, the area where those people on the foreshore live is creating some problem in that there is serious encroachment by the sea, and it is felt that, unless urgent and immediate action is taken, most of those houses will be washed into the sea. To this end, the Government has designated Six Men's as an area for orderly development to give the Government the opportunity to go in and bring some order to the system.

It is a lovely piece of land with quite a lot of space to the back which is poorly used or not at all used. It has a land area of 12.019 hectares or 29.6 acres. At the moment, and thanks to the Ministry of Transport and Works, the people have already seen the evidence of the Designation Order, because the Ministry has gone in and has started the development. It was in very shocking condition when I went there myself and saw the conditions under which the people in Six Men's were living. Since the Government feels it has a duty to those people on the foreshore, people who will have to go anyhow because of the encroachment of the sea, a decision was taken to make provision for those people on the foreshore in the resiting programme. The land lends itself very much to a development, and given the attitude of the people down there — they are very co-operative — we have not been having any problems. Of course, they seem very pleased with things, that at long last some hope has come in terms of development in the area, and that we will have a very nice development.  
1.25 p.m.

In addition to this, the World Bank sent a mission here, under an agreement with the Government, and looked at a number of places that could be considered right for some form of development. These include a place in the constituency of St. Michael West, near to the Westbury Cemetery, and also Six Men's in St. Peter. We believe that, so long as proper agreements can be worked out, the system as we saw it, and we have looked at it, can be a very good system for development for the lower social economic group, and Six Men's will be used as a pilot scheme as well as that area next to the Westbury Cemetery, and we are looking at other areas for development. We feel that, given what can be done in these respective areas, Government has a duty not only to designate, but wherever possible and wherever Government can acquire in the interest of the tenants, who have been largely disadvantaged within recent times, Government should do all that is possible to assist. We do not consider this is a one-shot approach, but that we should do this wherever possible in the interest of all Barbadians.

I believe I have said as much as I need to say. We have discussed Six Men's in here already, and I need not go any further at this point in time but stand ready to answer any question which might be asked of me on this matter.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW (St. John): Mr. Speaker, way back in 1975 a gentleman who represented a large ecumenical organization in the United States of some 3 million members, rejoicing in the name of Bishop Washington from Washington, came to Barbados and had discussions with me and with the Ministry of Tourism and other interested departments of Government on the subject of Six Men's. As a result of these discussions, which centered around the creation of development in the north of St. Peter, the church, which I shall not name at this stage — I really cannot remember the proper title of the church, but it was a Baptist church — acquired Six Men's Plantation, comprising some, maybe 220 acres or 240 acres of land, which would also subsume the area abutting and abounding on the sea, to take in right up to the Challenor Warehouse, and go inland to Six Men's Village and right up to the hill next to Maynards on the south, and Colleton Plantation on the north.

In pursuance of the objectives to bring members of the Church to Barbados under the IATA scheme of Affinity Groups Travel, from time to time that organization had brought church members to Barbados, in the meantime trying to mobilize the financing to carry out their scheme. If private enterprise is in a position and willing to carry out development in any part of Barbados, I think that the Government should then assume a regulatory function in these matters, having inputs into the type of development which they would like to see, which they have authority to do under the Town and Country Planning ordinances that we have on the Statute Books on this island, stipulating conditions such as relocation of existing tenants, which they have done in the past and can continue to do, at no expense to the Government.

There is an unfortunate feeling amongst the members of the American church, who have employed architects and planners to design the scheme, under which they would be training people in agriculture as well, which is very significant. The construction of a marina was also involved, and a Barbadian architect, a Mr. Tony Hoad was employed. I think that the Government ought to try — I am being very honest about this — it was not a Democratic Labour Party's scheme, it was only initiated during our term of office — any Government ought to get together with the originators of the plan and see in what way they could co-operate with the people who actually own the land. Instead of that, we have a kind

of resentment building up that this is a form of political expropriation in the true Marxist sense - the expropriators will be expropriated and the capitalists will be rent asunder. What they are doing is renting asunder a genuinely sincere effort on behalf of expatriate Barbadians to help develop their country, in the same way that the efforts of the Panamanians in acquiring the Panama Estates, which incidentally included Colleton, to the north of this scheme, was frustrated right here by those in Barbados. Let me say no more. Lascelles is gone. Colleton is gone. Four Hill is still there, held on to tenuously, some of it due, of course, as you know, to the fault of some of the people in the Panama Society themselves. But at the same time, not enough was done by any Government to protect those small people in Panama who had gone out there, 30 000 and 40 000 of them, to build the Panama Canal, and who, with their meagre savings, were looking forward to returning to the fair and shining slopes of this island in order to develop the island agriculturally and in other respects.

So now we have a repetition. The wheel has gone full circle, and in some quarters it is being said that some of the people did not support a candidate for the Government in the recent by-election. I do not think that the candidate himself would be so bereft of common sense as to try to expropriate the land of people because they did not support him. because you do not have any way of knowing who voted for you once they went into the voting box, and the results, as a matter of fact, do not demonstrate that the people in that area did not support the candidate who is now sitting in his place on the Government back benches.

1.35 p.m.

What I am urging is this, that if you have people who genuinely are trying to develop, why doesn't the Government get together with those people and let them spend the money? Why take away their land from them? You are expropriating, and expropriating without compensation, because the sum which was offered for prime beach land was three cents a square foot, which is less than you pay for plantation tenancies. I would like to get some of that land at three cents, not only that, any beach land in Barbados at three cents a square foot.

*Aside.*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You work out how much \$3 069 for 29 acres of land is. I beg your pardon, I read one dollar too high. I reduce my bid. It is \$3 068 for 29.6 acres of land or 12.019 hectares. I quote the Minister. Have the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Housing and Lands informed the Cabinet what they offered these people? That is penurious, it is derisory and it is crass expropriation in the worst communist sense of the term, because it is better to take the land and give them nothing than offer them three cents

per square foot for land in Barbados. There is no land in Barbados, apart from the plantation tenancies, which you can get for ten cents, for even 30 cents a square foot far less three cents a square foot for beach land.

*Certain remarks made by Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW were ordered to be expunged from the record by the SPEAKER at this stage.*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No right thinking person in Barbados can feel happy about a Government that takes land from people at three cents a square foot on the beach.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir: The honourable Member is breaching the rules of the House by deliberately fabricating the terms of the Resolution. He cannot say that the Government is taking land at three cents a square foot. The Resolution says no such thing. The Resolution does not say what is the price per square foot.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not breaking the rules of the House. The honourable Member is making an allegation. In due course Members on this side will be able to correct it and put their side of the story.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying positively that the Member for St. Philip North and I saw a letter from the Ministry which offered the people \$3 068 for 29.6 acres of land. Work that out. I can send for my calculator. I said to the honourable Member when I saw the letter 'they mean \$390 000, they could not mean \$3 000,' and they confirmed it was \$3 900. I mentioned the amount just now. Are you saying that this is not true? I could not believe it when I saw it, because only a Government that was interested in going out of power fast could make that kind of offer to a land owner in Barbados. Would any of you sell land at three cents a square foot, even down inside a gully?

*(Aside: Hon. B. A. MILLER: We do not believe that you saw it.)*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You say you do not believe I saw it? If the honourable Member gives me seven minutes I will go to my office and bring it. I want anybody on the opposite side to tell me that that letter does not exist and I will publish the letter in the newspaper tomorrow. Are you saying it does not exist? Are you saying it is a mistake? If you are saying it is a mistake, say so, but do not tell me that the letter the two of us saw does not exist, because it exists. Why are you going to deny something? Say it was only an opening bid, or say it was a mistake, but do not tell me it does not exist. Three cents a square foot for beach land?

What opinion would our people in the United States have of us here in Barbados - that we are interested in

Barbadians coming back home and trying to help to develop this country? — when the Panama Estate, as I say, has gone through the eddoes, not through the fault of the people on the opposite side, not assisted by them, but that is an unfortunate episode in the history of the migration and development of Barbados' people. Very unfortunate! All the wrong people got into it.

Colleton that the Government has acquired was part of the Panama estate. If you want to relocate people — during the by-election you were going to put an industrial estate there, and the first shed has not gone up — the roads are there, put the people there. The roads are built already. The roads are built at Colleton, which is just a couple of hundred yards away — go up by the Church Gap, turn right and you have an excellent place there to relocate the people.

I agree with the Honourable Minister. The trouble is that they acquired the land compulsorily for the purpose of agricultural resiting and then they bring it in under tenancies — I think it was last Thursday's paper or Thursday before last — under the Tenancies Act. So you are consolidating bad development. People cannot build proper sewage disposal systems, I prefer to call them, on the beach side. We know that, so I agree that you should move those houses, but why not put them up at Colleton? Who do you go down and interfere with Barbadians who are trying to help develop this country, is all I am asking? I have no interest. I am neither lawyer, consultant nor anything. I do not represent St. Peter, I represent Barbados. I do not represent St. Lucy where I was born, I represent Barbados. I represent St. John and Barbados. I cannot say I do not represent St. John. My interest in this is to try and create an atmosphere.

1.45 p.m.

If you look at the communication that was held in October, the International Monetary Fund communication on the meeting of the Executive Directors and the representatives of the Government of Barbados, which I have — I have it — and you will see that they have said that one of the discouraging factors — I am paraphrasing — I have it downstairs, I can bring it back in a few minutes — I was reading it up to this morning — is that not sufficient is being done to encourage inflows of capital on a non-loan basis — I am paraphrasing — and that more must be done in this particular respect. That is what the Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund said in their communication with the Barbados delegation in October last year, and they made a very strong point of this. If I could even paraphrase it further, I would say they are saying, stop borrowing and do some encouraging. I am saying that by pursuing this kind of programme, where you expropriate — this is expropriation, this is not acquisition — this is cold-blooded expropriation — if they get to hear about this in the United States of America, the *Wall Street Journal*

would do a flip and discourage investment in Barbados, because they will say it is cold-blooded expropriation. The point is this, it is not you that are going to suffer. Your pensions are assured. It is the people in Barbados who cannot get jobs who are going to suffer in the long run.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I would like criticism of the Government's conduct from people whom I believe to be genuine in their criticism, but I cannot take it from people who, when they had the opportunity at the Constitutional Conference to frame the Constitution of Barbados in such a manner that expropriation was prohibited, objected violently. It was only because of the persistence and the steadfastness of the people from this side, together with the late Ernest Deighton Mottley, the late E.R.L. Ward and Mr. Jack Dear that we got in anything at all in the Constitution dealing with the compulsory acquisition and compensation. The honourable Member bitterly opposed it, so it does not lie in his mouth to talk now about expropriation.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. On what does the honourable Member rise?

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The honourable Member made a statement that I bitterly opposed the inclusion of any provision about compulsory acquisition. The honourable Member is misleading the House. He is not telling the truth. I invite him to produce the documentary evidence where any such statement was made at that conference.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The honourable Member was there and I was there. My reputation for veracity is greater than yours. The position is very clear. One of the issues that came up was we wanted it entrenched. We wanted the words "prompt payment" introduced. All of that we wanted. We wanted that and the honourable Member opposed that. We had to fight tooth and nail to get the existing provisions. So I do not take seriously, nor does anybody take seriously, any suggestion the honourable Member makes about the Government expropriating.

The laws relating to compensation for the acquisition of land in Barbados are laws which were enforced and brought into force by the honourable Member when he was the Leader of this House, and the honourable Member was the one who introduced the law which says

that the basis for compensation could only be on existing use and that no potential use was to be taken into account. The honourable Member said that he brought that precedent from Pakistan, and during the course of the Constitutional Conference, the argument occurred that the Constitution should be so framed as to prevent that from operating, and the honourable Member insisted that the Constitution should be made subject to existing laws so that, notwithstanding anything you did with the provisions for compulsory acquisition, the existing law of existing use would apply. That is the history of the fact. The honourable Member has no record at all of being solicitors or being very very genuine when it comes to paying for land. He has no record. He cannot talk about it at all.

The principle of compensation will be determined, if there is an argument, in accordance with the law, as passed by the Administration under the Leader of the Opposition. It does not lie now within his mouth to come here and talk about expropriation. That law has not been changed, and I accuse the honourable Member of trying to seek publicity today by trying to suggest that it is expropriation when the honourable Member knows ....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point of order is that it is a cardinal rule in this House that you cannot accuse an honourable Member of improper motives, and the honourable Member has just said that I have made remarks for the purpose of seeking publicity and that....

*Laughter.*

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is that what he said? I do not know what the honourable Members find humorous about that because I consider that to be improper motives, that I am not making a genuine contribution to this debate on a matter of principle. That is what I object to. I do not know if Your Honour wants me to produce the necessary Standing Order, but I think Your Honour is well acquainted with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am worried about is whether "to seek publicity" is in it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I cannot remember the precise words, that he used, Sir. In the same way that

you sent for the words that I used, I invite you to ask the Clerk to show you the words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask that the honourable Member withdraw the term "seeking publicity."

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I have no problem in withdrawing that. The honourable Member does not like publicity. He cannot stand publicity. That is the problem. The honourable Member cannot stand his statements being exposed, because his statements are not consistent with his previous conduct. It cannot be, because the honourable Member knows that when he gets in here and talks about expropriation, that is a blatant untruth, because the laws of Barbados, as exist, do not provide for expropriation. The honourable Member knows that when he does that, he is misleading the House, because he is making a statement of fact which totally is inconsistent with the laws that he passed. So the honourable Member is not seeking publicity.

Well, I am seeking publicity. I say that the honourable Member's statement today is blatantly inconsistent with the laws that were passed by him when he was in charge of the Administration, and that any expropriation that took place was contained in that law, which says that a person who owns the land that has potential cannot be compensated for the potential, so get that. That is the position. I am seeking publicity. I want that publicized, that I accuse the honourable Member of inconsistent conduct, and I question the sincerity of the honourable Member's statement today when he says that we are seeking extortion by bringing this Resolution.

Let us get at the truth, now. It is clear to me that the honourable Member has been lobbied. He has been lobbied. The American system of politics has come to Barbados. The honourable Member is the subject of a lobby. There are people who come from America who know that if they want to get anything done, the best thing to do is to hire a lobbyist. Now, in Barbados, our laws do not make provision for lobbyists, not for hiring them, but our political situation is such that you have vote-catching politicians who allow themselves, unwittingly, to be used as lobbyists.

Let us get the position clear. Obviously, the honourable Member had access to correspondence between the Government and the owners of this land.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.  
1.55 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is a fact of life that a Mr. Broomes, a Major Quintyne and a Mr. Hoad came to the Ministry of Planning and said that they had a scheme

for the development of Six Men's in conjunction with certain religious interests in the United States. Nobody was more delighted to see them than the Minister of Town Planning. They were given full opportunity to come and discuss the scheme. They were told that the scheme, any scheme for the development of tourism and recreational facilities in Barbados, was perfectly compatible with the Government's plans for development.

It is also a fact that the scheme they talked about involved the moving of the Heywoods By-pass Road from a point just approximately past the existing entrance to the Heywoods land, under the hill, through other people's land, under Maynards and Colleton Hill to create a whole area between the sea and Colleton Hill for the development. It involved punching an entrance from the sea through Retreat to let in the water and having a "T" effect by having two channels on each side.

Obviously a scheme of such magnitude and financial consequence had to be carefully studied, because the Government has an obligation to the people who have traditional rights in Barbados in relation to that area, and we had the problem of people who were living on that land from time immemorial. We also had the problem of the recapturing of the expenditure in the Heywoods By-pass Phase 2 and Phase 3 which were being planned and so forth. All this was explained to them.

It is a fact of life on the seaside that at Six Men's and Colleton Estate, the water is removing the foundations of the houses there. You only have to go and see. We had to remove three or four of those houses already. The late Mr. Lisle Ward pointed out when we were buying the land from Colleton for the industrial estate that this was a problem, and he wanted to have this problem solved, because he felt that there was some obligation in relation to it. So, too, with Six Men's Plantation. So when the Minister of Housing comes with this acquisition, it is an acquisition which is predicated upon an obligation to do something for these people who are our primary responsibility, and that is the motivation of the Resolution. These are the people whose houses are threatened by the action of the sea, and that is our problem.

We have always told them — I told them when I Minister of Town Planning — look at your scheme in the light of the expense and cost of this great diversion, check and see whether it might not be possible to use the junction going up to Colleton Hill and going over to Half Moon Fort, where you have all this land for an industrial estate, which is unbuilt, let in the water there and they could get a bridge, as I saw in Lyford Cay. All of this we talked about, so that I reject categorically your accusation that the Government is not willing to sit down and talk with these people. You do not know what you are talking

about. You have received a one-sided story, and in your anxiety to make political capital, you are coming in here and regurgitating it and trotting it out without questioning it. The honourable Member is old enough to know that in politics there are two sides to every story, and he must never allow himself to be used like a yo-yo. That is the position. I have no fear, absolutely no fear, of any political fall-out in this. We are only ensuring that the people for whom we have primary responsibility, their interests are being looked after.

On the question of valuation, no Government Minister values anybody's land in Barbados. We have professional valuers. As I have said repeatedly in here, particularly after the honourable Member for St. Philip North had spoken that, notwithstanding his pontification of knowledge in this area, we must always remember that valuation is an inexact science, and it is a matter of judgment and opinion. We have always said that. There is no mathematical certainty about valuation. It is a matter of opinion, so therefore if the valuer offers 3 cents a square foot, that is his professional opinion; it would have to stand the test of judicial scrutiny if it comes to that. How can you accuse the Government of expropriating in the circumstances where a professional valuer gives an opinion. There is provision for judicial review, there is constitutional access to the courts, and you are going to talk foolishness in here purely for the purpose of trying to get a headline. That is all it is, for the purpose of trying to get a headline.

Sir, I would say that if you have land that the sea is invading and that the visible evidence is clear that the boundaries are being shifted day after day by the action of the sea, it would be a bold man to put a value on that of a very high nature, because of the circumstances of that particular piece of land. If you also have a piece of land which is occupied by people who have a statutory right to live there, and an option to purchase at a stipulated fee, you would be a bold man to put a value on that without taking into account, whatever its ultimate value, the cost of removing those people and of buying their statutory rights. All of these are factors a competent valuer would take into account, and I have absolutely no doubt that the valuers in Barbados, who have to go through the same prescribed qualifications as have been set out by the honourable Member in his time, take these factors into account. It may well be that they feel that when you discount all of these known and provable and legal factors, the residual amount will only come to 3 cents a square foot. Those are factors.

But the point is this, the owners of the land have a right to challenge you. In any event, the fact that the Government in here acquires it does not preclude the Government, when a feasible scheme comes before the Town Planner, from coming back in here and passing a Resolution saying that we do not need it any longer. The

point of the matter is that we have an obligation to the tenants whose property is being faced with action from the sea, and we cannot dilly-dally with that. That is the position from my memory of the facts. There is no question of expropriation at all. The law in Barbados does not allow expropriation. You have a constitutional right and access to the courts for your price to be determined in accordance with the law passed by the Democratic Labour Party. That is the position, Sir.

*Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW rose.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise .....

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should just like to make this a document.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, it is now 2.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I referred to it in my speech and I thought Your Honour was calling for it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: After lunch we can come back, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, please. As far as I know the Rules and Regulations, if an honourable Member reads from a document, he is forced to make it a document of the House. The honourable Member never read from any document.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No problem, Sir. Don't worry, somebody else will read it.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.10 p.m.

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.*  
2.05 p.m.

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

The honourable Member for St. Philip North.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Resolution before this Parliament seeks to acquire some 27

acres of land by the Government from Six Men's Ltd. for the purposes of housing, et cetera, et cetera.

Two speakers have previously spoken on the Government side. There are two things I would want to refer to that would lend some argument to my position on it. The first one is that the Honourable Prime Minister late in his speech said that because the Government will acquire a portion of land, it does not mean that if a feasible scheme is produced the Government's position cannot be reconsidered, which I think is a most encouraging statement coming from the Honourable Prime Minister to support my line of argument. The second one, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Minister in his presentation made mention of a World Bank mission and the fact that Six Men's and a portion of St. Michael West is being considered. Unfortunately, he did not proceed any further which would allow this side of the House to get a full balance of the Government's complete proposal for the area in conjunction with the present situation as it exists. The third factor which is important in this debate is that it is acknowledged that the residents on the seaward side of Six Men's would have to be removed anyhow. Taking those three things into consideration, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a compromise proposal, and ask that the Government consider it as a compromise in this situation.

We have a situation in which the Government is acquiring this large area of land, and it is a fact that — I was told that there are 77 houses and 181 persons, speaking from memory — the residential pattern is such that the existing houses are on both sides of the highway and both sides of the tenantry road, which has now been repaired. This is what is presently in use and occupied by the people of Six Men's. I am told that, somewhere along the way, there is also some agricultural tenancy, of which I am not very aware. Taking into consideration what is the actual situation, I am wondering if, considering the fact that the owners of this estate for some long time now, in conjunction with the church and the church group, have been looking at the possibility of a development which we understand and believe would be very costly — but we should not, from either side of the House, take it upon ourselves to conclude that they would not be able to fund such a development — there is a possibility of a compromise which will accommodate both the Government's objective and would allow the owners of the estate, with a change in their planning, to do the same one.

If you look at the portion of land that is to be acquired, there is some 500 feet of beach frontage which would be crucial for any development by Six Men's Plantation. It is approximately 500 feet, if it is right here on this plan, which would be absolutely crucial to Six Men's Ltd. for any development.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member would hold for one minute.....

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member may continue.

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

So what in reality you are doing to the owners of Six Men's by acquiring the parcel of land that you are now acquiring, is that you are making absolutely certain that any proposals for the development in that area are completely killed, because they would now have no access at all to the sea, because this is the only section that they have.

*Aside.*

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I mean, naturally, any development planner that would take into consideration tourism or any development in that area would like to know they have some beach frontage. The possibility, as I see it, looks as if the resiting of the people from the sea side can be accommodated along the existing tenantry road, even if you have to make one or two spurs, and allow a portion of the land to remain on the Six Men's Estate, with an approximate beach frontage of 300 feet going into giving them an entrance. Any planner naturally plans around what physical facilities might be available to him, and I am saying that you can go back to Six Men's Estate and say you are going to rethink the acquisition, take maybe half of what you are taking, 13 acres, which would certainly accommodate the existing tenants, but leave Six Men's with that portion of land, with a beach frontage of about 400 feet, which would allow them to go back to the drawing board to see if they can replan the project, making use of the land that would remain with them. By doing this, if it can be done, I think you would be doing two things, the Government would proceed with their project and, secondly, you would be allowing what is almost a dream of the owners and the church here to continue to plan the development as they planned it. It is a suggestion in relation to the compromise that has been held out to the Honourable Prime Minister that if a good scheme is produced you can consider it. I think the Government can ask both their planners and the planners of the estate to look at that possibility of replanning the area.

In the Leader of the Opposition's speech, he made mention of the fact of the offer to the persons at the point. I am certain that all of us realize that compulsory acquisition is always a very traumatic experience for most owners. Put yourself in the shoes of a landowner who

receives a letter acquiring a portion of land that he for years had been planning and dreaming of developing in a particular way, and a letter worded in a particular way. I think that in the interest of the House the letter should be made a document so that everyone would understand the sentiment that the man must have gone through when he received this letter, and it reads as follows:

"Six Men's Ltd,  
C/o C. L. Broomes,  
Mt. Joy Avenue,  
Pine Gardens,  
ST. MICHAEL.

Dear Sirs,

Re: Acquisition of approximately 11.19 hectares (27.66 acres) at Six Men's St. Peter for housing development.

"The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Housing and Lands has instructed me to offer you the sum of \$3068.00 for the area of approximately 11.19 hectares (27.66 acres) of land to be acquired from you in the above area.

I look forward to receiving your early response to this offer and also ask that you arrange to forward to me your title deeds and an up-to-date land tax certificate so that this matter can be speedily processed."

I am saying that despite the fact that all of us realize that the provisions are there, any landowner receiving a letter worded as such, particularly in the second paragraph, "I look forward to receiving your early response ....forward to me your title deeds and an up-to-date land tax certificate", would believe in his mind that there is some finality in the wording of it. I am saying, Sir, that letter was mentioned, and you must understand how the owners felt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One minute. Would you be willing to make that a document of the House?

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Yes, Sir.

*Aside.*

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: I do not know.

I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have to understand how any land owner would have felt on the receipt of that letter. So obviously any land owner receiving this sought the recourse of his legal person or any person you should not really heap any scorn on the person and say that they should have known better. This is a document that went out. And when the land owner

or his legal representative sought to have it clarified, because in the first instance the person believed it was an error — it is quite natural for anybody to believe that this was a typographical error — then to be told in no uncertain terms by the civil servant that, “No, there is no error in that, That is the offer.” I am saying that you have to consider that.

My position on this is that I hope that, in the spirit of compromise, the Government would consider asking both their planners and the planners of the estate and see if there is any way you can leave Six Men's with 400 feet of beach frontage so that they can replan the proposal and have both going hand in hand, the Government's objective being achieved and the dream and objective of the private owners being achieved at the same time.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: They should hire you.)

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR (St. Peter): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I join the debate to support the Resolution and also to commend the Ministry of Housing for the social conscience and the far-sightedness that they have shown in this matter. I also want to join the debate, Sir, to rise in defence of the people of Six Men's, to rise in defence, Sir, of their right to belong, and to rise in defence of their right to have their welfare taken into consideration when matters relating to their particular environment are being discussed.

The facts, Sir, are that the situation at Six Men's has for a very long time posed many difficulties to the residents of that district. The security of tenure of the people at Six Men's has for a long time been in doubt, and despite the fact that there is a large number of persons who live there, work there and are prepared to make a future there, they have come to feel that they do not belong in their community in the same sense that members of villages and districts have been made to feel that they belong to this country of ours.

When I said, Sir, that I commended the Ministry of Housing for its far-sightedness, I said so because the development of Six Men's is a matter which, to my mind, goes beyond the simple issue of just resiting a few people affected by the sea, but it has to do in a very fundamental way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you know, with the rational development of that general area of this country. Because when we look at Six Men's, Sir, it should be obvious to anyone who has a long run view of things that Six Men's must eventually be a logical extension of Speightstown, as a residential area. It is a district that is situated in close proximity to two primary schools and two secondary schools. It is a district that is situated in

close proximity to a beach, to a polyclinic and to a major shopping area. It is a district that is located to a major area of employment. So that any serious Government which has to exercise a decision in relation to Six Men's, obviously has to deal with the particular matter in terms of the potential at Six Men's, which it has, in being developed over time as a logical extension of what we now have in Speightstown by way of services, infrastructure and employment possibilities. And this is precisely the kind of development thinking which engaged the attention of Government when we sat down to decide whether we would go for the fullest development of Six Men's as a community in its own right as distinct from giving our support to the private initiative, which was, to my mind, Sir, of a speculative character.  
3.20 p.m.

I am, therefore, very pleased today, Sir, that, after a long history of grief regarding their status of the district and their status of the people, the Government by way of this Resolution and by way of this acquisition are giving the people of Six Men's a real stake in the community to which they belong. I am very pleased that, in acquiring all of the land rather than a portion of the land, we are going to make it possible over the long term for Six Men's to be developed as the logical extension of Speightstown, as it should be, and that we will give ourselves the elbow room to accommodate not only the housing needs of the people of Six Men's but also the people of Ashton Hall, Speightstown, Half Moon Fort, Sir, and other areas in your own constituency where there is now a pressing demand for house spots. This is why I compliment the Ministry of Housing and Lands for both its social consciousness as well as its far-sightedness in taking this initiative, which has proven to be so unpleasant where the Opposition is concerned.

As to the alternative options, I have had many long meetings in my capacity as representative for St. Peter with Mr. Broomes, Mr. Quintyne, and with Mr. Hoad and I am satisfied that, as an alternative to what the Government was proposing, the private sector initiatives for Six Men's was a far away second best. The plans were all of a very sketch nature. Indeed, it surprised me that, after 15 years of toying with the notion of a housing development, no final designs have been drawn, that the plans for a marina are at the conceptual stage. No money has been advanced by this church group of which we are hearing so much to do marine studies to determine whether that is a proper location for a marina. No monies have been advanced up front by the church group of which the Leader of the Opposition speaks in order to do the final design for the marina. But what came across very clearly is that the group wanted the Government to commit a vast sum of public money to do things which clearly were not within the concept of this Government and which, to my mind, would be an exorbitant waste of taxpayers' money. In order for the private develop-

ment which is highly touted by the Opposition to succeed, the Government would, in point and fact, have to build massive new roads, in strange places, to accommodate an investment, the feasibility of which has not been studied, and I cannot see how any serious Government in this country could give categorical support to that type of speculative and sketchy planning in preference to dealing with the welfare of its own as it should.

So this evening Sir, as I said – and I must repeat – I must compliment the Ministry of Housing and Lands for placing the welfare of the community of Six Men's at the top of its priority where the development of Six Men's community is concerned. I must compliment the Ministry of Housing and Lands also for now making it possible by way of the acquisition of 27 acres in that district for us to begin to contemplate scope for housing development in the northern parish of this country on a scale and of a character that the people of the north deserve.

I thank you, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to this debate so far with considerable concern. Having heard the Prime Minister speak to this Resolution, and now having heard the honourable Member for St. Peter, I started to wonder whether this debate was taking place in the Parliament of Barbados or in the Parliament of the Soviet Union, because it would seem to me that the Government is paying but little regard to the rights of property owners in Barbados.

I believe, Sir, that one of the fundamental cornerstones of democracy in Barbados resides in ownership of property. I believe that the Constitution of Barbados has enshrined that principle. I further believe that if the Government wishes for public purposes to acquire the lands of any private citizens, then it must do so in a lawful manner and must also give adequate and reasonable compensation for so doing, because the Government is only acting as agents of the people, the majority of whom I am sure are wedded to the principle that they should not be deprived of their properties for any purpose unless they are reasonably rewarded.

Sir, against that background I wish to make a few comments. I fully agree with the honourable Member of St. Peter that the people of Six Men's deserve a better deal. That has always been the position of the Democratic Labour Party, enunciated night after night in Six Men's during the two by-elections only recently. It has always been the policy of the Democratic Labour Party. We agree with that. But I would like to say this, that if you think that you will give security to the people of Six Men's by generating insecurity in the rest of the popula-

tion by your attitude towards the methods by which you deprive them of their property, then the very concept of security for the people of Six Men's can be undermined if you approach land acquisitions in this kind of cavalier manner.

The honourable Member for St. Peter, Sir, made an exceedingly good case as for the value of that land. Listen, Sir, to what he said. He said that any reasonable person looking at that site would recognise: that it is the logical extension in Speightstown; that it is located in an area which is near high employment generating facilities; that it is near to Heywoods; that it will be a suburban area in the future. Now, Sir, this is the case put by the Government – land that is suburban, land that has tremendous development potential for housing, land that represents the logical extension of a major town in Barbados – and then the Government offers the owners of that land three cents a square foot!

3.30 p.m.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Because of the law Barrow passed!)

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Now something is wrong, Sir, something has got to be wrong. When the Democratic Labour Party sought to develop the Oistins area, they did not seek to acquire the land across the road from Oistins at three cents per square foot. On the contrary, we put in the infrastructure because we recognise the marriage between public investment and private investment might be a good thing for the future, and we are happy that we did it. When we created the beach at Enterprise, we were happy, we did not go next door and say the land should be acquired at three cents a square foot. We are happy about that, Sir. We are happy about that marriage between private enterprise and public investment in Barbados. Sir, in those circumstances, I believe that since the Government has made such a wonderful case for the future value of this land, it is important that fair play should be brought to bear on this matter.

It is to my certain knowledge that this Government has paid no less than \$1 a square foot for land as far north as St. Lucy, far away from any beach, land that can only be used for agricultural purposes or land that can only be used for house sports, way in the country. I believe that I can recall that there was a Resolution in this Parliament some time in the past relating to land the other side of the Speightstown By-pass, and I believe that the Government has paid more than \$1 a square foot for land in that area already.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: For a right wing man you are making a case for the law courts).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I said the Government has paid over \$1 a square foot for land it acquired in St. Lucy and for land on the land side, not on the sea side, of the Speightstown By-pass. Surely, Sir, something must be wrong.

The Honourable Prime Minister, who must know that that letter was a ridiculous letter and a ridiculous offer, instead of getting up on the floor of this House and saying he would look into the matter and ensure that offers of this kind no longer go out from the Ministry of Housing, he seeks to defend it. And what does he fall back on? He said it was a law passed by the Democratic Labour Party.

(*Aside:* Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The existing law of the land.).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The existing law of the land — that is what he said — so that the land can only be acquired taking into consideration the use to which it is put at present. But it is you who passed legislation which determined the value of tenantry land, and you put it at ten cents a square foot, and now you are offering people three cents a square foot. You modified that basic principle by fixing the valuation of tenantry land, by law, at ten cents per square foot and now you are offering someone for land with the kind of potential development put forward by the honourable Member for St. Peter, who represents that constituency, seven cents less per square foot, not even taking into account beach front. Something must be wrong. You are not even abiding by your own laws, you are flouting your own laws, or the valuer is flouting the laws passed by this Parliament, because the minimum offer for the tenantry should be at least ten cents a square foot.

But that would not be a fair offer in my view, because I believe that in making assessments there are other factors that have come into play. In this Parliament already, Sir, this Government has enunciated, through the chief spokesman for finance, the former Prime Minister, that he was considering the rateable value of the land as the price at which land would be acquired in the future. Many may recall that that doctrine was enunciated on the floor of this House. So that aspect of their policy, too, I am sure, is being violated in this particular offer.

Basically, one must say that if the Government can get up and defend an offer of three cents a square foot for land which has the kind of value which the representative for that area presented to this Parliament today in no uncertain terms as probably one of the most desirable pieces of land in the north of the island, and one which is likely to have the greatest appreciation of value in the short and medium term, I agree with the honourable Member for St. Peter, but let us be fair to the people. If they made an initial investment there and they bought

the property and they do not have the resources to further develop the area, then offer them a reasonable price for the land at the present stage of development and what can reasonably be done in the future.

I believe that you have to be careful when you are fixing valuations on future usage, so I do not think that when the Honourable Prime Minister makes the point that the DLP had questioned the import of future use into the pricing and valuation, that was necessarily a point to be made in attacking the Democratic Labour Party, because, quite clearly, any joker can say that he plans to use his particular land in a particular manner in the future, and in that way rip off any Administration. This is possible, so you have to be very careful of this concept of future use, but you have to strike a balance and you have to arrive at what is fair, what is reasonably immediate.

Let us put it this way, Sir. If I were a land speculator in Barbados, if I were a land developer like the Honourable Prime Minister, now that I have heard what the honourable Member for St. Peter had to say about the physical infrastructure around Speightstown, of the short term and medium term development prospects of the area, I would go tomorrow and make an offer for \$2 a square foot for the land, based on what has been said. Deep down inside I am sure the Prime Minister of this country must know that you cannot offer people three cents a square foot for land of that kind.

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It does not matter who they are, because once it happens, it is going to create uncertainty as to the whole question of the security of ownership of property in Barbados. Once you challenge that, I put it to you that you are challenging the fundamentals of democracy in Barbados. Eventually this is going to happen.

Sir, I speak with some feeling on this matter. I speak with some feeling because if I had received that letter — I will tell you what I would have done with it — I would have torn it up, thrown it in the dustbin, would not have replied to it, would not have gone to any lawyer, and be prepared to fight it out with the Government in the courts of this country. But many other citizens are not able to do that. I remember not so long ago one of my constituents received a letter offering two or three thousand dollars for a wall property in which he conducted a business downstairs, in which he lived upstairs, and which was situated on Halls Road. I can tell you, Sir, the misery that man went through for several years, until he finally got a letter — that the Government was no longer in the acquisition — a few

months ago. It is a terrible thing to do to people, and this must be taken into consideration.

3.40 p.m.

I think what happens is that the professional valuers available to the Ministry of Housing need to be disciplined, or they need to try and import some market knowledge into the decision making in respect of valuations in Barbados. Whoever they are doing these valuations, they are creating a lot of mischief for people. I would hope that whereas this letter could only be considered as an offer at this stage, the views put forward on the floor of this Parliament would be taken into consideration when a reasonable offer is made. I am not questioning fundamentally the Government's right to acquire the property. All I say is, if you want it, pay for it.

I would also want to make the point that if, apart from this piece of land, there is any possibility of reaching any kind of a compromise, then that should be looked into, because I am a great believer that, in the long term, it is that partnership with private and public investment, particularly in the area of housing. You cannot beat the Cave Hill development. The Cave Hill development was one of the best housing developments in this country and that was a private enterprise one. You know that, too. That was a partnership, in fact, between public and private enterprise that resulted in the development at Cave Hill, one of the best housing developments, which has had one of the fastest appreciations in value in Barbados over the years.

I say this, that here is an opportunity where the Government can get what it wants, where it can satisfy the needs of the people of Six Men's, where it can give them the kind of security that they want, where they can be fair to the landowners, and where, in the long term, the Government may find that if they leave that avenue open for private enterprise, which can clearly put the seed money in there — leave that potential for development over the years — they might discover that that was, in fact, the correct decision.

I have no problem with the Resolution, except with the price which the Government is proposing to pay for the property. It is wrong. I have properties in Barbados and anyone offering me 3 cents a square foot for property, even on the land side, I would deal with them. It is wrong and you know it is wrong. You know it cannot be right.

(Asides: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The Government did not value it.).

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I think there is no point pursuing it, because the Prime Minister has conceded that the Government did not value it, that he recognizes that my

case has been well put and that he would give the fullest consideration to what has been said on the floor of the House today. I think I can rest at this point, Sir.

*Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, could I see the document that has been made a document of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Thomas is seeking to look at the document which was made a document of the House.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few observations on this matter of, essentially a legal nature, because it was the Leader of the Opposition who introduced into the debate matters of a legal character and purported to rely on his memory in relation to the applicable law. That memory has more than once been proven to be faulty, and the consequence of trotting out misleading information has been that the debate has been taken from a consideration of the public interest aspect of this acquisition into the area of considering whether .3 cents per square foot, or whatever, is adequate compensation.

I wish to start first with the Constitution of Barbados because, with some quite extraordinary vehemence, the Leader of the Opposition accused the Government of expropriation of assets to such an extent that certain people in this Chamber were wont to take him at his word. Were it not for the intervention of the Honourable Prime Minister, perhaps, many would have believed that, indeed, there was some injustice being perpetrated by the Government in relation to the acquisition of this land.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1966, the Leader of the Opposition and now Prime Minister, were all at the Constitutional Conference at Malborough House. I had the privilege then to cover that conference for the *Daily News* and *Barbados Rediffusion*, and I was very close on a daily basis, on lobby terms — Philip Greaves was there, too — to the deliberations of the conference and the various positions taken by the two parties that were represented — I do not include Mr. Mottley in this — the Democratic Labour Party and the Barbados Labour Party — and I know there was great concern. I will search when I get home to see if I can find the clippings from that conference. I have most of them, and I believe I can put my hand on them fairly swiftly.

The whole question of compensation for the acquisition of property was a major bone of contention

between the parties, as was the entrenchment of an Electoral and Boundaries Commission, but the result has been, Sir, that the Constitution of Barbados, in Section 16, after all the hassle, recites as follows:

"No property of any description shall be compulsorily taken possession of, and no interest in or right over property of any description shall be compulsorily acquired, except by or under the authority of a written law, and where provision applying to that acquisition or taking of possession is made by a written law —

- (a) prescribing the principles on which and the manner in which compensation therefor is to be determined and given; and
- (b) giving to any person claiming such compensation a right of access, either directly or by way of appeal, for the determination of his interest in or right over the property and the amount of compensation, to the High Court."

In simple language, what Section 16(1) of the Constitution guarantees — it is the Fundamental Rights Chapter — is that any law dealing with acquisition of property must lay down the principles and the manner in which compensation is to be computed and, secondly, that law must provide for a right to the courts to have the assessment gone into by an independent tribunal. 3.50 p.m.

Now the existing law in Barbados is the Land Acquisition Act Cap. 228, and all of this the Honourable Leader of the Opposition ignored, both the Constitution and Cap. 228, in particular Section 11. The honourable Member who represents St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin) professes to be a valuer. He spoke in here today and not once did he refer to the rules governing compensation. Well, I will write them in the record now. In Section 11 the rules are set out to the Land Acquisition Act.

"Subject to this Act, the following rules shall apply to the determination of compensation for the compulsory acquisition of land.

- (a) The value of the land shall, subject as hereinafter provided, be taken to be the amount which the land, in its condition at the material time, might be expected to realise if sold at that time in the open market by a willing seller for the purpose of being put to the same use to which such land was being put at the material time;
- (b) in ascertaining the value of such land, regard shall be had to the net amount of any income derived from that land at the material time

and, where no income is derived therefrom at that time, to the rent at which the land might, at the material time, reasonably be expected to be let from year to year for the purpose of being put to the same use to which it was being put at that time;"

Subsection (c) deals with land for agricultural purposes and so on and defines agricultural purposes as material time. Those are not germane to this debate. It says in subsection (6) of section 11: "No allowance shall be made on account of —

- (a) the acquisition being compulsory or the degree of urgency or necessity which has led to the acquisition;
- (b) any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;
- (c) any damage sustained by the person interested, which, if caused by a private person, would not render such person liable to an action."

Subsection (d) deals with damage and subsection (e) says

"No allowance shall be made on account of any increase in the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put; and

- (f) any outlay or improvement on such land which is made, commenced or effected within two years before the publication of the notice of appropriation under Section 5 with the intention of enhancing the compensation to be awarded therefor in the event or with the view of such land being required for public purposes."

(Aside: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is your law.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Not only is it their law. If, as the honourable Members on the other side are saying, there is nothing wrong with the law, why the quarrel today?

Sir, provision is made in this Act for recourse to the ordinary courts by summons and the functions of the court are set out in Section 10, and it is clear under Section 15, which deals with the provisions for summons, that the court is the last right of resort for an aggrieved litigant. That is where this letter is important.

The Act, in my submission, complies with Section 16 of the Constitution and the Act was introduced and amended after the Constitution. It was amended in 1967 and the Constitution was in 1966. The Act (a) prescribes the principles for compensation, and, (b), as the Constitution requires, gives a right of access to the Court. These

people, Six Men's Limited, received a letter from the Permanent Secretary .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I rise on a point of elucidation, and I wonder, because I feel this is of some importance, whether the honourable Member would appreciate that what I said was that those aspects of the law which you have outlined largely flow from the initial regulations which related to a free market situation, but subsequent legislation has in fact eliminated the free market, because the Tenancies Act fixes a price, so the free market has gone. It would seem to me that that very law would have to be amended, and amended very soon, because all the concepts that have been listed there flow from the concepts of a free market for property, but it is no longer there.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the situation of the tenancies, I will tell him this. A letter was written on October 25, last year to Six Men's Limited, and it said that the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Housing and Lands had instructed the Senior Crown Counsel to offer the sum of \$3 068 — offer — look forward to receiving an early response and so on.

*(Aside: And title deeds.)*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You have to send the title deeds on all these. When the offer goes out, you request the title deeds so that you do not hold up the person from compensation. While you are hassling over the amount of compensation, the title is being checked. That is the only reason for the request for the early submission of title deeds. That is the procedure.

Now, Sir, I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition was still a lawyer, and the terms of this letter, which express themselves as an offer, would require our lawyer to reply and say "we do not accept your offer, we want to negotiate," but certainly by use of the word "offer," there is a clear intent for the parties to negotiate. It says "I look forward to receiving your early response to this offer." If the offer was considered derisory, it was open to them to write and say "You are making sport; you could not mean \$3 068. You might mean \$130 000 or whatever, but we are not accepting that offer. We think it is too low."

Virtually, in every case of compulsory acquisition this process of negotiation and bargaining is gone through. The Crown will put up its offer and the other side will get a lawyer. In most of these things there are lawyers involved. I do not understand the concern of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that if it had come to him he would have gone to a lawyer, but that the people, a company, Six Men's Limited, would not have sought legal advice. I would have thought if they

were a company they would have had to have a lawyer to form that company. With a matter as serious as is being alleged in here, I would have thought they would have taken this to a lawyer who would enter into negotiations and the door is not closed, you can still negotiate. But surely, Sir, before you get to court, one would expect Six Men's Limited not only to retain a lawyer, but to retain a valuer, who would carry out a physical inspection of the property sought to be acquired and put up his own recommendations as to what is the true value. The Government's Land Valuation Department — the honourable Minister responsible for Housing and Lands would have an even better understanding of this than I do — I am sure, in almost every one of these compulsory acquisitions — the Commissioner of Land Valuations, Mr. White, his department — gets into this and advises the Ministry of Housing and Lands and the Permanent Secretary as to what is a reasonable valuation and within what ambit an offer should be made.  
4.00 p.m.

It is open to these people, as I say, to come with their lawyers and valuers and sit down and negotiate a fair price with the Ministry of Housing and Lands. If they are dissatisfied, there is recourse. We seem to forget that two leading lawyers in the DLP,.....

*Aside.*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: ..... Mr. Asquith Phillips, Q.C. and Mr. George Moe, some years ago, took this Government to court over the offer of compensation in relation to the Shamrock property that was to be acquired to allow for the development of the Spring Garden Highway. That step is open to these people. The law is there if one is not satisfied with what the Government offers. It is very simple. Go to court and have the matter tried, like any other case, on the basis of expert evidence and have a determination by the judiciary that is provided for constitutionally and under the Act.

They say that, in the light of all of that established procedure, somehow the Government is seeking to expropriate somebody's landed assets. It is irresponsible and unfair, especially having regard to the fact that the Member for St. John was Prime Minister when the Constitution was drafted, and when the amendment to the Act in 1967 came in, setting out the principles and so on as stated in Section 11. He must know that, under the Laws of Barbados, no citizen, unless he is totally ignorant of his rights, unless he is totally indifferent to the pursuit of those rights and unless the Government suddenly goes mad,.....

*(Aside: Dr. R. C. HAYNES: It is mad already.)*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: .....you have been accused of that, nobody on this side..... can be deprived

of his property without being paid adequately for it. If the adequacy of the compensation cannot be settled by negotiation, the courts are there to settle it and they have done so in the past.

I had no intention of joining this debate until I heard the nonsense that was coming from the other side. And I have noticed, too, that in a section of the Press, within the last year, once or twice, a columnist has tried to champion a cause about this whole business of compulsory acquisition, without reading the law, or, if he read the law, without understanding it, to allege that, in the matters of compulsory acquisition, people's rights are being trampled. It is not so, Sir! We all know in here, and let us concede it — let us concede it now as to what I have found — that there have been delays in the payment of compensation. The Press will write down that, you see. You sat down there and kept quiet until I said so. Those delays have been compounded by a number of factors. But, thank God, since I have been in the Ministry, I have got an additional member of staff to work to sort out the files.

Let me concede and tell you about the problem. The filing system that was in operation in relation to compulsory acquisition never moved on with the times. In the days when Mr. Carl Fields was, I think he was called Crown Solicitor, and you had four or five acquisitions in a year, it may have been possible practice to include the five matters in one file. You had one file, and my title deeds and letters would be on this file relating to my acquisition, and his would be on and yours and so on, all on one file. Obviously, that system could not work effectively, or efficiently, when you started acquiring 200 or 300 properties, or even less than that. So the problem.....

(*Aside:* Dr. R. C. HAYNES: File right, left and centre.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, acquiring for the development and advancement of Barbados.

You found that there were files that thick with all kinds of papers belonging to all kinds of persons on the same file. I have had to organize a system where we have had to strip those big files, identify all the documentation relating to a particular transaction and open a separate file for that, mark it, number it, and have a card index system that corresponds with the file. We have had, as I said, assistance from the Ministry of Establishments in providing a person to sort out all of that. That really has been the cause of the substantial delays that there have been in paying people compensation. In my constituency there is a problem with the Allen View land that was acquired for the Caves.

(*Aside:* Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Tell them to pay.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: No, no. It is not a question of paying — they are willing to pay — but it is a question of finding where all the documents are. I have a special group of two working — I think they are about 18, I have a list of all the people from Allen View who have been affected — and we are trying to sort out all the title deeds, all the correspondence, so that these people can be paid with some reasonable despatch. But that is the only problem, which is really a bureaucratic problem and a problem of organization and management with the matter of compensation. Otherwise, the rights are protected and the Government does not act in defiance of the rights.

I will concede, as I said, that there has been a delay in getting the money to the people whose land has been acquired, but we are working on that problem. I would like to say that by June — because the officer who has come on is for six months — we had one who was working for three months but he has gone to the university to finish his Law Degree and we had to get somebody in to replace him — and in about six months I believe that we will have broken the back of that problem, and I look forward to a speed up in the payment of compensation.

One other thing that heartens me and gives me some confidence is that I expect within a few months that there would be greater speed in payment ....

(*Aside:* Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Change the Government.)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: .... is that we have now got additional staff. You know, in that department there was virtually one person, after Mr. Davis went to the special unit, doing the conveyancing. The lady who wrote this letter has recently joined the staff and we have another lawyer. So we in fact now have three lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers dealing with these matters, and up in the Ministry of Housing and Lands they have one lawyer at the level of Deputy Solicitor-General, and I think there are two persons who have worked in solicitors offices for years, search clerks, and one who could be considered, because of his experience, a para-legal. So we have now been able to put the human infrastructure in place to cope with the problem that must necessarily flow from a vast number of acquisitions.

4.10 p.m.

Finally, Sir, in relation to the Tenancies Act. I understand the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to say that, when that Act was introduced, the quantum of compensation was fixed and written into the law. That was dealing with a specific set of identifiable lands where we believed, for the most part, having regard to our colonial history and our past, the tenants on the

plantation lands were — for the most part I say — located in the worst areas of the plantation. Some got away — up at Kendall on top of the hill there, a wonderful view; in Vacluse Tenantry, some wonderful views; at Highe Park.....

*Aside*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Applewaites? I do not know that. I can speak of those that I know. In one or two areas the tenants have really got good, good views, but, for the most part, the people were tenanted on lands which the plantation owners did not themselves want.

We also wanted to do social justice to ensure that the poorest classes who had slaved in this country for so many years got the opportunity of home ownership, to share in the benefits of home ownership, like the middle class and anybody else. We had to set a price that was within their financial competence, and we set the price at 10 cents.

In a general Act providing for land acquisition that may result in land in a tenantry being taken over, land on a beach, land near a large highway and so on, I do not believe that one could legislate a fixed sum per square foot for general acquisitions.

*Aside*

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What? I am being told that Six Men's comes under the Tenantry Act. But I do not know, Sir, whether — ..... well, I am not familiar with the area — Six Men's.....

Mr. SPEAKER:..... And I am being told that you have used up the time allocated to you.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Already?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am obliged to you, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): I have a few comments to make on this matter, Sir. I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that Members on that side who spoke earlier would have declared their interests in this matter, and that is the Leader of the Opposition, who is acting on behalf of one of the clients, as well as the Member for St. Philip North, who is also acting in his capacity for one of the clients. I know a lot more about this, because some of the very people came to see me to make inquiries of me if, today, I would have stopped the Resolution from coming through so that they would have an opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Mr. Speaker.....

*Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN rose.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Two honourable Members are on their feet. On what does the honourable Member rise?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In his capacity as a land surveyor — I want to make it clear — as the land surveyor — so you will understand where I am coming from.

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

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; I would like to declare to this House that I have no interest in the matter before this House, and he is misleading the House in that statement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is something you are quite capable of saying. I know as a fact that you as a land surveyor, and your firm, as valuers, have an interest in this matter. You even made it much clearer when the Resolution was given notice of and I attempted to do it. You said do not touch it — it is debatable. You knew very early that it was debatable.

Sir, I have heard the Leader of the Opposition putting a case for the owners of this land and no doubt they have written him. A letter was read by the Member for St. Philip North which came from the Ministry and happens to be in the hands of members of the Opposition who sit in this Chamber. One of the persons involved called me, another person came to see me and one came from the States also to ask me if I could assist in having the tenants on the seaside piece of the land pushed further back into the hinterland and put them on the outskirts of the area so that they can set up a development there including a marina, which I had to remind the Leader of the Opposition today, Sir, was also involved.

All of the law which the Attorney General had to explain to this House today, Sir, we know very well, because acquisitions are done in here every single Tuesday, and it is striking strange why this particular acquisition has caused so much time to debate about the tenants' rights. I know the gentleman, Mr. Broomes, and I believe that Mr. Broomes knows the law courts — if I know that is the man whom I am referring to — he knows the law courts very well. He knows a number of lawyers in Bridgetown. He is well aware of the facts, Sir, that if Government sets out to acquire a portion of land and offers him X amount of money and he does not agree with that amount of money, Sir, he has recourse. There is a committee, and this is known as the Town and Country Planning Standing Committee on

Valuation, which, during my tenure of office as Housing Minister, had a number of prominent Barbadians — former town planners, solicitors, and valuers — sitting on it. If they disagree with the applicant one way or the other, it is referred to the Ministry and the Ministry, therefore, makes the final decision. Is that correct? Then it is brought to Cabinet and a decision is made there.

So the whole truth of the matter here, Sir, is not the welfare of the people there. It is the interest which Members on that side are using Parliament today to prevent this Resolution from going through, and they are acting as agents of the persons concerned in this matter. That is it in a nutshell, Sir, because it is very simple. If they disagree with what Government has offered them for the land, then they can go to the law courts. The Attorney General pointed out all of this area of the law. We know all of this. We go through it every Tuesday here and, therefore, I want to make a full-fledged statement on the floor of the House. It is the interests which Members on the other side have in this particular matter that has held up the entire .....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I believe, Sir, that both the Standing Orders of this House and the Immunities and Privileges Act would make it absolutely clear that it is quite improper for an honourable Member to identify 2 persons on this side by their parliamentary names and then proceed to state that they were acting as agents of a vested group and not representing the public interest on the floor of this House today. As you would know, Sir, under the Immunities and Privileges Act that is a criminal offence. It is a criminal offence that he is really accusing the honourable Members of.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member can show me the Standing Order which says that a Member cannot declare what he feels, I am quite prepared to execute that Standing Order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, thank you very much. In the future I will say what I feel, in that case. Thank you for your ruling. It is very useful for future guidance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard Members who have said a lot of things in here before.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have no doubt, Sir, they will say what they feel if you are not in the Chair, because I am quite sure that, with your years of experience and your legal knowledge, you have demonstrated on both sides of the House that you have the competence to deal with any Member who violates the Standing Orders. And what you hear me say in here, you can rest assured that I

will say it in public. I am not like some people who wait until people die to say things about them, or when they are out of the country. I tell you straight to your face what I have to tell you, even if the gun is at my head, and I will stand by that conviction until I die.  
4.20 p.m.

The position, therefore, Mr. Speaker, which has caused all of this debate is not what they have paid for the land, because I am quite sure that on more than one occasion I have seen, even when I was Minister of Housing, valuations put on a number of things that I myself did not think were either too high or they were too low. I on more than one occasion asked my Permanent Secretary to get an independent valuer, and I believe this has happened to some of my colleagues when they were in office. We know these cases, so to say that we have no sympathy, no heart, that we are heartless — and some people seem to think in some quarters about some people how heartless they are, especially towards old people — I know that I operate with a Cabinet and a party that was founded on the sympathies and the care for the small man in this country. That is the whole basis of the foundation of this party, so to get up and say that we do not regard people and pay them three cents a square foot for beach land is utter nonsense, because there is recourse. As a matter of fact, I think that the Member for Christ Church West Central, (Mr. M. A. King), his brother, if I am not mistaken, was a member of the Valuations Standing Committee. I am subject to correction, but I do think so, and they would even have the right to take a lawyer there to argue their case.

So all of this debate from almost 12 o'clock today until now, I do not see the need for it, and therefore I am satisfied — I had set out earlier and again this morning to find out what interests Members on that side have in it — and I have proof that the reason why this debate has taken this long in here is because they are trying to negative a decision of Government to acquire the land there because they are acting as lobbyists for parties that have interests in this whole matter. Mr. Speaker, that is my firm belief.

I support the Minister in recommending this Resolution to Parliament, and I am sure it will have its passage, knowing quite well within myself that if any of the arguments advanced on that side had merit, we would have withdrawn the Resolution and make the appropriate amendments, as we have done in the past, because we do not know everything. We are not like the others on that side who get all the information and know everything. We have to be guided by our technocrats and use our better judgment in the interest of all concerned. I am quite sure that if any suggestions had come from that side in relation to this particular Resolution, the Minister would have withdrawn the Resolution, give it another look, rethink the situation and bring it back in here, Sir.

That is my contribution, Mr. Speaker, and I support the Resolution in its entirety.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES (St. Michael North): Mr. Speaker, I do not know who has any interest in this particular matter. As far as I am aware, the Leader of the Opposition has a political interest in it in the same way as any honourable Member of this Chamber has interest.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I want to make myself quite clear. The Leader of the Opposition has more than a political interest in it, he has a legal interest in it. I want to make the position abundantly clear. I say without fear of contradiction that he has a legal interest in it. The Leader of the Opposition, the Member for St. John. I will say it outside and I will bring documentary evidence to prove it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, that is a point of explanation.

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: It is a point of interruption!

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, as far as I am aware, the Leader of the Opposition has a political interest, as any other politician should have, in this particular matter. One of the easiest things in the world is when you want to confuse a matter, just use a lot of rhetoric, and that is precisely what has been happening in this Chamber today on this particular issue.

I have before me here a plan of the land that it is proposed to acquire, and this plan tells me that the acquisition of this land, that the land amount to 116 168 square metres, which, according to my mathematics and calculations, converts to 28.7 acres, and further, Sir.....

(Aside: Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Do you have all the land? There is a piece more land in there. Look at the total amount of land).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: Well, Sir, I have a plan which shows 116 168 square metres. Then, Sir, I see here 120 188 square metres, which is in fact more than I was saying it was just now, and it shows approximately 12.019 hectares, which perhaps works out to about 30 acres.

Sir, the amount that Government has offered for this land is \$3 068, which works out to less than \$110 per acre, and which, according to my calculations, despite all that has been said in this Chamber by Members of both sides, works out to less than a quarter cent per square foot, not three cents per square foot. A quarter of one cent, Sir! The calculations were wrong. It is less than a quarter of a cent per square foot. A client encouraged

me to work it out. Anyone is free to work it out. You will see it works out to less than .0025. Anyone is free to work it out. In my opinion, Sir, \$110 for an acre of land in any part of Barbados is absolutely ridiculous. I do not know where the Ministry of the Attorney General got that figure from.

But what were the facts, Sir? I have no quarrel at all with the laws as they stand as they relate to land acquisition; absolutely no quarrel with them whatsoever, and I believe that those are reasonably fair, and I believe that the Members on the other side also believe they are fair, because they have been working and using those same provisions with regard to land acquisition for the past ten years that we ourselves worked with, probably for about 10, 12 or 13 years, so I believe that on this particular matter we are *ad idem*. But I take exception, Sir, to statements made by the Honourable Prime Minister, because I, too, was at that constitutional conference in London in 1966, and the Prime Minister is wrong. At no time did the Prime Minister oppose payment for fair compensation for land that was acquired. He was always very insistent that persons should be given fair compensation for lands acquired from persons. As a matter of fact, when the first draft of the Constitution was put forward here in Barbados, the provisions relating to land acquisition which are embodied in that chapter that relates to human rights were borrowed from the Trinidad Constitution and we had looked at it for a long time and we did not like it. By the time we got to London in 1966, we reported back to London, and we had changed that whole chapter and we had substituted the Jamaica precedence for that particular chapter, and it is the Jamaica precedence which makes provision for fair compensation for any lands that are acquired. So it is not true to say and to accuse the Leader of the Opposition of being against paying fair compensation for lands acquired when he was Prime Minister and that he was opposed to putting it in the Constitution, because it was placed in the Constitution even before we got to London in 1966. So let us put that out of the way, Sir.

4.30 p.m.

Let us, Sir, come back to this particular matter. What is the complaint of this side? The complaint of this side is very simply, that at the very time the Government was negotiating with the owners of this land for the acquisition of this land, they placed an Order on the land designating that particular tenantry a tenantry under the Freehold Tenancies Act. That is the problem. It is well known, Sir, that the prices under that particular Act are controlled, and it is because of that legislation that the Government can then come and make this, what we consider a ridiculous offer for this particular piece of land. That is the whole problem here today.

We are not querying Government's ability to acquire land. We are not even querying its wisdom in acquiring this piece of land. We are telling them, perhaps, that one might be able to make better economic use of the land, but people have rights and people have been living there for a long time. People are being removed from the seaside. They have to be removed from the seaside because if the Government does not move them, the sea is going to move them. We all are aware of this fact. It is not that we are querying that. What we are querying is the fairness of the offer. It is true it is an offer, but it is a ridiculous offer.

(*Aside:* Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: An offer does not mean that is the price).

Mr. P. M. GREAVES: I know. I am well aware that an offer is not a price. We are all aware of that, because, from time to time, offers are made, representations are made based on the offers and then, eventually, we are all satisfied with the price that is given. But to offer a quarter of a penny, or less than a quarter of a cent for a square foot of land in Barbados today, to offer less than \$110 for an acre of land in Barbados today, is being ridiculous.

Our main problem here today is that the Government has a duty to make what should be a fair offer, and it is not a fair offer. Some of the seaside land is also included, but that seaside land is now the subject of an Order, so that seaside land would have to be considered just like any other tenantry land, and that is the problem. We do not think it is right. If you are going to negotiate with the owners and your intention is to remove the tenants — and that is my understanding, that the tenants are to be removed — and put them on safer land and in safer conditions, then, one should not, at the same time, have placed this area of land within the Order so as to create a tenantry out of it.

I hope, Sir, that the complaints and the issues raised on this side will be taken and that the Government will give other considerations to the problems raised on this particular matter, because it is Six Men's today and it is another area tomorrow.

On the question of payment of compensation, I would hope that, now that the Attorney General has been able to so reorganize his office as to bring greater efficiency into the office, those few remaining persons in Checker Hall who have been waiting for the past 6 years for compensation for their land will receive the compensation that have been denied them for so long.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, from the fire on this debate, I assume that the Opposition will not vote for this Resolution, and I would suggest that they do not.

The last honourable Member said that while negotiations were taking place between the owners of this land and the Government, a Designation Order was put on the land. It would seem to me as though the Opposition knows more about what is happening in Government than the people in Government really know.

I recall sometime in 1984 meeting with Mr. Broomes and a Major Quintyne, and before that, I met Mr. Broomes on a site visit in the area, because I asked to see who had anything to do with the land at Six Men's. The circumstances surrounding the land at Six Men's is not as easy and straightforward as the Opposition would have you to believe. There were faceless men who were operating on behalf of that estate, and I say that with a full sense of responsibility. The tenants did not know who were the landlords. I do not know how much the Opposition knows, but if they do not know, I will tell them.

For nearly six years tenants have not been paying rent down there. If you do not know that, I can tell you now. They did not know who were their landlords. They heard about Mr. Broomes, who had some relevance to a church which was down there, a Pentecostal Church of some kind. However, when we went in to look at the place, we met Mr. Broomes and he suggested that he would like to have a discussion with me, and on the day arranged, Mr. Broomes came in with Major Quintyne and we had a very lengthy discussion on this matter.

#### *Asides*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: At the time Major Quintyne was involved and I can only speak for that time. I cannot speak for now. As far as I am concerned, I am only here to say what I know and I do not want to say anything other than what I know.

I spoke to both of the gentlemen, and Mr. Broomes gave me a long essay about discussions which he had with the former Prime Minister of Barbados before the end of 1976 and that how these Bishops came in, or whoever they were, these religious people — I do not know if there was going to be another Jamestown or what — and were meeting with the then Prime Minister and had asked for his assistance in getting the tenants off, which the then Prime Minister agreed to, and that they were going to put up, not an arena, or anything of that nature, but they were going to put up a hotel complex and they would want to remove the tenants who were there and put them somewhere near up over the hills or somewhere, because Six Men's, Mr. Speaker, is a plantation that runs a very long way. It is nearly a mile of running lands on the road going back quite into Alley nedale, from that area down on the main road.

4.40 p.m.

I told Mr. Broomes at that time that we had already introduced the Plantation Tenancies (Freehold Purchase) Act, 1980-53, and that the tenants had rights. We have heard a lot of debate here today and I am surprised to know how many people seem not to understand that the tenants have rights that cannot be extinguished. That is what the law says. The amendment to the Constitution makes provision for that, except in so far as the Minister of Housing and Lands, acting on the authority of the Cabinet, can designate certain areas for orderly development. No Mr. Broomes, no Jonestown people, no religious group or other group can change the terms and conditions of the tenancy of the tenants on the plantations in this country. The law is there.

Your constant effort in fighting a liberal piece of legislation will continue to do you all the harm that is possible. Right down the line you are fighting it. You were not in favour of the Plantation Freehold Purchase Act — there is nothing at all to support it — and now at this point in time when the Government is acquiring this land, not leaving it to the plantation owners at all, because they would not do anything, we hear about developers. I want to advise you that it does not matter what the Leader of the Opposition says, it does not matter what the honourable Member for St. Philip North says, and they seem to be very much bound up in it. I do not know. They are very *au fait* with what is going on. Probably they are very lively politicians. They are concerned citizens, they are concerned with people who live abroad more than those who live at Six Men's. I wish them very good luck with that.

The Government has taken the view that this land should be purchased even though the tenants have a right to purchase it at ten cents a square foot as you say and as we know, except for the land on the foreshore. But what can the land on the foreshore do? Does the owner, because he is owner, have the right in law to go and put up any structure on the foreshore? You all are people who are in development, and you should know all of this. He cannot do it. There are certain constraints with respect to the placing of a building on the foreshore in this country. There are many checks and balances, and if the Government had decided, and still decides, that they would remove the tenants from the foreshore, who are in danger of losing not only their property but their lives, because one night you could find that bad weather will come in and these houses could be washed away, they cannot be faulted. The Government, in its enlightened policy of resiting people who are in danger of losing their homes or who have had problems, has decided that they would resite the people on this land which is being acquired.

But it is not only that. The Government must think ahead. Unfortunately you all have never thought ahead, looking only as far as your nose. In acquiring

land you have not only to think in terms of the present generation, but you have to think in terms of future generations. Therefore, if you are acquiring land and you have a reasonably good area of land, you build up your land bank, so that as the population grows larger, or if it remains the same, and the expectations of people become greater, and they want to have their own places and homes to live in and good conditions, you would have the land. In the past people lived in terrace homes until they became 30 and 40 years, but today at 18 and 19 they want to go into their own homes. Do not ask me why they want to go. Probably it is because they want to do their own thing, whatever that is, in their own boundaries, and that is why Government has decided to acquire. The land looks large, 29 to 30 acres of land seems a large amount of land to acquire, but in today's world it is a small portion of land, and when you think that Barbados is shrinking day after day in terms of land area, you have got to — the Government has a duty — to acquire lands wherever possible.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about expropriation. Nobody can be more trained and tutored in the art of expropriation than himself, since only recently we saw him sitting by the side of the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Cuba, and he would know very well how to handle matters of expropriation. We in this Government do not conform to that philosophy. We do not believe in it. We believe in the democratic principles, and if it is socialism, it has to be democratic socialism; but we do not believe in the principles of expropriation, and I have never gone for it. I do not believe in it.

With respect to the offer which went out from the Ministry, I regret that it went out in that way. These are matters that are done by functionaries in the Ministries and no offer is made unless it is made by the Land Valuation Department. They do that. The land, in their view, is worth nothing today because the owners were not getting any returns on it and there was a squatter situation existing down there. I believe that the tenants were reaching the point where the statute bar could have been invoked and by length of time they could have claimed ownership, and on that principle alone the view was taken that the land was worth little or nothing to them. But that apart, it does not stop Government from offering a price.

There is another thing. Whenever an offer is made to a person or land is being acquired, we offer on the basis of the tax valuation of the property. You start from there. No person whom you are acquiring from is willing to tell you he wants X amount for the land or the property. There are difficulties there. If you are the Government you will have that problem, and those of us who are here would always have that problem. Anybody

who is in Government will have that problem. People have a tendency to feel that although the Government is their Government — and by Government I mean the country is their country — you may not like the Government of the day, but it is still the Government of the country — wherever possible they must try to poke that Government in its eye, punch it out if they can, and therefore you never easily get people co-operating with you on matters of this kind. But an offer has to be made and it must be made at some point. You are not going to make it at the highest rung of the ladder. You will make it at a reasonable point on the ladder.  
4.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, once a person told me that when you approach a lady and you want to know her age, you don't guess too near the age. If you think she is 30, you say you believe she is 55, and she gets very upset and up-tight and will tell you you are mad or something like that. So sometimes it is good whenever you are making an offer to make it at a point where you create a little unease and then they say he must be joking or is making fun up there, so let me tell him exactly what we really want for the property. Therefore an offer, a preliminary offer of any kind for that matter, could have been an offer for X, or zero plus one, or something like that. The honourable Member for St. Michael North (Mr. P. M. Greaves) was calculating the figures, I believe he must be a millionaire because the only men who are very good charming men to deal in these fine figures are the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central (Dr. R. C. Haynes) and himself and the honourable Member for St. Philip North (Mr. W. O. Franklin). They are always calculating these figures because they always feel that every little point cent in terms of interest and returns can amount to so much at the end of the day that they can leave their children and grandchildren very well off.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we do not make too much of the question of the offer. I saw the offer for the first time today. I do not see these things. We do not have anything to do with it. We do not have a Cabinet Committee that looks after the cutting up of lands or the valuation of people's property. I am not in that business. I do not want to know. Let the officials deal with that. They may put you into trouble sometimes, but that is the price of public life, so I do not worry about those things. Let them make the offer. Let them go and tangle with the owners. When the time comes and we find that the problem is reaching the stage where it is becoming too untractable, I would step in, and in the final analysis the Cabinet will make the decision. We do not get into those things. I am not interested in those things. This Government is too concerned with bigger matters to be concerned with all of these little matters, petty things I would call them. Not that they are not big to the people who are involved, but I do not feel that Ministers should get into the nitty

gritty of all these little matters in their Ministries. When you become too involved, you operate more like a Permanent Secretary than a Minister, and I do not like to see Ministers in those roles.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have explained as much as I can in the light of all the discussions on this matter.

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

#### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT MARTINDALES ROAD, ST. MICHAEL FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

*Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Martindales Road, St. Michael for the purpose of Housing development.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, sometime in the past when this matter came before Parliament a number of Members expressed the view that this area of land should not be used as a housing complex, that is, for high rise buildings. At that particular time the Government had in mind the construction of complexes there hopefully for nurses and people who were working in Bridgetown and would not want to go too far out. The view was expressed then, among other views, that the land could be retained for probably a proper development within the area, construction of single unit houses or maybe used as an extension or for ancillary services for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

We looked at all the options and we decided that we would opt for an area which was offered at the Pondsides for the construction of 50 units. Originally we were looking at something like 75 units but we thought that, given the land area, the density was too high, and representation was made to me, and I thought that the representation was quite reasonable and correct, and therefore I reduced the number from 75 to 50.

*(Aside: Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Some decrease!)*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: However, we are looking still at lands in that area because there is a part of Bay Street that needs to be cleaned up. It would be on the northern side if you are going in an easterly direction out of Bridgetown on to Bay Street. That would include the Pondsides and maybe near to where Harry's was and around there. We feel that it would serve a useful purpose to clean up that whole area that is ready for renewal and put a complex there.

As Government owns quite a lot of land, which used to be known as Gibbons Land, going back on to Belleville and quite a lot of land in that area, we are of the view that in the fullness of time, and sooner rather than later, we should look at that area for improvement to make the condition of life better for the people who live in that area. So in any attempt to clean up the area in Gibbons Land, Dr. Gibbons' area of the land and all around there, you may need that particular portion of land that we are now dealing with for assistance in siting some of the people who might have to be moved around, since the density of population in that area is extreme. The modern-day approach to it is that, much as you will offer a lot which might be smaller than what used to be the norm in the past, you would still be in a position to give a person a comfortable spot of land which would site a reasonable house on and also provide proper environmental conditions.

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

Hon. V. L. JOHNSON: I beg to second that, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am duty bound to declare my interest in this matter to this Honourable House. My interest, Sir, is very specific, very legitimate. I am the representative of St. Michael South Central and the people of Martindales Road, Bannister Land and Delamere Land are very dear to my heart.

It was with some concern that earlier in one session of this House — I am not quite sure whether it was during this session or a previous one — at the joint intervention of myself and the honourable Member for the City (Hon. B. A. Miller) we were able to persuade the Government of that time not to proceed with the dislocation of people living in that area. Sir, we felt very strongly, and certainly I objected very strongly to remarks made in New York by the head of the Barbados Labour Party and the head of the Barbados Labour Party Government that Martindales Road was a slum. Martindales Road is not a slum. It is a healthy community, a very viable community, and a community which welcomes visitors and one which makes you very happy once you function and work among the people there. It is a community, Sir, which has given considerable support to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital over the years in the supply of labour on a long term and a short term basis.

We have always felt, Sir, that it was a mistake to utilize the available lands on that side for the purposes of housing. The arguments which I put forward at that time were quite straightforward. Firstly, although it would appear that there is a considerable amount of land

adjacent to the hospital for expansion, it is very difficult to build on that land. We all know what has been the experience with the Nutrition Centre that was built adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. All that open area, the whole Delamere field that you see there, is land that is very difficult to build on, with hardly any foundation at all. The hospital itself is built on a piece of rock that juts out in the area, and even at the back of the hospital it is very difficult to find foundations in that area. It is only, Sir, when you cross the road in the area of Enmore and the area of Bannister Land that once again you come onto land with firm foundations.  
5.00 p.m.

It has been clear to us, Sir, for many years, that there will be a need for an expansion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other health related facilities in the future. At that time we thought that the Government had accepted our argument that the best use of the land would probably be for health related activities in the future. However, it would appear to me that certain political considerations are now determining the position to be taken by the Government of Barbados. I know that the Barbados Labour Party has been quite unhappy about the voting pattern of polling district RC1, namely Bannister Land and Delamere Land, over the years because that area has offered strong support to me. I am asking the Minister of Housing to give a firm commitment that when this land is acquired and when the houses are put up there, the people of Bannister Land and Martindales Road will have the first option of getting those houses. That is a commitment that I would like to see made on the floor of this House, because I know the kinds of tricks that the Barbados Labour Party will get up to just before an election.

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Well, election is in September, you told me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I just rise on a point of order. I would have thought, Sir, that we would have to be asking the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central to put some of our people in them, because, according to their argument, they will be the Government. But he has conceded defeat by saying that he is going to ask us to put the people from Bannister Land in. We thank you for all your honesty and conviction. You have conceded defeat on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: To continue, Sir, I think, Sir, that the Barbados Labour Party should do nothing to break up that area. I have been impressed over the years, Sir, with the social cohesiveness of Bannister Land and Delamere Land. Few people in Barbados would know that

those two areas would have probably produced some of the best footballers in Barbados. Some of the top sportsmen in this country come from those two small areas. Those are places that have highly developed social conscience. The people there have learnt to help each other over the years. In fact, Sir, apart from Carrington Village, particularly Quakers Road, Halls Road, Brittons Hill, the Pine and Belleville, there is no area in Barbados that shows the same level of social development as you would see in Bannister Land and Delamere Land. I think, Sir, that when one takes all of these things into consideration, it is important that the Minister should give the people of Bannister Land an assurance that they would not be moved out of the area, and that if any new housing is put in that area, they will have the first option to rent or to purchase those houses.

Sir, I think it will also be a very serious mistake, and very socially disruptive, if those houses were put up there for political purposes, to reduce the number of votes available to me, to bring in Barbados Labour Party supporters from all over the country and then distort all of the value systems which have emerged over the years within a very close and compact community.

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am not afraid, but I have to defend the rights and interests of the people of Bannister Land. I have to make sure that when people say that they live in a slum, I make it quite clear that they are not slum dwellers. I have to make sure that they are not dislocated for political reasons, and I have to make sure that if Government money is spent in that area, then they should have the first option to be beneficiaries of any development that goes on in that area.

With those few remarks, Sir, I would urge the Government to look and see whether housing is the best purpose to which all of this land can be put. I will concede that, when I look at the total area of land, there are certain parts which can be dedicated to improved housing and an increased amount of housing area. I will also urge the Government to remember that one of the problems we have in that area is that there is a need for a small community centre and probably a small recreation area in the Bannister Land area. We already have plenty of playing fields across the road, because the people use the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's playing field and the Delamere field. We are not complaining about that. What we are saying is that many of the young children do not have any facilities. So I hope that when the planners design the housing complex that shall go into this area, they take into consideration that some of the land can probably be better used for health related development in the future and, secondly, to make sure that there is space for recreation within that area of Bannister Land.

I think that I have made a very valuable contribution, and I think that the people of Bannister Land have been very well represented today in the Parliament of Barbados.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am sure that my colleague, the Minister of Housing, in true pattern and true Barbados Labour Party tradition, set out to house the nation and not house the nation for any particular reason in strengthening one's hands in relation to votes, Sir. One would have never thought of taking into Christ Church West a housing development, which is in Bonnetts. You do not have to strengthen the Member for Christ Church West hands. He is a strong and powerful candidate with over 3 000 votes. You do not have to strengthen your hands, Sir, at Lammings in St. Joseph, where we have started a housing development. So it is not really kind to say that the reason why we may be building in Martindales Road is to bring in Barbados Labour Party supporters to put them in there. And even if we did, they are taxpayers, and, to the best of my knowledge, there is a committee that determines the needs of a person to be housed in this country. Unlike the other party. The Member for St. Michael North West, when he was then the Minister of Housing, put people into houses built out of taxpayers' money who could not qualify for a mortgage, and to this very day they are living in the houses in Eden Lodge, behind Bim, and you cannot put them out. People 55 years old could not get a mortgage. That was the whole idea.  
5.10 p.m.

I believe it is stupid for a party to determine that they are going to build a development for the purpose of bringing in people. If that was so, Peter Morgan would still be in the House, he would still be in Parliament, or we would not have built Rosemont and Fernhurst which was won by your party, or we would never have lost St. James South. That demonstrates quite clearly that we do not build houses to house people who are supporters of the party, and it is an unfair accusation to make. I think it is a very silly argument that they put up.

To the best of my knowledge, I think my colleague would forgive me if I say that long ago that land was looked at for the purpose of having houses there, as my colleague quite rightly said, looking at the nurses, the bus conductors and some port workers who earned three or four hundred dollars a week, rather than letting people go into the houses where you pay \$25 and \$30 a week, because many of these people who earn over \$1 000 a month today are living in Government subsidised houses. I know that as a fact. There are people who live in Government houses who own big bungalows.

*Aside.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: My colleague asked me why I would not tell him. I know the Minister he is, he would

have found out that going along the road. Maybe he knows but at this point in time he cannot get it undone. I will give him the names of some of them. They may be supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. He can get them out. That is how we really operate. We would not, as you say, bring television cameras to show us putting people out of houses in St. James. The Minister said you must pay the rent, and if you do not pay the rent there is a way out. That is the courage of our conviction. We won two by-elections on that premise, never mind all of these things that we are so bad and so heartless, so we have not got to build houses for the purpose of housing supporters of a particular party. We build houses because we see the need for housing in Barbados, and I am quite sure that my colleague there will agree with me.

The second point, before I take my seat, is that I have no doubt that he is a good representative, as he says he is. There is quite a bit of land behind Delaware Clinic, that I know, quite a portion of land behind Delaware Clinic run away in bush, and I have no doubt, to demonstrate how good a representative he is.....

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have no plans of giving way, Sir.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: There is a portion of land, Sir, in the back of a place known as Delaware Clinic, in which I am told the Member for St. Michael South Central has an interest, or that he is the landlord — I do not know how far his interest runs — but all like now it is run away in bush. I do not know why the health inspectors have not prosecuted him, and he is a person dealing in such matters.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir.

*Certain remarks made at this stage by Dr. R. C. HAYNES were ordered by Mr. SPEAKER to be expunged from the record.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Some of the land adjoins Delaware Clinic. I am quite sure that the Member can demonstrate to the people of Bannister Land, I have no doubt in my mind that he can put down a small modern structure there. As a matter of fact, I have no doubt that he would give the commitment on the floor of the House this evening for all they have done for him, they are so dear to his heart, that he would put down a small structure there for them. It does not cost very much. I believe \$100 000 would do a good trick for them, and he

obviously does not depend on his parliamentary salary, because he normally gives it away, as he said. He does not want the increase in parliamentary salary, so that money, I have no doubt, would put down a nice little structure designed by the Member from Franklin and Franklin Associates, the surveyors, because they always have interest in this type of business, and make a gift to the people of Bannister Land and Martindales Road, because we the Government are providing the playing facilities on the other side of the road next to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, so they have at least a pavilion, they have at least a playing field and they can play football and cricket. What they need now is a small meeting centre, a little club room, where they can go and sit down and play hearts and whist and dominoes and show off their talents. I am quite sure you can demonstrate this evening to those people who you say love you so much, I invite you to get up on the floor of the House now and make that commitment to that constituency of St. Michael South Central.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt this Resolution has not invited the amount of debate because no great interest is on that side in respect of this. All we have heard is a plea from the Member for St. Michael South Central that he would like the Barbados Labour Party, when they regain power, as he made it very clear for he is appealing to the very Minister — he has appointed a Minister in the Barbados Labour Party Government of 1986–91 already — to give the people in Bannister Land an opportunity to go in there. That is what he has done. Therefore, I am very grateful for his kind thoughts and best wishes for my colleague in 1986–91, Sir, and I have no doubt that he is going to do that, knowing the Minister as well as I do.

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

#### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SHARON, ST. THOMAS

*Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Sharon, St. Thomas for the provision of an access road to the new Sharon Primary School.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, when the Government acquired some land from Sharon Church for the construction of a primary school, although it was not agreed fully, it was the understanding of Government that the Sharon Church would allow the Government to use a common road which leads to the church and would lead on to the school as well, but there seemed to be some misunderstanding somewhere along the line and therefore the Government then had to acquire a road to give access to the primary school.

One of the persons involved in this acquisition is a person whom we are buying a large amount of land from, which we really need. The reason for that is, the lawyer representing one of the persons, a Mr. Vaughn, has represented to the Ministry that if we had acquired the piece of land we wanted we would have put him in trouble with respect to the remainder of his land, and we thought it was but fair and reasonable. This is how we operate, Mr. Speaker. We are very liberal in our policies, so long as representation is made. If it is not made, it is too bad. We are representing Barbadians and citizens of Barbados, and if representation is made to us in the proper way we will always try to assist wherever possible. Wherever there is a case that you might very well dislocate a person by acquiring a small portion of land for a particular purpose, the Government undertakes to acquire all so that the person would not be disadvantaged.

We are taking a small piece of land from the church itself and this amount from Mr. Percy Vaughn. I consider it to be a fair arrangement in the circumstances, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS (St. Thomas): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to thank the Minister and the Ministry of Education for this access road to the new Sharon Primary School, which I believe stands out as a model among primary schools in Barbados. I wish to place on record the gratitude of the people of St. Thomas, and particularly that area of Sharon/Arthur Seat/Melrose, for this school.  
5.20 p.m.

As Members probably know, the old school there was part of the Moravian property. It became real dilapidated and run-down and the Government, I think, was very far-sighted in building the new school. Because there was some difficulty over the present access to the new school, it was absolutely necessary that an alternative access road be developed for the school, otherwise it would have meant a tremendous amount of traffic to the school via the existing entrance past the church.

While on this, I am also heartened to know that St. Thomas is going to get yet another new primary school. Shortly before Christmas, the Minister of Education and representatives of the World Bank met me in Farmers at a site, I suppose it would be east of the present Farmers Pavilion, and I believe it was about 3½ acres of land which has been identified for the erection of a new primary school in that area. This, again, becomes very critical to the educational development at the primary level in St. Thomas, because at present, the people from the Porey Spring/Dunscombe/Airy Cot/Canefield area, can, in fact send their children to Hillaby Mixed, which is some considerable distance

uphill to Airy Cot. The next available primary school in that rough area is just past Hillaby, at Turner's Hall.

Turner's Hall Primary School is also badly in need of repair. Hillaby Mixed School is, itself, out-moded, and the most significant feature that would have informed the planning for any school to service that area has been the sharp decline in the roll at Hillaby Mixed. From the days when Hillaby Mixed had a roll in excess of 280 children, today, I think the figures are 69. I was corrected only on Sunday because I was given a figure of 49 previously, but I was told on Sunday that, in fact, the roll is now about 69 at Hillaby Mixed. It may mean one of two things or a combination of both, that Barbadians are becoming more conscious of the size of their families — and, perhaps, the days of five children in a family are behind us, and, therefore, there will be consequential decline in the population of children in relation to schools — or it may also mean, and there is some evidence of this, that the children now and their families prefer not to go up the hill to Airy Cot to the Hillaby Mixed School, but prefer to go, as it were, downhill to Turner's Hall. For whatever reason, there is a declining school population and there is need for rationalisation of the facility for primary schools in that area.

We did not want to acquire land on the main road, which is busy. The site at Farmers lends itself, I think, very well to the objective of having a school slightly off the main road and away from heavy vehicular traffic, so the children should be quite happy and their families in the new location at Farmers. I have already tested the water, as it were, and have found total support for land construction of the school under the next World Bank Project. I do not think it would be in this coming fiscal year, but it would be in fiscal 1987/88.

Once again, I am very obliged to the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Housing and Lands for what they are contributing to the development of primary school education in St. Thomas. I note that the Democratic Labour Party in 30 years and onwards still are saying that they are going to build a secondary school in St. Thomas. We will have that debate at Estimates time to show them the folly of their thinking.

I am obliged to you.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I have received a late Notice Paper, and I would rather like to give notice of what is on the Notice Paper at this point in time, if there be no objection. I am therefore asking leave.

## GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$54 000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1985-86, No. 23, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 355 750 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1985-86, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1985-86 No. 24, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, if I were to have some copies of these measures circulated to all honourable Members on the other side, if they would probably like to deal with these Resolutions in all of their stages.

Since we know that Estimates is just in a matter of weeks from now, and since we have dealt with a number of these measures on the floor of the House, I do not know if Members on the other side would take relatively kindly for us to dispose of these measures this evening. If so, I would not mind having a chat with whoever is the *de facto* Deputy Leader of the Opposition at this point in time. I reckon I can discuss it with the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central; though he is relatively junior to the Members, I think he has a rather high profile among his other colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, those are the items on the Supplementary Notice Paper. I would now revert and ask to deal with the Appendix Notice Paper, which would then be Order No. 5, which is No. 1 on the Appendix.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not recall seeing those matters circulated.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir. I asked if it is possible for me to have them circulated and allow Members on that side to look at them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I received certain Resolutions during the course of last week. I am wondering if Members on the other side had those.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, if I may assist the Honourable Leader of the House, who clearly does not know what is going on, there are two Resolutions which you gave notice of...

Mr. SPEAKER: I will suspend the House for 8 minutes so that the matter can be cleared up as to what we are going to do from here onward.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would just like to say that it is not a matter of what we are going to do. I can suspend the House if it is Your Honour's desire, but I do know that there is anything to be cleared up. I am doing Order No. 5. That is all to be cleared up, but I agree with the suspension for a few minutes.  
5.30 p.m.

#### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT JEMMOTTS LANE, ST. MICHAEL

*Order No. 5 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Jemmotts Lane, St. Michael to facilitate the widening of the entrance of the Ladymeade Polyclinic.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is comparatively simple. It seeks to clean up an area at the junction which leads into Ladymeade Polyclinic. There was a small piece of property there on the right hand side going in, which would be on the west if you are going in an easterly direction, which was causing some obstruction to vehicular traffic going in and out of that area, and therefore it was thought and recommended that the property there should be acquired in order to give greater visibility to the traffic going in and out of the road leading to the Ladymeade Polyclinic. It is a straightforward matter.

Provision was made by the Welfare Department for the tenant who was in the house, and everybody, I think, is feeling very well. I do not believe that since the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has an interest, not in the property but in the occupant, he would object to the fact that proper and suitable arrangements were made for the occupant of the house which was removed.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Dr. R. C. HAYNES (St. Michael South Central): Mr. Speaker, once again I must declare my interest, which is

marginal in every sense of the word, since the property being acquired is marginal or adjacent to the property of Delaware Limited. I believe in the Resolution somewhere it refers to Delaware Clinic. Delaware Clinic, as far as I know, is not a legal entity and not an owner of any land in that particular area. That is the first point I want to make.

The second point I want to make, Sir, is that there is no bush or empty land at the back of Delaware Clinic, and in point of fact, at the back of Delaware Clinic is now the Ladymeade Clinic. A brand new ear, nose and throat surgery, and the Children's Development Centre. At the back of Delaware the whole area is taken care of. It is an excellent example of how private enterprise can pioneer the development in an area, because, make no mistake, when Delaware's building was built some 13 years ago, it was the first professional building of that kind. It attracted a lot of jealousy, a lot of criticism, but over the years we proved to be right in what we did, and I am pleased to see the accountants, the lawyers and other doctors getting into the same kind of real estate development for the enhancement of their profession, their patients and themselves. I see nothing wrong with that. What is of interest, Sir, is that the presence of Delaware at that site must have been a factor in the Government's decision to place Ladymeade there and now we have a situation where you have a Government clinic operating beside a private sector clinic to the mutual advantage of both.

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: We cannot take any more patients. Never mind, it works out all right. We have no problem with competition. We are quite happy with the situation. It is a mutually symbiotic relationship between private and public sector as it should be, not a parasitic one.

The third point I want to make is that a lot of things have happened in Jemmotts Lane recently. We now have the Delaware Clinic, we have the Ladymeade Polyclinic, and there is a lot of traffic coming into that area.

*Aside*

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: There is Delaware Clinic, but the property is owned by Delaware Limited.

If you pass there in the afternoon, you will see that Jemmotts Lane now becomes a serious bottleneck for traffic in that area, and within the last few months more and more people are going to the polyclinics, and with the transfer of the dispensary facilities from the Bayville Clinic, to the disadvantage of the residents of the Bay Land, to Ladymeade, persons now have to drive down or go down to the clinic to collect their medicines. So

you have a lot of traffic in that area, and Government should really be giving consideration probably to putting a roundabout at the junction of River Road and Lower Collymore Rock, if that is possible. Probably a roundabout is also needed at the junction of Jemmotts Lane and Bay Street. I have worked in that area for about 15 years. The building is about 15 years old now, and normally when one left Delaware around 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock you could drive home. Now it could almost take you a good 45 minutes to get from your clinic to Bay Street, or from the clinic around to Collymore Rock, so much has been the congestion, and this is taking place only in the last three months or so.

Another point I want to make, Sir, is that I cannot understand how we are debating a Resolution for acquisition today. The Government has already removed the structure that was there, has already displaced the goodly, honourable, very intelligent gentleman, who unfortunately has been the beneficiary of welfare services but no toilet, as I understand it, to the facility given to him in Collymore Rock. That is my understanding, Sir. So the house has been knocked down, the area has been cleared and the Government having already taken these steps now comes for parliamentary approval to acquire the land. In other words, they have already knocked down the house, they have already cleared the site and now they are coming for approval to validate what they have already done. Now something seems to me to be wrong. I should think that the acquisition legislation should be passed first and then you can go and remove the structure.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not think that they know who owns the land. I am not acting on behalf of anyone, I am not a lawyer, I am not a real estate agent or anything of the kind, except I believe that, quite justifiably, squatter's rights may come into operation in respect of that situation and that the beneficiary probably should be Dr. Jeegles himself. The late Beatrice Foster cannot receive dollar bills, Dr. Jeegles can, and I think he has established squatter's rights, because I think he was there for about ten years, and this is a problem at the moment relating to this acquisition in that the Government does not know who really owns the land or to whom money should be paid. All I am saying is that, in the spirit of democracy and fair-play, it would seem to me as in the case of Six Men's argued earlier; similarly, squatter's rights almost certainly would operate here.

5.40 p.m.

Those are the main points, Sir, that I wanted to make in respect of this Resolution and to reinforce the point that Government should never be shy of the fact that the private sector can play a pioneering role in the developmental process of this country. What has happened in Jemmott's Lane in health related industry and building development is a classic example of what can

happen. I will always challenge the Prime Minister, I would always send clear signals out to the business community, that he said again and again and again on the floor of this House that the private sector in Barbados does not contribute anything, that they do not develop anything, that they just reflect what is going on in the society and they are parasitic on public sector investment. Here is an example where it is worked in the complete reverse, where we have seen a critical area of Barbados now brought into the 21st century whilst we are still in the 20th century, as a result of the injection of private sector capital.

I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker, it was very little private sector capital, because in those days Sir, no bank in Barbados would lend five specialists as co-guarantors something like \$180 000. We had to wait until an American Bank came into Barbados, which borrowed the money from a local bank and then loaned us the money. That is the sort of thing you had to fight against in Barbados, and that is the sort of thing we have been criticized for. Remember the days of Fort Knox? Criticized all down the years by the Barbados Labour Party, although one of the founding members of Delaware was the first son of a former Premier of Barbados and Leader of the Barbados Labour Party. Yet they took those steps over the years to try to destroy the image of Delaware Clinic. The Barbados Labour Party will have a lot to answer for, because when you look at all the professional groups in Barbados, you would see what that has meant as a shining example of what a few black professionals can get together in Barbados and do, and stick together over the years, despite all the difficulties.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG (St. James North): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, Sir. I do not know why the Member for St. Michael South Central had to get up here on the floor of the House and discuss his personal business as to how much he and four other black professionals, as he put it, had the vision where others did not. I do not see why he had to get up on the floor of the House to tell us of the jealousies that exist within his own profession, that is, the medical profession. We happen to know that there are jealousies that exist in the medical profession because BAMP itself has demonstrated over the months the professional jealousy, that they are not only medical men but also money-hungry men. That is the jealousy. All that he said here this evening on a simple Resolution is that his professional colleagues, his medical colleagues, all of them who sat side by side with him did not have his vision to put up Delaware Clinic, or Delaware Ltd. whatever it is, and to demonstrate how small, young, black businessmen can come together and do something for the good of the society. We do not want to know about that.

As far as we are concerned the accusation of acquiring people's land and do not know the owners and the man has nowhere to live, as you implied, and no

toilet is utter nonsense. As long as Section 3 is published in the newspapers the Government has the right to go on the lands. Is that correct, Minister?

(*Aside:* Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: The Governor-General gives them permission.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Governor-General gives them permission. You have not got to come to Parliament to get parliamentary approval to acquire. You have been in here long enough. We have not got time to lecture you at this very late day leading up to an election. That is elementary. I believe the reporters who come in here every Tuesday know that. I do not understand. We have not got to get parliamentary approval, Mr. Speaker.

(*Aside:* Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is how you operate.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What you do is you publish Section 3 in the newspapers with the Governor-General's assent and that is the end of the matter. You go on from there and then come into Parliament and get the appropriate approval. I think that is the law. Am I right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is ....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker -- I will give you a ten minute break just now -- my colleague wishes to respond very briefly to whatever was said by the Member.

I just want to indicate just for the record that we are not concerned with your professional jealousies and your problems. That is a matter entirely for the medical profession. We have had enough problems with them and BAMP, of which you were one of the instigators, headed by your very professional colleagues that tried to stem the tide of progress with the National Health Scheme. You were the instigator behind that, you and Professor Walrond, but we will survive, because we are members of a great, powerful combination, and we know where we are going, we know what we want to do and we know we have to do it, and we will get there.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say a lot. The problem with respect to the tenant of this property has been resolved. He is a mutual friend of the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and myself, and I am sure that he will be happy to see that he is put right. He is not only a friend of his, but as a friend of mine used to say in the past, a friend and slave.

I am grateful to him for drawing to my attention that it should not be "Delaware Clinic" in the Schedule to the Resolution but it should be "Delaware Limited". I am to move an amendment, with the permission of the

House, that we delete "Clinic" and substitute "Limited" in its place.

I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution be so amended.

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

*The question that the word, "Clinic" be deleted and the word "Limited" be substituted in its place was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to move, Sir, that the Resolution, as amended, do now pass.

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

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

5.50 p.m.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House be suspended for 15 minutes.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.*

#### ON RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 6, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7.

#### COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT OXNARDS, ST. JAMES

*Order No. 6 was called – To move the passing of a Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition of land at Oxnards, St. James for providing access to and facilitating the further development of the Oxnards Crescent Housing Development.*

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution speaks for itself. It is clear and simple, and I beg to move that it do now pass.

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Order No. 7, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7.

*Order No. 7 was called – To move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the services of this Island.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. 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 1985–1986 No. 17 – \$276 408

#### HEAD 17 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 17 stand part, Sir.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that. It speaks for itself.

*The question that Head 17 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD 28 – MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 28 stand part.

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

*The question that Head 28 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD 42 – MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND WORKS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

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

*The question that Head 42 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the*

*passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, each seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, earlier in the day I gave notice of a couple of Resolutions which I do not think they pose any problems. They are relatively small and I presume that I can do these Resolutions now, Sir. I have no doubt that Members on this side will agree to this. If so, I ask for leave of the House to do these Resolutions now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there are no objections on the other side.....

Mr. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have not seen them at all.

*Asides*

## ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, this brings us to the end of Government Business today.

I beg to move that this sitting be now adjourned Sir, until Tuesday, January 21, 1986 at 12 o'clock noon, Sir.

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

*The question that the House do now stand adjourned until January 21, 1986 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
6.20 p.m.

## CONTENTS

### MINUTES

Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday,  
December 17, 1985..... 3190

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER ..... 3190

Accounts and Statements for the month of  
November 1985, as prepared by the Account-  
tant General.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... 3190, 3223

Resolution to grant the sum of \$902 000  
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it  
at the disposal of the Government to supple-  
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part I — Cur-  
rent, as shown in the Supplementary Esti-  
mates 1985-86, No. 20, which form the  
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$148 790  
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it  
at the disposal of the Government to supple-  
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part II —  
Capital, as shown in the Supplementary  
Estimates 1985-86, No. 21, which form  
the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$5,000,000  
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it  
at the disposal of the Government to supple-  
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part II —  
Capital, as shown in the Supplementary  
Estimates 1985-86, No. 22, which form the  
Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to approve of the compulsory  
acquisition of land at Bourne's Land, St.  
Christopher, Christ Church, for the exten-  
sion of the playing field at Saint Christopher's  
Boys' School and the relocation of houses.

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of  
Judicature Act.

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$54 000  
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it

at the disposal of the Government to supple-  
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part I — Current  
as shown in the Supplementary Estimates,  
1985-86, No. 23 which form the Schedule to  
the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1 355 750  
from the Consolidated Fund and to place it  
at the disposal of the Government to supple-  
ment the Estimates 1985-86, Part II —  
Capital as shown in the Supplementary  
Estimates 1985-86 No. 24 which form the  
Schedule to the Resolution.

### FIRST READINGS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG ..... 3191

A Bill to amend the Supreme Court of  
Judicature Act.

A Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

### CONGRATULATORY AND/OR OBITUARY SPEECHES

Obituary speeches re the late T. O. Bryan. .... 3191

Mr. St. John, 3191; Mr. Taitt, 3191, Mr.  
Speaker, 3192.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Suspension of Standing Orders ..... 3192

Mr. Craig, 3192

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF PARCELS OF  
LAND AT HARRISON'S PLANTATION,  
ST. LUCY ..... 3192

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3193; Mr. R. E.  
Brathwaite, 3194; Mr. Franklin, 3194; Mr.  
Bradshaw, 3195; Mr. N. K. Simmons, 3195,  
Mr. H. B. St. John, 3196; Mr. Barrow, 3196.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT  
SIX MEN'S TENANTRY, ST. PETER ..... 3198

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3198, 3216; Mr.  
Barrow, 3199; Mr. St. John, 3201; Mr.  
Franklin, 3204; Mr. Arthur, 3206; Dr. Haynes,  
3207, 3211; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3209;  
3211; Mr. Craig, 3213; Mr. Greaves, 3215.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT  
MARTINDALES ROAD, ST. MICHAEL. .... 3218

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3218, Dr. Haynes, 3219;  
Mr. Craig, 3220.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT  
SHARON, ST. THOMAS . . . . . 3221**

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3221; Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, 3222.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT  
JEMMOTTS LANE, ST. MICHAEL . . . . . 3223**

Mr. L. B. Brathwaite, 3223, 3225; Dr. Haynes, 3223; Mr. Craig, 3225.

**COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT  
OXNARDS, ST. JAMES . . . . . 3226**

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1985-86**

No. 17 — \$276 408 . . . . . 3226

Head 17

Head 28 — Ministry of Legal Affairs

Head 42 — Ministry of Transport and Works

SUSPENSIONS . . . . . 3204, 3226

ADJOURNMENT . . . . . 3227

**SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE**

ARTHUR, O. S. (St. Peter)  
BARROW, Rt. Hon. E. W. (St. John)  
BOLDEN, His Honour C. L. (Speaker) (St. Joseph)  
BRADSHAW, Hon. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)  
BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. B. (St. Andrew)  
CRAIG, Hon. L. S. (St. James North)  
FRANKLIN, W. O. (St. Philip North)  
GREAVES, P. M. (St. Michael North)  
HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael South Central)  
St. JOHN, Hon. H. B. (Christ Church East Central)  
SIMMONS, Hon. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)  
SIMMONS, N. K. (St. James South)  
TAITT, B. M. (St. Michael West)