
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 25, 1991

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

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)
His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)
Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation and Leader of the House)
Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of Foreign Affairs)
Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Labour, Consumer Affairs and the Environment)
Hon. N. K. SIMMONS, (Minister of Justice and Public Safety)
Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc.(Econ.), (Minister of State, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs)
Mr. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.)
Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Mr. C. LeR. TROTMAN, M.A.
Mr. R. L. MORRIS, B.A., Cert. Ed.
Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B.(Hons.) (Minister of Community Development and Culture)
Mr. H. B. StJOHN, Q.C., LL.B.
Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.)

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A., LL.B.

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meetings held on June 4, 1991 as well as June 11, 1991.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes of the proceedings of this Honourable Chamber of the meetings held on June 4 and 11, 1991 be taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations or corrections, then let those Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report and Audited Financial Statements of the National Petroleum Corporation for the period April 1, 1989 to March 31, 1990.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 3 is now ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the order of the day. Order No. 6.

ORDER NO 6: RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FOUL BAY, ST. PHILIP, FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum to this Resolution indicates, the purpose of this Resolution before this Honourable Chamber is for the acquisition of a parcel of land measuring 8 438 square metres or thereabouts at Foul Bay, St. Philip, for the purpose of providing recreational facilities in that area.

The Government is of the view that this is a matter which is outstanding in that particular area. I am told that the area of land which is being acquired was in use by sporting groups, particularly cricketing organisations, for a number of years. What we are therefore seeking to do is to bring this land under public ownership to ensure that the participation of our young people and our sportsmen is not inhibited by private owners.

I would want to indicate that the plan of the plot is here. If any Honourable Members want to have a look they are free to do so.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and I would just say a few words because the area that is being acquired at Foul Bay is in my constituency. The Victoria Sports Club has been playing on that particular area for the past 46 years and suddenly, last year, that Club was about to be uprooted after, as I said, 46 years of playing on that same piece of land. We felt that any time any group or organisation can occupy any particular area for that number of years then you cannot just wake up one morning and get rid of them off the land. I felt that the Government should acquire that land for the residents of Foul Bay so I am giving my full support to this Resolution.

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

ORDER NO. 2: RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE BARBADOS PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF 1977

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Town and Country Planning Act, Cap. 240 requires the Chief Town Planner to prepare development plans for the approval of the Minister and Parliament. A development plan consists of a report of a survey along with a plan and is intended to indicate the manner in which the Chief Town Planner proposes that land in the Island be used for a given period.

The aims of the plan are to satisfy the social and economic goals of the society as far as practicable through the creation of an efficient physical structure and good environment. The policies and proposals provide a framework for the ongoing process of making planning decisions. A physical development plan is thus a very critical aspect of the planning system. The plan must be flexible enough to encompass the myriad areas of planning control. It deals with all aspects of development which have a physical land base component with differing degrees of detail and differing scales.

The first Physical Development Plan for the Island was produced in 1970 and laid in Parliament in 1976.
12.25 p.m.

I think that it is significant to note that two Honourable Members who are still present in this Chamber have had very important roles in the Physical Development Plan which was prepared in 1970 and laid in this Chamber in 1976. The Deputy Prime Minister was the Minister who had responsibility for town planning in the seventies and it was under his guidance that the first Physical Development Plan was prepared. The Leader of the Opposition the Honourable Member for Christ Church West when he was Minister responsible for Town Planning I believe had the privilege of laying the first Physical Development Plan in Barbados and introducing it into this Honourable Chamber.

Indeed a quick look at the debate which took place on that occasion would indicate that generally speaking some broad guidelines were laid down regarding the procedure for the Plan. Basically those guidelines have been in place and have been followed to a large extent. I would want to say certainly at the outset that the Plan is not a legal document in the sense that there can be no deviation from it. It is a Plan which however has to be able to encompass the dynamic situation in which Barbados finds itself. Indeed this is the whole basis on which Physical Development Plans are constructed not only in Barbados but in areas where they have been put into operation, that is, that it is not like the Laws of the Medes and Persians that changeth not. They outline certain development possibilities taking into consideration the entire social, economic and environmental aspects of the country. But as you would appreciate from time to time changes will take place,

different approaches will be brought to bear on particular situations and therefore the changes would have to be incorporated.

After 1976 when this Plan was introduced into Parliament a number of changes have taken place certainly some of the projections on which the Plan was based, for example, projections relating to growth of population, it had been anticipated at that time that the population in Barbados would have been somewhere in the region of 300 000 by now. That is still far from being the case. Even the whole question of the movement of population the way in which it was anticipated that the population would have grown and moved, that certainly did not take place. Also as a result of a number of decisions which were made one would see that a number of changes had to take place.

Under the Town and Country Planning Act there is a provision for a review of the Physical Development Plan on a five year period. In 1983 this review was put in place in an attempt to incorporate, presumably, decisions which would be made during the period between the setting up of the Plan and the laying of it in Parliament, up to that time. As a result of that then following the procedures which had been laid down a public enquiry was set up I think in the seventies. The Enquiry was headed by Mr. Justice Williams and in 1983 the Commission of Enquiry was headed by Mr. Justice Colin Rocheford. This began its deliberations some time in 1986. There is a Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Physical Development Plan (Amended) 1983 which was available and which I believe all Honourable Members have had access to. Of course all Honourable Members would also have had an opportunity to look at the Physical Development Plan because I believe that when notice was given that the documents were circulated.

It was a public Enquiry and representations were made by individuals representing themselves I suppose, representing various organisations, the architects, the Town Planning Association, the engineers, the National Trust, a range of people who had interest in this particular area and in the general physical development of Barbados made representation to the Commission of Enquiry and of course all of the other matters which had to be incorporated were looked at and they were incorporated in the Report. The Report was then taken to Cabinet and it was agreed that the recommendations as far as possible would be incorporated into the amending Plan. The document which we have before us now which reads "Barbados Physical Development Plan (Amended) 1986" is the document which would when the debate is concluded and accepted would be the Physical Development Plan by which we would be guided.

I would want to draw Honourable Members' attention to I suppose a number of features. In the back of the Physical Development Plan there is a map called "The

Settlement and Land Use Policy Map" which is a fairly detailed, fairly clear map of the physical and land use settlement use policy as enunciated in the Plan. One of the criticisms which was made when the Enquiry took place was the absence of properly detailed maps. An effort was made on this occasion to provide as many detailed maps as possible. Let me say that this work was done as indeed the previous work on the first Physical Development Plan in collaboration with the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. We received technical co-operation from the UN to assist in this particular area.

Provision has also been made for other plans to be made available. The Plan calls for a greater Bridgetown Plan. The approach that we are using in this matter of the Physical Development Plan of Barbados is that we would first present the overall Plan which sets an overall framework for the physical development of Barbados. In accordance with the requirements we are going to be doing more detailed planning in a number of areas as for example there is now in circulation a greater Bridgetown Physical Development Plan, maps relating to that. When we have finished this attention would be turned to the Greater Bridgetown Physical Development Plan which as I understand it is bounded on the north by Porter's Hill, on the north east by the ABC Highway and on the south by I think it is Rendezvous Hill. I think that is the area as I understand it which would be covered by the Greater Bridgetown Physical Development Plan. Right now in circulation there is a detailed Plan for that area.

We are hoping when once we have concluded that second stage, we will move to the stage where the Plan for – indeed I think it is ready now and will be made available to the public shortly – the Adams-Barrow-Cummins Highway Land Use Study. This will be available very shortly for the public to see and to make comments on. We will then be looking at some other areas – towns in Oistins, Holetown, Speightstown. We would hope therefore that by this process and through this process that there will be eventually a detailed plan encompassing all of Barbados.

I think that one has to make the point that this Physical Development Plan, to a large extent, is the Plan which the former Administration is probably even more competent to deal with since all of the work in this area relating to the preparation of the Plan, to the setting up of a Commission of Enquiry and to the hearings which were put in place has been their handiwork. And as happened in the case in 1976 it fell their responsibility to introduce the Plan which we had prepared. It now falls our responsibility to introduce the amendments which had been prepared by the Members on the other side. So that they, obviously ought to be, as I am sure they are, very well *au fait* with the contents of the plan and since they have been involved in this I do not anticipate that the details of the plan would be subject to much discussion. As I said, we are as it were fulfilling the legal obligation, having gone through all of the legal

requirements we are now going the other stage of bringing it to Parliament.

12.35 p.m.

I said that the original Physical Development Plan 1970 in attempting to control and rationalise the changes proposed the hierarchy of settlements spread evenly over the country. This involved the growth of Speightstown and Oistins as regional centres acting as foci for the development of the northern and southern areas each serving a population of one hundred thousand.

We know these seven district centres were identified at Belleplaine, Holetown, Welchman Hall, Nestfield, Four Roads, Six Roads and the Charles Rowe Bridge area. Each district centre would serve populations of around six thousand. At the lowest level there were fifty-eight village centres to provide daily needs for the catchment areas and these were based on what is known as the central place concept. However, there were certain weaknesses which were identified in that particular approach since it meant that centres would have been springing up all around the country which would then have very serious implications for land use and particularly for agricultural land. It was felt therefore that we had to ensure that we provided an arrangement where the agricultural land would not be as adversely affected as if we had put those particular proposals into operation.

As a result of the above shortcomings the hierarchy of settlements did not polarise as was planned and instead a concentration of development occurred within and on the periphery of greater Bridgetown. A structure of the central places also became blurred due to the inability of the existing congested centres to absorb more development and the subsequent and partially uncoordinated spacial dispersal of service activities away from the centre.

To accommodate the expected physical growth and to check the undesirable characteristics observed in the past in the pattern of physical development a new amended settlement development strategy has been defined. This strategy seeks to rationalise the emerging linear urban corridor within which the various urban centres will be integrated into one metropolitan zone. At the same time the strategy identifies a balance hierarchy of urban and suburban centres within the urban zone as well as optimum locations for manufacturing, tourism, housing, recreational and other developments.

In the amended structure of urban centres, central Bridgetown retains its importance as the national capital. Speightstown and Oistins are regional centres, Holetown a tourism oriented local urban centre and Warrens, Wildey and Worthing are suburban centres.

The strategy also proposes a location for a new centre in St. Philip to be developed in the context of the planned

urbanisation in that parish. Beside the urban structure the proposed strategy specifies policies of growth for Speightstown, Oistins and Warrens as well as for the District Centres, whereas for the other centres policies of limits to growth are indicated.

In this structure, the plan outlines the implications of a national settlement development strategy for the management of urban growth in the greater Bridgetown area. Regarding central Bridgetown it proposes a strategy of gradual upgrading and expansion of commercial areas in selected locations to ensure the continuing growth of the "area" as a highly attractive and convenient national and international centre of commerce, business and finance.

Attention is also called to the need for expansion of integrated rural development programmes in those agricultural settlements located in the central and eastern parts of the country where population decline has been projected to continue. In these settlements it is possible to provide for more viable vegetable gardening, fruit cultivation and livestock development. By creating larger holdings through the absorption of vacant or under utilised holdings and through rationalisation of land use pattern. This is of great importance to stabilising important small villages now suffering from significant population decline.

With regard to the land use development, some deviations from the first proposed land use policy have occurred particularly during the late sixties and early seventies when some potential agricultural lands were subdivided for residential purposes and I dare say that this continued into the eighties.

To facilitate the planning and control of land use development the plan specifies defined limits to the urban development zone and proposes strategic urban and rural land use policies to guide future growth.

Manufacturing is envisaged to be a key growth sector in the strategy of economic development and it is expected to generate, according to the projections, some 11 200 jobs between 1980 and the year 2000. To accommodate this expansion a minimum net land area of 61 hectares is projected to be required. Some 29 per cent of the future industrial development is proposed to be located in Christ Church, 18 per cent in St. Peter/St. Lucy area, 41 per cent in St. Michael and the remaining 12 per cent in the rest of the country.

The indicated pattern of distribution in accordance with the settlement and development strategy seeks to encourage manufacturing development in the northern and southern sections of the urban corridor and the outer fringes of greater Bridgetown, while growth in central Bridgetown is intended to be restrained in order to curtail excessive concentration.

As far as tourism infrastructure development is concerned it is also proposed to be concentrated in the future on the existing tourism zones on the West, South and South East Coasts where the prime beach attractions are located. To accommodate expansion, locations are indicated in St. Peter, St. James, St. Michael, Christ Church and St. Philip. I would just want to say that basically these plans are outlined as were seen during the time that discussions have taken place on them.

Obviously as I said, it is a dynamic situation that we are in and even although we may have projected certain areas and certain growth developments, the chances are that we may not be able to be on target with all of these and because of the dynamic situation whether these dynamics are of economic or social nature the adjustments would have to be made.

12.45 p.m.

I think that one must bear this in mind. Indeed, Sir, one of the persons who appeared before the Commission of Inquiry felt very strongly that the Plan should be logged and that decisions which were made should be legally binding that he went to the High Court for this to be declared. I think that about a month ago a decision was made which reaffirmed the decision that was made by Mr. Justice Colin Rocheford, indicating certainly that the Physical Development Plan was not a legal document in that particular sense.

In short, what I am saying is that a changing economic and social environment must be accommodated within the Plan. There are provisions in the Plan for housing and the development of services. Basically, there are provisions also for the development of transportation and utility services and, of course, there are provisions in the Plan for recreation and conservation. I think that it is very important that we understand that there has to be a lot of attention being paid to conservation in Barbados and the Plan recognises this.

With this brief outline, I would want to indicate that we have reached the stage where I would want to move the following Resolution which has been laid in this Honourable Chamber:

"Whereas it is provided by Section 5(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act, that the Chief Town Planner shall submit for the approval of the Minister a development plan for the Island. A development plan called the Barbados Physical Development Plan was submitted to the Minister on July 8, 1970 and in accordance with Section 10 of the Town and Country Planning Act this came into operation on March 15, 1977. In accordance with Section 11 of the Town and Country Planning Act, proposals for alterations to the Barbados Physical Development Plan were submitted to the Minister on February 7, 1985. In accordance with Section 9(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act, certain

objections and representations with respect to the Plan were made in writing to the Minister and Mr. Justice Colin Rocheford was appointed to hold a public enquiry into those objections and representations.

Certain amendments which have been proposed as a result of the public inquiry have been approved by the Minister and notice of that approval has been published in the Official Gazette in accordance with Section 10(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act. It is provided by Section 10(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act that the amendments to the development plan shall be submitted for the approval of both Houses.

BE IT RESOLVED, therefore, that the House of Assembly approve the amendments to the Barbados Physical Development Plan 1977.

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

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Housing in introducing this Resolution has highlighted a number of important areas that I believe the continuing debate should address. First of all, I have one or two complaints about what has been introduced today. From what the Honourable Minister has said, this report was submitted to the Government early in 1985. The gestation period is something in excess of five years. If I may adopt the words of the Honourable Minister, "There is a dynamic situation. It is not static." Again to use his words, "There are lots of economic and social developments that must of necessity affect the plan." In other words, the Plan is not written in stone and it must be subject from time to time to changes according to social and economic developments. The period of five years or more that it took the Government to bring this matter before Parliament for the approval of the House, in my view, is a shameful dereliction of the duty of the Government.

Sir, the Physical Development Plan is one of the more important instruments that is brought before Parliament. It deals with a wide range of Government activities and private activities and, in a sense, can be considered omnibus in its implications. As my friend has said, it sets the context for all kinds of developments, however we define it, in this particular society. Therefore, I must start off by crying shame on Government for sitting down on this report for this excessively long period of time.

I am going, Mr. Speaker, to deal with certain aspects of the Plan and its policy and I will leave others to deal with other aspects. Impinging on this Plan is the development for housing, agriculture, recreation, transportation, communication, conservation, and almost every area of

activity both public and private is effected by a plan of this sort. I am considerably disappointed at the casual manner in which the Minister and the Government have brought this Plan today, as if it is no big thing, and he confesses that it has not kept *pari passu* step with other developments in the society. Therefore, Government is asking Parliament to rubber stamp a document that is way out of time. A lot has happened in Barbados since then.

The Town and Country Planning Act, Sir, makes provision for the orderly and progressive development of land in both urban and rural areas and also to improve all the amenities relating thereto. The Town and Country Planning Act also makes provision, Sir, for the grant of permission to develop land and other powers of control over the use of land, and to confer additional powers in respect of the acquisition and the development of land for planning and for purposes connected with those matters that I have mentioned, Sir.

Take a look at what has been happening since this Plan was put on the Minister's desk in 1985/86. The Minister of Housing in his introduction said that in the late 1960's and the early 1970's – I am paraphrasing him, Sir, in the event he jumps up and says those were not the exact words that he used – there were changes from the Development Plan from agriculture to residential development.
12.55 p.m.

The Minister said "and I dare say," to use his exact words....

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Later on too. He said the late seventies....

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Could I be protected, Sir? I did not interrupt him. The Minister said the late sixties and the early seventies, and "I dare say" later on. Well, he is perfectly correct, because in the last five years and I am agreeing with him – there has been substantial movement away from the provisions of the Physical Development Plan that was currently subsisting. The Government has put more and more agricultural land into housing development and in each case where it has done so a number of things arise that are worthy of consideration.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: We can go far back before I deal with these developments within the past five years.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: No, we will deal with the ex-Minister of Housing and Lands shortly. Mr. Speaker, land has always been a bone of contention from the time this country existed. This is because it is perhaps the most important physical resource in the country. From the time of slavery there was a question of land use, how land should be allocated and who should own it. All of these are old questions. The question persists even to this day:

When the Barbados Labour Party's Government 11 – 12 years ago passed the Freehold Purchase Act in Barbados, that particular piece of legislation was passed with important social objectives. It was to deal with the ancient, time worn questions of land ownership, land distribution, land use and so on. It was intended to look at this important national resource and determine how we could go another increment towards an equitable use of the land for the benefit of all the people in our society. So land is an old problem and it will continue to be that.

The point I was making earlier, Sir, is that every time there is permission by the Government – the Town Planning Department or the Minister of Housing and Lands – for subdivision of land in this country, and more particularly when land is taken out of agriculture for subdivision for residential purposes, the debate starts all over again. The Physical Development Plan must be seen in the context of the concerns that are expressed by people of every ilk in this society when these things happen.

Only recently, Sir, we had the example of the cutting up of agricultural land at Cottage in St. George for housing development. I used the occasion of that debate to point out that it is not merely a question of taking a number of acres out of agriculture, which is bad, but it is not only that, it was also the question of the change of the lifestyle of the people who live contiguous to the new development.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: There is virtue in consistency.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now. I am not accepting any interruptions unnecessarily. I want to remind Honourable Members that there are a number of areas in which one can interrupt another Member. Use those interruptions as the legitimate reasons. No cross talking.

Mr. L. R. TULL: As I was saying, Sir, when development of that nature takes place, this business of cutting off agricultural land adjacent to rural communities and allowing housing development, a lot of social problems are created. The ignorant and the socially insensitive would see an argument like this solely in terms of where you live and who you want to live next to. People who fall into that category see it only in those terms. I have observed it.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: But then if I ask Members on the Government side to be patient, why don't the Members on the other side understand as well?

Mr. L. R. TULL: I can only speak for myself, Sir, and I need your protection, because I have some important statements to make. Although I may step on certain people's corns, the statements will be made. I have seen land taken from Mount Plantation, to give an example of what I am talking about in relation to Cottage, and given to about 20 people to build big houses, some worth about half million dollars. Right under the hill was an old dance house called the Monte Carlo, where for 40 years the agricultural workers of the whole area – those who worked at Edgcombe, Bulkeley, Windsor, the Mount, Drax Hall, all over – used to go to the dance hall at Monte Carlo on Friday and Saturday nights to let off steam. That was their only method of recreation. After the development at the Mount up the hill to accommodate about a score of people in big houses, those people called the police station at Boarded Hall every weekend and complained that the people down the hill at the dance house were making too much noise and disturbing them from sleeping. The policemen from Boarded Hall, instead of hanging up the phone and "schewpsing" and forgetting about them, went over there and finally succeeded in closing down that dance house.

When I make the point, Sir, I am not making any specious points, I am saying that when you cut off agricultural land that is adjacent to the homes of people of the lower socio-economic group and allow to be built immediately next to them a number of houses of a certain pedigree, it causes social problems, it disrupts the ordinary tenor of life of people who have been living there for 300 years and the Minister of Community Development would do well to take that into consideration, because it is one of the problems that causes a lot of stress between the two groups of people when this kind of thing happens.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Whenever it happened, sometime around 1972, 1973 or 1974. If you want to know whether it happened under the BLP or DLP, I think the point about whether it happened with one party or the other is a lot of childish argument. I am making a point that transcends the incumbency of any particular Government, so if you want to know, it was in your time. But that is not the point I am making, I am making a point of far greater importance. I have seen it happen in many other parts of Barbados. I have seen a lot of it in St. George, but I have seen it in other places, and therefore a Government that is socially alert and sensitive would in its planning ensure that in distributing

land for housing that they do not cause social problems attendant on those decisions at a time when we could provide the housing and still not cause the problems.
1.05 p.m.

Now the Honourable Minister talks about flexibility and the law of the Medes and the Persians. Now, I am the first to accept that there cannot be a Physical Development Plan passed and then a Government cannot make any changes. We can't be ruled by these things, but it is also important to appreciate on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that Parliament cannot be trivialised. There is no point coming to Parliament with a resolution and asking it to approve a resolution for a Physical Development Plan and then when that is done there is an arbitrariness about the way in which you move away from it. In other words, I am submitting, Sir, that any time Government – and for the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central I mean any Government – that finds it necessary at any time to make a major deviation from a Physical Development Plan that has been approved by Parliament, it should come back to Parliament with good and compelling reasons. There are reasonable people in here. Don't mind the hecklers now and then. Even they are reasonable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand you that we have hecklers sitting in Parliament?

Mr. L. R. TULL: No, Sir. It should be incumbent on Government, Sir, where there is a major deviation from a Physical Development Plan to come back to Parliament and explain why the deviation is necessary and try to win the support of Members of Parliament in their endeavours. I don't think this has happened. When you approve a Physical Development Plan, you just go through the motions and you leave that Plan to lie around somewhere and nobody pays much attention to it after that.

The Minister says that the Physical Development Plan is a critical aspect of the planning system. Fine words! With which we agree. However, if it is such a critical aspect of the planning system, how is it that Government ignored its existence for so long and how is it that Government can deviate and make some provisions on that Plan as the spirit moves it – not moves the Plan, Sir, but as the spirit moves the Government.

All I am asking, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that far greater accordance is given to this business of having a Physical Development Plan. Barbados is a small country and has limited land resources.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Bad decisions, especially bad decisions taken by a Minister of Housing in the exercise of a discretion that is turning out to be too wide for him. "For him", Sir, means Minister of Housing. It does not mean...

For the sake of the Honourable Member for St. Michael Central – it is for the Minister of Housing, and not a particular Minister of Housing. The discretion given to the Minister of Housing, in my submission, is too wide, in relation to this business of approving land for subdivision. Land is too important a resource in Barbados and physical planning in Barbados is far too critical – to use the words of the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands – to be left to the caprice...

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. L. R. TULL: ... of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not permitting Members whom I have not asked to speak to interrupt other people. I am going to deal with that according to the Standing Orders. It is about time that we understand that Members speaking must be given every opportunity to speak. Continue.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Yes, Sir. Now, those are my views. They are strong and they are sincere. Those who feel that to take the arbitrariness out of the hands of the individual in something as important as this when there are so many bad examples of arbitrary and foolish decisions in relation to the subdivision of land in Barbados; those who think that it is "colonialist" in again doing nothing more than expressing a lack of appreciation of the importance of the problem and the size of the difficulty with which we are dealing.

The Town and Country Planning Act also says that there must be a zoning plan. The zoning plan deals with... Whenever there is a discussion on the zoning plan, we always get the questions on changes in land use and building operations and the subdivision of land. What a first-year law student is taught, Sir, is that the law must be certain. That's one of the things that is taught immediately as you begin to study law. The Law must not be subject to the vagaries of independent thought and feeling. You have to be able to tell somebody the Law is such.

It has been difficult, Sir, for any practising lawyer in Bridgetown to tell any client, after studying a proposed application for change of use of land to say that according to the guidelines, the rules, the policy statements, whatever, that you have a good case or you do not have a good case. The whole thing is whimsical, Sir. You cannot continue in this age to leave important matters of land use to the whims of any individual or company.

We want a comprehensive land use policy.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: This is no new wisdom coming from me. Year after year, for many years, persons of every breed of political thinking call for a comprehensive land use

policy. The call is based on very good intentions. We want to know, Sir, what is going to happen with agriculture in Barbados. We would want the Minister of Agriculture or any one speaking for him to tell us in a debate like this what are the projections into the next century and way beyond for the availability, what approximately is going to be required for agricultural activities in this country. That kind of thing has to be known.

1.15 p.m.

We have, Mr. Speaker, Sir, a duty to protect the patrimony of this country for generations yet unborn and of those who think that you only plan for today they are short-changing generations yet unborn. You must have some planning. I am not foolish, Sir. I am not here asking anybody to give detailed and specific figures for another 100 years. But certainly there is need for considerable long-range planning with a vision of where we now would want to see this country go many years in the future. We have a duty to lay the foundation for that kind of development.

There is something wrong in debating this Resolution and voting on it today, Sir. What is wrong is that it covers such a universal range of concerns and activities in this country, and it is so technical in its import, that for a handful of us to get up and make a number of general observations, in my mind, is unsatisfactory. No matter how many commissions of enquiry you have had, no matter how many people gave evidence before the Commission of Enquiry, and no matter what is the report finally submitted to the Minister, the buck stops here. Parliament has the last word in the approval or non-approval of the Plan. Therefore, Parliament should make available to itself all the best concerns, advice and technical expertise to help it come to a sensible conclusion on this. In view of the fact that this Plan is over five years old makes that even more necessary.

I am therefore suggesting, Sir, for what it is worth, that we do not just pass this Resolution but that this is another matter before Parliament that, in my submission, is a fit one for further study by a committee. As a matter of fact, since this Parliament has begun, this is the fittest of all for a committee.

I want to make two final points, Sir, because this thing is exceedingly troublesome. In fact, I will make more than two or three points. The question of the development of beach lands warrants serious consideration by this Parliament and by every right-thinking person in this country. I am disappointed that the Government, despite the concerns and the objections of a number of persons in the society, in my view most of them if not all of them are well-intentioned, has proceeded to build a police station at Hometown on the beach. I always felt that was a bad decision, but many men, many minds.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. L. R. TULL: There is no reason for anybody to get upset over the expression of honest thought. I believe that land at Holetown should not have been used to build a police station but the Government has gone ahead and done so.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: As far as I remember the Oistins Police Station was built on a man-made ... do you call that a moat?

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I am trying not to hear, Sir, but I am hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering why you hear them because I have not heard them. I have to do one thing.

Mr. L. R. TULL: The difference, Mr. Speaker, between yourself and myself is that you are listening and I am trying to speak. One requires thought. It does not require much to listen. They are interrupting my train of thought, Sir.

I am concerned about determining once and for all a policy with which everybody can agree in relation to the use of beach lands. It need not be a contentious issue and I am not quarrelling with anybody at this instance. But the fact that the country is divided over the kind of use to which beach land should be put is something which we cannot ignore. The Government talks about a consensus Government. Unless they have redefined the word "consensus" since I left school, it means that you must take into consideration the diverse points of view of many well-meaning persons in the society and see how you can come to something that is harmonised. That is what we would like to see. I am also concerned about the extent to which the country as distinct from the urban areas, is given priority in the planning and policies of Government in this country.

If we do not redress the imbalance – to use the word that has now become a part of the political lexicon in Barbados – or reduce that imbalance between development in the country and development in urban Barbados, we are going to continue to create a number of social problems in the country. I do not mean in the country of Barbados in this case. I am talking about the rural areas.

If the Government is prepared to listen, Sir, they will hear from someone who lives in a rural area, and for the benefit of Honourable Members on the other side, who lives

contiguous on lands adjoining a fairly big tenantry. I live at Cottage and Cottage Tenantry is next door to me. It is very good, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Also Bridge Cot but Cottage Tenantry is the one I like, Sir. It has a lot of benefits in living next door to them because I have a lot of people who watch over my place when I am not there so that if a strange car goes up in there, those people in the tenantry can say "yes, what do you want? Mr. Tull is not at home. What is your mission?" So for those who think there is something wrong in living adjacent to low income people I throw out to those who know nothing of it the virtues and the advantages of living among the ordinary folk.

But in the countryside, Sir, I heard the Prime Minister get up in here in the Budget debate a couple of months ago and talked about spreading the pain and the grief to the extent at which a person who is working for a few hundred dollars a year must contribute something like the one who is making a couple hundred thousand dollars a year.
1.25 p.m.

All right we have passed that. But I am submitting, Sir, that the people if they must share the pain must also be sharing in the benefits. In Barbados despite all the pronouncements by the Government, particularly by the penultimate Minister of Transport and Works – and I was so sorry I was not around at the time he was pontificating so that I could have gone for him and brought him to Christian thinking – there are many places in the country where people do not have basic amenities, where the roads – the things that pass for roads in many parts of the country in rural Barbados would make you break down in tears. I know that you are very much a St. Michael person, Sir. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are welcome to come up to St. George on a weekend when you are not busy and avail yourself of the hospitality of the Member for St. George South who will give you both personal and polished hospitality. Things are bad, Sir. Things are real bad in the countryside. People are walking through the canes when the rain falls because what is supposed to be a road is Lake Erie. Not Lake Erie. Lake Erie has very little mud in it. But there are big, huge pools of water in many places. If there were just one or two I would not seek to exaggerate. I am talking about many areas in the country where the people are deprived of basic things that people in other parts of the country take for granted.

It is necessary for the Government to start a serious assault of this lack of amenities and services in rural Barbados. It cannot continue in the way in which it is going. We had suggested in our Manifesto of this year that we set up a rural development commission. I am sure the Honourable Member for St. Lucy the Minister of Housing would support that. The Honourable Member for St. Philip

South I believe would support that. I believe that, Sir, because none of them can find any serious quarrel with the submission that the unevenness of the development between urban Barbados and rural Barbados is so stark that it constitutes one of the burgeoning social problems that you will find in rural Barbados today. I ask the Government to advert to that.

I understand that the Minister in his introduction to the Resolution said that the Government had given consideration to Warrens, Wildey and some part of St. Philip as subsidiary urban development centres. I cannot but remember the way in which the Democratic Labour Party in a moment of fickleness in 1976 attacked the proposals of the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto that they develop three urban centres in Barbados, one as I recall very well was in central St. George, around the Charles Rowe Bridge area and around the Glebe Development and the St. George Parish Church. The Democratic Labour Party told the people of Barbados at the time in the height of recklessness and irresponsibility that this was nothing more than "a Tale of Two Cities" and made a lot of fun about it and even asked the people of Barbados, "Have you ever heard about a town that did not have any sea?" I have lived to see that the same central St. Philip in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Philip South has been developed by the last Government, the Barbados Labour Party Government as a thriving urban centre in Barbados. I have also lived to see that in the same area in St. George that a lot of activity that has developed around central St. George has provided a number of services that are consistent with the plans that we had articulated in the 1970s in our Manifesto.

Again, Sir, there will be those who will nitpick and quarrel over trivialities. There are some who will quarrel over whether the area around Six Roads has been developed or whether it has not been developed. And if it has been developed, who developed it? I am not into that kind of discussion. That is more suitable for third form debates. I have also lived to see the whole development of the Glebe in St. George, the building of new schools, the new polyclinic, new playing fields and the moving of houses and the developing of new housing areas, the outlets for agriculture and new shops. All of these things I have seen developed in central St. George as a result of the foresight of a Government that was not concerned only with a lot of trivialities.

It is a pity that the police station and law court that was – to use this awful word you hear nowadays – on stream to be constructed in central St. George based on a number of objective criteria, one of the most important of which is that police stations particularly and law courts should be located where the people live, among the people. It provides an opportunity for better relationships between the police and the people they are looking after. They make their presence quite often a beneficent influence on the

community. It was for this reason that the Barbados Labour Party administration had taken a decision to move the police station from Boarded Hall where it occupied a vantage position in another century where the policemen could see when the slave uprisings started in the St. George Valley. They could stand up top the hill and they could look down in the St. George Valley and see when the slaves were misbehaving themselves and be ready for them. That is why police stations are built on hills in Barbados, whether it is the one there, the one up at District "C", the one up at Bissex in St. Joseph, the one at District E; they were built on top of hills where you could look down into the fields for miles to see when the slaves were misbehaving so you could get ready for them. A lot has changed since then. The police station at Boarded Hall has outlived its usefulness in many particulars but that is the chief one.

There was a proposal – talking about these Physical Development Plans – that a fire station be constructed at Boarded Hall because it would enable the Fire Department at that station to be able to see across the hundreds of acres of fertile cane land in the St. George Valley. They could see even lying on their cots in the station when a puff of smoke came out in the valley and they would be able to give a quick response to cane fires that constantly burn out large acreage of the St. George Valley. We were proposing that a fire station be put there. I believe that that also was based on continual thinking.

I am going to wind up, Sir.
1.35 p.m.

I want, before I finish, Sir, to urge on the Government, not to allow the Physical Development Plan of Barbados to be any bone of contention between political parties or between Government and sectional interest in this community. It need not be, Sir. God knows that there are a multitude of things that will be contentious and the Government can expect to be fought tooth and nail but I believe, Sir, in the area of the Physical Development Plan that we need not find ourselves in that position. And we would not have been in that position today, Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Government had not treated it in the casual and off-hand manner in which they did. If they did not so treat it, the kind of strictures coming from this side would have been absent.

The Government, Sir, has not only to be concerned about the position of the Opposition in Parliament in trying to reach certain agreements in relation to physical development in this country. After all it concerns us all and we have all got to go and leave it, Sir, and we are going to leave it for our children and children's children and therefore we want to make a reasonable bequest to them. We want them to have a legacy that is worth-while, so we need not quarrel. It is not only Government and Opposition, it is Government and the community. I will come back to it

again, Sir. I don't care who it rides. I might even go as far as saying I do not care in whose craw this particular corn sticks.

I am not concerned about that, Sir, but what has happened in recent times, in relation to the use of Ministerial power in the grant of permission for land development and land division, Sir, that continues to be a serious problem with many people in this country, not only political people, many people, and the Government would do well to rid this country of the perception that in getting permission to cut off agricultural land and put it in housing depends less on the substance of your case and the objective facts than on who you know and what else you intend to do with the person you know. A word to the wise is enough, Sir.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that after an entire speech which was contentious, the Honourable Member for St. George South ended by saying that the Physical Development Plan should not be contentious and should not cause any quarrel between the two parties – after an entire contentious speech.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is this, and let me first tell the Honourable Member through you, something. The Honourable Member for St. George South is falling into a trap being set for us in here by people who have agendas set. The speech made by the Honourable Member for St. George South about Ministers having too much power, that statement is a statement that is being made by certain persons in this community who would like to reduce any sort of power that any Minister has because the point is this. These people who have their agendas set believe that Ministers, all, not only Ministers of Housing or Town Planning, all Ministers have too much power and you are falling into that trap. Somebody has to be there to make the decision. After all the considerations and the consultations and the proposals, somebody has to make the decision and I am ashamed that you who had been a Minister for ten years can come now, after you are not a Minister and say a Minister has too much power, when nothing has been done to change the powers of Ministers. Nothing has been done in the last seven or eight years to change any power that Ministers had. The same power that Ministers have now the Barbados Labour Party Ministers had and there is no decision today, Mr. Speaker, or within the last six years that has been taken in an arbitrary manner. If you want to hear decisions that were taken in an arbitrary manner I am going to give you some when we come back from lunch.

You see, Mr. Speaker, proposals come to a Minister from officers in the Ministry, from the Head of departments, from the Permanent Secretary, and Ministers analyse all the proposals and considerations and so forth sent to him. As I have said before, the Minister, because he

is ultimately responsible to the people of Barbados, has to make the final decision, and someone has to do it. It is not a question of being arbitrary, it is a question that a Minister is put there by the people of Barbados, he is put there selected by the Prime Minister to be a Minister and therefore he is responsible for the decisions he takes. It cannot be arbitrary, because you take into considerations all the recommendations that are sent to the Minister. I am ashamed of any Member over there who held Ministerial office. The Honourable Member for St. Peter he would not know because he never held it. I don't think he will ever hold it either. I am ashamed of any person over there who held Ministerial office and comes and demeans the office of a Minister.

Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is inaccurate and misleading the House by saying that the Honourable Member for St. Peter never held Ministerial office. On many occasions the Honourable Member was Minister of Finance in Barbados.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: He was Minister of Finance when you were Prime Minister. I am sorry, I did not remember. You missed the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN: The Governor General has given him instruments as Minister of Finance.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are getting irrelevant.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that people who have been Ministers before should not get in this Honourable House and give the public of Barbados the impression that Ministers now have power that they never had before. That is not true. The same powers that were there for years are still there and Ministers do not take any decision arbitrarily and I am saying that if you want to see examples of what one might term arbitrary decisions you can have all the examples, because I am saying that there are persons who believe that Ministers should not have any power at all. There are certain people who believe that we should not have any power at all and for any person who was a Minister to fall into that same trap that the people are setting is really demeaning the office of a Minister. To give the impression that because any decision that has been made by a Minister, because the decision was not recommended by a Permanent Secretary or by a senior officer, is really to beg the question, because there is no way and there is no reason whatsoever that a Minister should on each and every occasion agree to what is recommended to him by a Permanent Secretary or by an officer. That will never happen unless a Minister is a robot. So do not try and give the public the wrong impression. I am going to say finally on this that somebody has to take the final decision and be responsible to the public of

Barbados. The point is that resides at the moment with the Minister.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other criticisms that I heard was about how bad the roads in the rural districts are. Mr. Speaker, do you believe that these roads in the country got bad yesterday? These roads in the country area in Barbados were bad for the past three hundred years and the first time that the imbalance in the country districts was attacked and approached in a systematic manner is within the last five or six years. I am going to give you an example. Let me give you an example.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker may soon get outrageous as well too and I will have to deal with that kind of behaviour. I have said before that I allow Members to speak without interference. I am asking other Members to allow that to proceed and so far we have been doing reasonably well. But I will not permit a Member to be interrupted unnecessarily. I will use Standing Order 40. It is a very simple Order to use. I am going to ask Honourable Members to speak in soft tones if they need to speak but not to shout. Continue.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am going to repeat the statement, Mr. Speaker. The first time that that imbalance between the country area and the town area in Barbados was attacked and approached in a systematic manner was in the past five years.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading House and he is actually contradicting the Barbados Physical Development (Amended) Plan 1986 which is before this House. In the Plan itself, it speaks of the work done in the Integrated Rural Development Plan which was set out under the Tenancies Development Act and under the Barbados Labour Party to rectify that very imbalance. So the Honourable Member is obviously contradicting the document. I prefer to rely on the document where a systematic planning took place during that period and many tenantry roads were constructed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is this and I am going to give an example why what I am saying is true. In St. Philip, the constituency which I represent, between 1976 and 1986 apart from the main road from Grantley Adams Airport to Sam Lord's Castle which was done hurriedly on Sundays, Bank Holidays, et cetera to accommodate the Finance Ministers Conference at Sam Lord's Castle one road was built in those ten years. It is Berlin Road in Woodbourne. One road in St. Philip South was built in ten years. I do not mean

putting grit here and a little marl there to stop holes. One road was built in St. Philip South between 1976 and 1986. In the last ten years...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. Just one minute. I want to be clear that I understand Standing Order 40. I will read it for Honourable Members:

"2 (a) The Speaker or the Chairman shall order any Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly" – I am sure you would not want me to put that in the records of this House for any Member – "to withdraw immediately."

I have been very patient and I will continue to be patient. But do not stretch one's patience to the point where one has to put this Rule into effect. Continue.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member is misleading the House because he said between 1976 and 1986 only one road was built in St. Philip. He never said South. That is where he is a liar now. He never said South. He said St. Philip. I heard him twice within the last five minutes. He limited himself to St. Philip South, otherwise I am going to read out for St. Philip North.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about my constituency and I am sure that I have said it before. I am hearing *sotto voce*, Mr. Speaker, about roads in Heddings. No person in this Honourable House or anywhere can tell me or teach me about St. Philip South. The roads that were put in Heddings for the Rural Development Scheme were not roads. You have to call them tracks. They were not roads but tracks. That is why I put roads in inverted commas. They were tracks. They were not put to accommodate any person either. Mr. Speaker, they were not put there to accommodate any resident or anything at all. Therefore, they were not roads as you and I understand what roads mean and in the sense that the Honourable Member for St. George South was speaking about. They were not roads. They were tracks. They had a track which was built in Marchfield when you go across the train road. It was a track not a road. They have a new thing for a feeder road. But at least a feeder road should still be something that some person can look at and say that is a road.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: I am not going to be diverted from the point, Mr. Speaker. The point that I am trying to make again is that each one of the Members in

here can tell all over Barbados that all of us have had roads built in our constituencies. All of us have had a lot of tenantry roads built in our constituencies. The point is that the tenantry programme that was followed by this Government in the past five years or so was a programme that provided proper roads for households – people who wanted to get to church and the supermarkets, but not the big roads where you and I with the big cars are driving on, and people who wanted to stop holding shoes in their hands when they wanted to go to church on a Sunday morning when the rain was falling. That is what we did in the past five years. But I do not want to spend much time on that because the bad roads were there for 300 years. They did not start yesterday. A road like Sunbury was one which people walked on for the first time under the Democratic Labour Party. I am not going to continue with that any longer.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that I intend to deal with is this.

Aside.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be coming back after lunch. Another point which the Honourable Member for St. George South made, and this is about the third or fourth time that I heard him make the point in here, was about putting middle-class housing near low-income housing. His view has always been that if you do that you will cause trouble.
1.55 p.m.

My view is that if it is done it causes people to uplift their own homes. In fact, there was a time in Barbados when certain persons did not even want you to put roads in certain areas. There was a time in Barbados when certain people in the plantocracy did not want you even to put roads where people were living.

Mr. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member is misrepresenting the text and the import of what I have said. I have not said anything about houses of a certain kind influencing people who are there to improve their houses, I am dealing with the customs and the mores of the people who are affected. I am not talking about any houses, Sir, I am talking about a disruption of the lives of the people in the way they live, not whether they put on another board or coat of paint.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: When your house went in there, did it disrupt their lives? Why don't you answer?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has spoken already, so he could not answer as such. He would have to answer at some other time.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I think this is a good time for us to have a break, Sir. I am moving that this sitting be suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed.

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, just one other point raised by the Honourable Member for St. George South that I think I need to respond to, and that is the point about the Physical Development Plan taking what he considers to be an inordinately long time to reach the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Physical Development Plan is an amendment to previous plans and as such it has to be referred to certain bodies and institutions for comments, criticisms and things like that. I was the Minister of Housing and Lands from June 1986 and the Physical Development Plan first came to me in draft form on 15th October, 1986. I read the recommendations and noted the comments of the Chief Town Planner at that time. A meeting was then arranged between myself, the Chief Town Planner, the Administrative Officer (Town Planning) and the Chief Housing Planner to discuss matters relating to this Physical Development Plan. That meeting was held on 27th October and then a Cabinet Paper had to be prepared highlighting the issues which were the subject of a difference of opinion and also including the comments of the Commission of Enquiry. It was then sent to me for approval.

After going through these processes, it was sent to Cabinet on 20th February, 1987. Cabinet took note of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry – I think the Commissioner was Mr. Justice Rocheford – into the objections against the Physical Development Plan, as amended, and on 19th March, 1987 Cabinet concluded that the Ministry of Housing and Lands should submit for the approval of Cabinet the specific amendments which were proposed to be made to the Plan before copies of the amended Plan were sent for the approval of Parliament.

Again this Plan made the works, going to different organisations. In fact, you could go all through here and see what took place. I do not want to read everything in it, because it is a massive file, but the point is that the Physical Development Plan had to go to different institutions and

organisations for comments. The draft Cabinet Paper came back to me on 6th November, 1989. Persons who wish can be brought up to date on the processes through which the Physical Development Plan went in order to discover why it took that long to get back to me on 6th November, 1989. I approved the draft Cabinet Paper, it went to Cabinet and Cabinet deferred the matter on 16th November, 1989. On 21st December, 1989 the Cabinet concluded that the Plan should be adopted for use by the Chief Town Planner for the next five years, the Plan should be submitted to both Houses of Parliament for approval by Resolution and should come into operation on the date approved by the Minister in accordance with section 10(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act.

It then had to go to the Legal Section, the Parliamentary Counsel and other people, and on 12th November, 1990 I signed the notice of approval of amendment of the 1977 Development Plan for Barbados.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the time the Plan took before the first time it got to me and the last time it got to me it was in circulation among different organisations, because there were observations, proposals, recommendations and things like that. I thought I should set the record straight. It is not that the Minister or the Chief Town Planner or any particular person was holding it up. One could always make the point that the Minister could have instructed people to speed up what was going on. That point can always be made with anything, but I just thought I would make the point that the Plan was being sent to different organisations and institutions and that is why it took that long. It is all here on the file, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to read every single minute, I do not think that is necessary, but I thought I should set out why it has taken this long to reach Parliament.

I think I have responded to most of the things I needed to respond to. I support this Resolution.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, this Physical Development Plan as presented to us has a purpose, to constitute the single most important policy document used in the patterning of land use and physical development on the Island. With that, one would expect certain things to follow.

While this document is very important, while I must from the outset compliment the former and the present Chief Town Planner for presenting this document, there are some things which we need to address at this point in our development. Since 1983, when the draft was first presented, and since the Enquiry made recommendations, a lot of things have happened in Barbados. There has been a transformation in Barbados in the area of transportation, in the area of housing, commercial activity, certainly in agriculture, and these things need to be looked at in the light of a Development Plan. The Development Plan

certainly sets about to inform Government as to how best it could plan, bearing in mind the population, bearing in mind the economic situation and trends in the country as a whole, and therefore we should not treat this document lightly. It is a document which should be supported, but my regret is that too much time has passed before this document finds itself on the Floor of this House, and I would like to suggest that at least every three years a review, some sort of modified version is done and presented to this House, rather than wait for six years, because, as I said, the acceleration of development is making this document just a matter of going through the works and it becomes only a matter of academic interest.

3.10 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. George South expressed his concern over the power of a Minister. I am sure that he was referring particularly to the Minister responsible for Housing or for Planning in this country. I am sure that from time to time, this Chamber has seen or heard Members express similar concerns and therefore, I do not agree with the Honourable Member for St. Philip South who feels that it is something that should not be noted in the contribution of the Member for St. George South. What the Honourable Member probably failed to emphasise is that the Chief Town Planner has a job to do. He is fully qualified in all areas to deal with town planning matters. I have my reservations, too. I am concerned that Ministers from time to time have made certain trespasses on the domains of the Chief Town Planner. It does not sound well or augur well for us in this country to hear that the Town Planner's decision or his recommendation is overruled and overruled without any proper investigation and explanation.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, and I don't need the former Minister of Housing – no wonder why he is no longer the Minister of Housing – to tell me about the Act. I am *au fait* with the Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: What I am saying is that the Chief Town Planner has a role to play. I know that the Minister has the powers. He can disagree. However, there is also a committee to which he must or should refer certain applications. We are suggesting that in order to bring about some credibility to the system, we want to reduce the sort of criticisms that are hurled, sometimes unnecessarily, and sometimes justifiably so, at the Ministers' intervening in matters that they should obviously stay out of. Just because the Minister has power, he doesn't have to use it. Allow the Chief Town Planner to do it! The Chief Town Planner has made some very important decisions in the interest of this country. We don't need a Minister.

For instance, when there is a threat to the lives or the health of Barbadians, such as people going into the Belle and putting down houses in the water zone, going in other

areas in Bowmanston and doing similarly and the Town Planner issues notices, as the law requires him to do, and a Minister goes and tells people about an extension of time, at least it should be left to the judgment of the Chief Town Planner. He knows the reason for issuing those notices. It is like that. I am not saying that a Minister should not point to persons that they have a right to appeal. When it comes over – and the Honourable Member must listen...

Hon. H. A. BLACKMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, because the final point he made was exactly the point I made. It does not matter what was in the Press. When I was interviewed by the Press, Mr. Speaker, I told them that the people have a right to appeal. That is all I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: No more.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, there are times when we all... I know when I should play politics on certain issues. I am not trying to play politics with this. This is very important to me and to my children and to their successors as well. Therefore, I have a bounding duty to point out some of the mistakes and some of the problems that confront us today. Ministers must not be seen, because they have powers and they are responsible to people, to be using their powers in such a way that hold up the chief officers to ridicule. That is the point.

What we are saying is, that the Chief Town Planner knows – and certainly if you read the Physical Development Plan – when there is danger to the water resources of this country. He also knows when to issue stop notices or enforcement notices. There are two different types of notices, if you don't know. What I am saying is, that we must not appear to be getting ourselves involved in matters which are clearly within the responsibility of the Chief Town Planner.

Now, this takes me into another area. We are seeing a lot of land that was once worked, used for growing canes and the various forms of agriculture, going into, not housing development, but being cut up for speculative purposes. Note what I say, Mr. Speaker. I am not particularly bothered when some agricultural land is allowed to go into housing. That is not my quarrel, neither is it the quarrel of this side. We understand fully and we know full well that depending on the situation, one has to look at the economic reality and the benefits that can be derived by taking lands out of agriculture and putting them into commercial or any other purposes. We know that. However, we also know that the studies have revealed that there are some areas in Barbados that should be reserved for agricultural purposes to grow food crops. We are saying that we condemn that. Not only this side, Mr. Speaker, but those who know and want the best for this country,

condemn acts where people have been allowed to cut up land under the pretext that they are going to cultivate or grow crops.

I very well know, because I have had that experience, that there are some people who applied for subdivision of agricultural lands, some of whom said that they were going to put up processing plants. They wanted manager's quarters. They all put lofty recommendations. When you agree that they are good ideas for the country and you approve it, then you see no manager's quarters. All you see is a residence put up just for subdivision. We have to be aware of that sort of thing. That is why I said that no Minister can police that like the Chief Town Planner and his department.

Therefore, I would want to see before the Minister takes it upon himself to make pronouncements and approve developments on our East Coast Road that he listens to the Chief Town Planner. There are some applications that the Chief Town Planner does not approve and that in itself is bad – the recommendation of the Chief Town Planner is not accepted. I would like to say that that is why most of these applications that have caused contention have come about.

The Honourable Member who just sat down must be aware that you go through the country... Clifton Hall Plantation, for instance, was once a plantation that was very productive. Now you can see what has happened. It is now being sold out in four-acre lots.
3.20 p.m.

At the same time we have to be very vigilant to see that these people who are applying for these subdivisions are not doing so for speculative purposes. Yes, if you are going to subdivide them. What is worse, the prices at which these four and five acre lots are going tell you that they cannot be interested in agriculture. That is agricultural land being sold at \$25 000 an acre. How many genuine agriculturists or people who are interested can buy that?

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I am calling the names – Ashbury in St. John and in Wakefield if the Honourable Member does not know. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South should have told you that. He was the Minister. The Honourable Member for St. John knows what I am talking about. He would agree.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House in respect of Wakefield. I think he is doing it unintentionally. There has been no permission granted for any four acre subdivision. There has only been permission granted for a small sites and services programme of about 60 lots behind St. John's cemetery. That is part of the

Clifton Hall/Wakefield group. The Villa Nova Development is a private development and it is not four acres. I am just correcting it.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: The Honourable Member for St. John does not know very much about St. John. I was born and bred in St. John. For your information what you are talking about as house lots, that is Clifton Hall Plantation if you do not know.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Must I repeat the Standing Order?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the Honourable Member for St. John who just got up on a point of order. Wakefield, the lot of land that was approved for sub-division, next door to Villa Nova, next door to Venture, is agricultural land...

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Ashford was cut up in four acre lots. I am saying that was prime agriculture land. I very well know. That land has now gone for residential purposes. What is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, it was at \$6.50 per square foot. What I am asking the Government to do and the Honourable Minister of Housing to consider seriously is to find ways and means of curbing...

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: It can be done. We are seeing land at \$7.50 per square foot. I am asking the Government to look at ways and means. I am not prepared to tell the Government except the Government invites me to sit down. I will tell them the ways and means how it can be done but it can be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand what you said. Somebody invited you to sit down?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: No, Sir. I am saying it can be done. Are we going to sit down and talk about house spots? Are we going to be talking about people wanting land when they are allowing people to cut up land and sell at \$4.50 a square foot and Barbadians cannot buy it? Are you asking someone to buy 5 000 square feet of land to put a house on and pay \$40 000 for it? Are we asking ourselves who is going to get the \$40 000 when the banks are not even lending them \$40 000. It is outside the means of the average Barbadian. I must point this out to the Honourable Members who do not know what is going on out there. It is okay for us to sit down in here and talk about that. If the developers are selling it at that exorbitant price then I am asking the Government to devise ways and means of taking it back by way of a levy or tax on those profits. We are talking about a physical development plan and we are

talking about the total development of all Barbadians, that is, finding lands, housing and recreational facilities for all. That is what we mean when we are talking about a physical development plan but at the same time we outlaw lawyers like you who cannot practise. Mr. Speaker, every day I am out there and I am seeing it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not even so sure to whom the last comment was made. Was it made to me?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. You have never practised law as an attorney.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am trying to say to you is you should not be hearing what they are saying. You should be talking to me.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Sorry Sir, it was not worthy of me. I should not have been listening to any of them.

I am calling on the Government and I am making a genuine plea to devise ways and means of stopping the exploitation that is taking place in this country. I can only say a word to the wise is enough. If you are thinking of Barbadians and Barbados for Barbadians, then you have to find ways and means. You are the Government. It has a duty to Barbados to find ways and means that this could happen.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question about sporting facilities and transportation. Government must look and take this document very seriously and it will find that this question of transportation must be looked at again. When a plan is prepared it is prepared against the background that certain areas have potential for development. It gives the Government an idea where they can explore future housing developments. With that, Sir, it means that you must look at transportation to coincide with that development. What we have seen is that transportation in Barbados over the years has always been on the conventional sort of routes, so to speak. We have looked at Ruby, Sanford and the parish of St. Philip totally. Lots of developments are going up there and it is yet to be serviced properly with public transport. If we are going to talk about physical development that is what it is all about. We are not talking about a road that was done in St. Philip. It is not talking about that at all. If we are talking about roads we are talking about the main network of roads for people and this debate should not be about putting in a road which is a narrow road or a cart road. We should move this debate from that. This is serious.

We want to see the City developed. We want to see St. Lucy developed. We want to see industrial development taken to St. Lucy, as the plan would have suggested, as at Six Men's. That is why the Barbados Labour Party conceptualised that Highway so that we could have access and our people who are in industrialised areas like the Six

Men's Development could have access to the major highways so that they could go to the two major ports, the seaport as well as the airport. Now, that is exactly what we mean when we talk about development.

It is important that we look again at the parish of St. Andrew and when we come in here and talk about roads in St. Andrew we look at it against that background because you cannot alienate and isolate people in the north, particularly in the parish of St. Andrew. We are calling on the Government at least to look at one major road leading to St. Andrew that could help the people to get out and in so that in the case of an emergency, flooding or a hurricane they would have a proper access road.
3.30 p.m.

Also the question of location of schools because the Plan is all about densely populated areas where the services should be provided. We have seen housing developments gone here and there and sometimes the Town Planner stipulates in the conditions that an area be reserved for recreational facility yet the developers go ahead and develop without leaving that area.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about BLP, DLP or what kind of Government. I am talking about what is being done. I am asking the Government to set up a system and make sure that these things are complied with. The Town Planner sets out the conditions which I know are not being adhered to and that is what causes a lot of problems. Mr. Speaker, most of the flooding problems that we have in this country are created because developers ignore the conditions. They would not put down the proper suck wells and they would not sink the wells deep enough to take off the water. That happened in Wotton an area that was developed by the Democratic Labour Party, if I must say that.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: What I am saying is that – you should know better if you are the Minister of Housing. You have a responsibility – it is all right to have an application approved but then the follow-up. I am aware that you have officers in the Ministry of Health and at MTW. But what I am saying is that there is not enough policing or adequate policing to ensure that the conditions are fulfilled. That is what causes the problem.

I want to make another point in here and I want the Minister of Housing to note what I am saying. Some people go out there and they get planning permission to develop land and they foist on poor Barbadians land that is not suitable for building – that is something I want to draw to his attention – land that should not be used because the foundation is 20 feet deep. But yet it is sold for building. I

have to express those concerns. I am out there. If the other side does not want to hear me then I know that they are not interested so much in their country because that is what the country needs to hear about. The Government needs to take stock of it.

I am not criticising that. It has happened in BLP time as well and it continues to happen. But what I am saying is I am asking the Town Planner and his department if it needs additional staff to police it to make sure that certain unsuitable land is not passed on to Barbadians or to the unsuspecting public. No one needs to tell me about this because in the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act in one of the sections it makes provision that the Town Planner can declare a lot unsuitable. I am not saying something or blowing in the wind in here when there is provision for it. We have set the example. I am asking the present Minister and I know that he will do and is doing a better job than the former Minister of Housing.

It is no sense allowing problems to continue in this country when at some time I will be called upon to grapple with them. I would like to see a smoother transition when it comes in the next matter of years.

What I am saying is – he is my friend but he must listen. He would not listen to me. I am his senior so he must listen. Sporting facilities. In this Development Plan we have to look at where we put recreational facilities. Over the years as Governments we respond to the wishes of our constituents but there need to be proper studies carried out to ensure that these facilities are placed in the correct areas. For instance you might put a facility in some part of St. George but no one anticipates the development so the Ministry of Sports asks you, "Why are you putting it there, there is nobody to use it?" That should not be a condition for not putting the pavilion there. Once you have the Development Plan and it is anticipated, the Government knows that area should be left not only for the National Sports Council to decide or to have input from them but also the Ministry of Housing and the Town Planner could be consulted on these matters to make sure that he knows that there are no less prospects of developing that particular area so that we could have the facilities.

We have a situation in Christ Church. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central knows what we did. We moved a small area which was used for recreational facilities in Gall Hill and put houses there. We went over the other side in Wotton and developed a playing field. People criticised that but what happened is that no one anticipated the massive expansion that took place in Kingsland. That is what caused the problem. We may say that it was political reasons. Yes. We would have used that argument. But today what has happened is that not only is one playing field needed in Wotton, we need about two more to accommodate the people living in that area.

I am saying -- I am appealing on my behalf and on behalf of the Member for St. Michael East Central -- that there is need for a playing field in the St. David's area. That area will sooner or later be developed because development is coming east of that. You have seen the Fort George Development. If I were to ask the Minister of Housing or the Chief Town Planner, have you made provision for a recreational facility in the Fort George? I do not know. I have not seen the plan but they should see by looking at the sort of land that the terrain does not lend itself to that. As I said that is the danger. Where is the playing field? Where is the cricket pasture? Where is it? That is what I am warning the present Government about. You have 500 houses up in Fort George but no provision at all for a playing field, a baby crèche, something of the sort. The Minister of Public Safety has to be concerned. Do not sit there and look at me. You must be concerned too because your police station must be informed. Your policy should be informed by this Physical Development Plan.

There is a need to move some of the Central Police Station. Everybody is making complaints to Central. Move them east because the development is taking place there. It might not be necessary to have the police station in Six Roads. You might have to move it further as you move further into Ruby, Sandford, Merricks, in that area. Move it up the hill because of the population shift.

I would hope that the Honourable Members on that side do not get up all the time and think that because we are making suggestions that we are critical of them.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: We do not have to criticise them. We are more constructive. We are not going to deal with personalities now. We are letting people know that we can run the Government. When they are failing we are capable of delivering the goods.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government will take note of what I said, especially in relation to the cost of land because I know the development cost cannot be that much. You cannot go on asking Barbadians to get involved in agriculture, inviting the young people and then you have the land out of their reach. How can you do that? You cannot really be serious. You are defeating the objective. If you are thinking in terms of fighting crime then you have to look very seriously, study your Development Plan and see exactly which area the new developments are going. At one time Roebuck Street was densely populated. It was necessary to have police stations on or around even in the Belmont area, at the Bridge and at Central. But people have moved out now. It is no longer a residential area. As you go up White Park Road a lot of people have moved out. It is now commercial. Go up Collymore Rock it is commercial.

What I am saying is that we have to look at the population shift and follow the advice. You cannot tell me that if the Town Planner can sit down with all these various agencies and come up with an idea that one person because she or he is a Minister should have the right to dismiss it with the stroke of a pen. I said I deplored that sort of behaviour. After full consultation these things should be done. But I said, Mr. Speaker, I have my reservations about this abuse of power and therefore I hope that the Government will take note for the better development of our country.

Thank you.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I want to speak early, Sir, because I have a bad back and I am going to have to leave the House. I am not going to be very long, Mr. Speaker, on this because it seems to me that this Physical Development Plan is out of date, substantially out of date. This is 1991 and we are dealing with a Plan going back to 1983 at the latest.
3.40 p.m.

So it is really futile for us to be debating at length the specific proposals in this Plan. Yes, it might be of academic interest. It is certainly anachronistic now. What brings it home clearly too, Sir, is page 105, paragraph 818. Unemployment in 1980 was 12.6 per cent of the labour force, assuming that by 1990 unemployment has been reduced to seven percent and by 2000 to six per cent. The extent of new jobs required in the future can be as stated. This is a load of rubbish. Having regard to the factual reality in Barbados today, this is of no value now. It would have been good when it was prepared, so I don't want to waste a lot of time on it. I suppose Government now will be preparing the one that follows this.

I wish to say, Sir, that I support the point made by the Honourable Member who just spoke in relation to the siting and locating of recreational facilities. I really find it a bitter pill to take as the MP for St. Thomas, although I realise that as the MP for St. Thomas, in the Opposition, I have to accept, on behalf of the people of St. Thomas, a certain degree of ostracism because of the Party I support and the way the votes have been shared out. But, for many years beginning in 1985, the people of Redman's Village, Welches, Warrens Terrace, Bagatelle Gardens, even Bagatelle Terrace which is in St. James North, were assured that with the development of Highway 2A coming through from Arch Hall going to Warrens there would have to be the provision of recreational facilities for that large body of persons who reside in those areas. Welches is very built up, Warrens is very built up. Redmans Village has reached the extent of its elasticity, Bagatelle Gardens, Bagatelle Terrace.

There is a little playing field on a slope by the pavilion at Bagatelle and when the Highway ultimately comes

through there 18 feet of that playing field will go, there will be no playing field. At the moment, you can't meaningfully play games on that playing field. People make a little effort to run around and try and get fit but apart from that you can't really play serious games there. So, we have no playing field there.

Lo and behold, as Lord Denning would say, opposite Redmans Village there had been an open site which had been identified and spoken of with a view to the establishment of a playing field. It had a depression, and the idea was that with the rubble coming from the development and excavation of Highway 2A would fill in that area, level it, acquire it and put the playing field there. They have gone and put down Mobil Redmans Village Station there now, big, massive thing. So that site has gone and there is no other site around there that we can find that would allow for the residents of those heavily populated districts, the youth especially, to express themselves socially, recreationally and culturally. That is why I am submitting, Sir, that when we are ... What are they saying?

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that to do with the Resolution?

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Ask them on the other side, what has that got to do with it. It has nothing to do with who represented St. John before, or who represented St. Thomas before. I am not calling for an excessive amount of playing fields in St. Thomas. We have, at the moment, enough on inland St. Thomas and eastern St. Thomas, but at that area of Redmans Village, from Arch Hall back to Warrens junction, think of all the housing on both sides of the road, particularly as you are coming to Warrens on the left hand side of the road. Thousands of people, and not one area for them to express themselves. The only playing field now is down by the lab where Collins and Carlyle Laboratories have their site. There is a nice little playing field, that is a private development, but in the planning Government has not allowed for that, could not have addressed themselves to it, otherwise I don't see why Mobil should have been allowed to go where they are and put down this big concrete thing there. What I am saying is not going to be new to Mobil because I said it the morning when they had the opening of the station. So, I am saying, Sir, that in future, Government must make sure in its planning that there are open spaces for recreation in the most populous areas.

I also see in this Plan that it has been envisaged that there would be a police station at Welchman Hall. At one time that was so, then we were looking at other sites because the reason given from within the Ministries of Housing and Health was that at Welchman Hall you wanted no further development because of the threat of seepage into the cave and with the extension of the cave.

I see it in here – Welchman Hall – we had decided to carry it down by Cane Garden, down in the bottom, in the flat. I see it in here now that they want to put the Police Station back at Welchman Hall and there are little people, four or five, from the Allen View area, who the Town Planner refuses to give permission to put down their little chattel house and even a septic tank. Now we are going to put down a police station a little further down the road in Welchman Hall, the cave comes under there, the extensions are contemplated to go even further down and I think that Government must bear these things in mind. I am concerned that they could now give the permission to establish a police station at Welchman Hall when, having identified it first in our time and having discussed it they said no, you can't go there, look for somewhere else and we looked for somewhere else, and down in the bottom by Cane Garden we thought would have been the place to put the police station and indeed the fire station.

In relation to fire stations the plan is out of date too. This is out of date because ... I will speak first and then the Minister can pick me up on this. In 1986 I had a meeting with the Fire Officers Association and we were discussing the establishment of fire depots to give better coverage throughout the island. I asked them – because I had my own views but I did not want to impose them – to come up with a plan to ensure that the zones of the island were properly manned and we did not have to rely exclusively on Probyn Street.

The Fire Officers Association came back with a plan which provided for depots out of the North which would cover St. Lucy, St. Peter, one in Belleplaine that would cover St. Andrew and we were thinking that at Cane Garden we would have a fire station or fire depot as well as a police station.
3.50 p.m.

In St. Philip, we would have had one in the Six Roads area. The recommendations are on the file and they were approved by me before I left Government so much so that I think that I actually wrote them into our Manifesto 1986 in some detail. But I do not see very much about the establishment of fire depots in this Plan, Sir.

Sir, in the last three days we have had some publicity about the dump at Mangrove Pond. I have not filed the case yet. I will file the case this week and they do not have no way out because I am going to sue them in Rylands and Fletcher.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It has nothing to do with when it was bought, Sir. It has something to do with who opened it and how they have managed it from September 1986. That is the negligent part of the claim and there will be the

nuisance part of the claim. Get out of those three - Sanitation Authority hand and foot.

Sir, at Page 92 Paragraph 6.75, this is what the Plan says:

"Both the northern and southern land fill sites are full. So a new site has already been selected in Christ Church and another new site in the northern area is being identified."

Now I come in here today with this. I want to know where are the new sites in Christ Church and in the northern area. That will go in the affidavit that they have alternative sites identified in this. That is going in the affidavit. I say so. It is going in there.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is hearsay. How can that be hearsay? Are you making sport?

Sir, that dump at Mangrove Pond has to be closed very, very soon. I am dealing with it in the context of the solid waste disposal referred to on Page 92, Sir. When we spoke in here a few weeks ago, people thought that we were making fun. Now they have seen it for themselves. Did you see the photographs of an actual company's sewerage truck going to dump sewage? Were it not for the photographers, Charles Grant and Grantley Sealy, they would have dumped and gone along. But from the time the fellows took up the cameras, they went out of the dump site. High day time Sunday. The problem is how did they get in there. There is no efficient policing of that area, Sir, and they are trying to kill the people of Arch Hall slowly. I am going to make sure that does not happen by this time next week. The sweetest piece of evidence that is going in the affidavit is about the manager. Now tell me that this is hearsay. The Manager of the Sanitation Authority on television last night at 7:07 p.m. said, Sir, that he admits that they allow some of the wrong kinds of things to be dumped up there that are bad smelling. He mentioned fish and entrails and chicken guts. He said so. That is an admission against him. I am going to lick them like Gabby.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Sir, we have had a lot of double talk about this business of the dump. I am saying, Sir, that the Physical Development Plan identifies at Page 92 a site already selected in Christ Church. They have another site in St. Lucy, Sir. I am not pressing the Minister of Housing. He had about three of these land fills already. But there is another site in St. Lucy and the only problem with that is that they need to construct a road, not too far or

less than a half mile, to get to it. But up by the Clay Pigeon Club in Christ Church they have got another site. Free the people of Arch Hall, Bennetts, and Sea View, Sir. I am serious about this. Next time that Your Honour takes a drive on Highway 2A, Sir, you will see the dump for yourself and you will be impressed by the fact that it is the most unsightly and unessentially pleasing site in Barbados. If you go on the Jolly Roger on a cruise, you can see the rubbish littered on top of the promontory at Mangrove Pond.

I must not be taken to be minimizing the importance of land fills pending the incinerators. We accept that there has to be land filling. But what I am saying, Sir, is that this site has now reached saturation point. It is disgusting to tourists and locals alike. There were five tourists who were part of a nature trail that walks on Sunday mornings with Dr. Hutson. They phoned me to say how they love Barbados but that they were disappointed that we should be more environmentally conscious than to allow this vast extent of rubbish to be located in what they said for them was a green belt area, Sir. It really is disgraceful and disgusting. You have to go and see it, Sir, and it will touch your sensibilities. God help the people in Arch Hall, Bennetts, Sea View and the rest below in Sandy Lane and Sunset Crest if we get a storm this year. The amount of rubbish that is going to blow off that dump to those areas, Sir, is going to be serious. Do not say that I have not spoken about it and that I have not warned you.

Sir, I want to finish on the question of land use of agricultural, rab, and marginal lands. Sir, I think that everybody accepts that there must be proper management of the land resources in Barbados and a proper plan implemented for the use of land. There are areas which are identified as marginal and rab. I do not see any difficulty with passing those areas for housing development. They cannot be in our system agriculturally productive. They have the advantage also that when they are sold the owners get capital sums which can go to the reduction of their debt at the National Bank. Take some of these plantations which are heavily indebted to the National Bank. If you allow them to sell off some of their rab and marginal lands, particularly rab, for housing development, they will be able to take the money from those sales and pay off or pay towards the liquidation of their debt with the National Bank.

4.00 p.m.

That is an advantage I see in a consistent policy of allowing rab and marginal land to be sold for housing development. The big problem comes with what is called good agricultural land, where the top soil is 5", 6" and so on. I am not talking about certain areas where you have only a half inch or an inch of top soil. That is marginal. I

am talking about good agricultural land. Every Government in Barbados should be slow to permit the subdivision for housing purposes of that kind of land.

Now, I declare an interest, for this debate, to the extent that I am the beneficiary of one of those four-acre lots, in August 1975, at Neils. That is being financially prudent. I saw a good deal.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: You can go and check it in the Registry. Wilkie, Cozier and others had the land for sale, \$25,184 for four acres – you cannot get it for that now – and I bought it. I was in the hot peppers scheme with the Government, the ADC, the finger okras, the melons, all of those things. This year I am in grass.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What pangola grass? The grass has no name, it is wild. When the rain starts to come, Sir, I will have to turn it into fruit trees. The problems that many people in my position face are particularly problems of labour. We will complain, the public will complain about the level of unemployment, but when you have land available for people to work, they do not want to do it. I have been doing that little thing up there for about ten years, I have had enough now, so I am letting it run in grass for the time being. I will plough it up week after next. I do not mind the vegetables and so on, praedial larceny never bothered me, because I had my own methods of dealing with that. Ever so often at night you would know that somebody lives in the house below.

Aside.

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I cannot disclose my methods. I am not saying that praedial larceny was not a problem before, the problem in that whole area – I'm using the Neils area as one – all of us who have lots out there and everybody has been engaged in some form of farming – is to get regular and consistent labour. We cannot get it from among Barbadians. You would find St. Lucians, Vincentians and Guyanese who would give you proper jobs, but they have no documented status in Barbados and I, as a public figure, cannot attempt to employ somebody who is undocumented. That is a problem, but unless they are documented we cannot take the risk.

On another occasion I will have something more to say about how we can deal with the loss of foreign exchange from lands going out of sugar but substitutes being available in different forms to bring foreign exchange into Barbados. On that occasion I may have to disclose a personal interest.

I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution and also to state one or two home based concerns I have in terms of the physical development of the country as it relates to my constituency, St. Michael North East.

It seems to me, Sir, that there are a number of areas which for a very long time seemed to have passed the notice of successive Governments for the ultimate improvement for the people living in those areas. I know that there are some developments which were allowed to take place in the Jackson area, and I will speak specifically on that point, the Jackson Terrace development, which seems not to have paid any attention to the recreational facilities for the people in that area. In fact, the area of land which was used by the residents of Jackson Tenantry has been reduced almost to nothing with the development of that Jackson Terrace.

There is a development going up now in Cane Garden, albeit now in the St. Thomas constituency, and I am yet to recognise any plans for a recreational area in that particular development.

I do have requests with the Ministry of Housing and Lands and the Ministry of Sport for the development of an area of land in Friendship Terrace, following what was a shut down of the area that the people in that area used and which is now leased to a company. I think the name is AHI. 4.10 p.m.

If the housing developments are going up in these areas then some specific plan must be made and adhered to for the improvement of recreational facilities for the people who will be inhabiting those areas.

In the area of ground transportation, Sir, I think it is far too long that the people of Canewood and the people of Bibby Lane and Lears have been suffering for proper means of transport. There is virtually no link by way of public transportation between Jackson and Bibby Lane, Jackson and Lears. It seems to me that even now that the ABC highway has been developed not much is thought of for the improvement of transportation in that area.

I just want to sound the call, Sir, to the Ministry of Communications and Works that part of this physical development has to do with proper communication for the people of St. Michael North East. For a long time, I think, since the demise of the bus company which operated between St. Joseph and Bridgetown, there has not been a proper transportation service in that area. That was a long time ago.

Another matter that concerns me, Sir, since we are talking about the physical development of the country, is the amount of land which is taken out of the production of agricultural crops. In spite of all the claims that they should

be going into housing, I find that large areas of land are left idle. I have a problem, Sir, with reconciling the position where the people who own these lands are indebted to the Barbados National Bank by large sums of money. We are talking about Government's spearheading a thrust for the improvement of agriculture in this country. I would like to see, if the indebtedness to the Bank are unpaid, Government considering a proposal whereby this land is taken, if even on a lease basis, and made available to some of the young people in this country who want to produce agriculturally for the benefit of this country. I think it will take some of the young people off the road if properly managed and policed, and I think it will allow this country to see the benefits of lands which are wilfully left idle. I think the country can be better off in that regard.

I just thought, Sir, it was necessary for me at this point to make known these areas of my concern, because usually when these matters come up in detailed manner, I am unable to make any contribution in that regard. I think I should take this opportunity to make known my concerns about these matters which affect the constituency of St. Michael North East.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I propose to be very short in my winding up. I just want to say that it is generally accepted by all sides that the whole question of physical development planning is of paramount importance to Barbados. I am not now talking in political terms, but in terms of the country. This fact has been recognised by both sides. The comments which have been made by Honourable Members have been noted. I am satisfied that the comments have been made out of a genuine concern for the proper physical development of Barbados. Although at times the comments may appear to be critical, to a large extent, I think that they were constructively so.

Let me, however, say that under the system and certainly the Law which is in existence, I want to disabuse the minds of Honourable Members and any member of the public that the Minister has the ultimate responsibility for making decisions. You can have all sorts of commissions of enquiry; you can have an appeal tribunal. When an application goes to the Town and Country Planning Department and the Town and Country Department turns down the application, an opportunity is provided for the applicant to appeal to the Minister to review the decision. A system has been set up where the Minister appoints a panel to review the application. Even when that panel has sat and reviewed the application and made its recommendations, it has to make recommendations to the Minister, who then has to decide whether or not he will accept the recommendations of the panel or reject its recommendations.

I can say that the history of this, whether under the Barbados Labour Party or the Democratic Labour Party, has been clearly established that Ministers have accepted some recommendations and have rejected some. So, ultimately the responsibility is the Minister's. That is how the Law is written and that is the practice. However, I think that in all honesty and sincerity that Ministers have exercised their discretion with compassion and certainly with some concern for the applicant, and at the same time, concern for the proper development of this country.

I think the whole question of the loss of arable land to housing ought to be addressed. One has to recognise that initially Barbados was essentially an agricultural community and any development which has taken place as far as housing is concerned, quite naturally, would have meant that land which was previously used for agriculture would have had to go into housing. That is still, to a large extent, the case. There seems, however, to be a fallacy which has developed in this country that all of the land which has gone out of sugar has gone into housing. That, simply, Sir, is not true and Honourable Members should not fall into that trap, should not be so misguided as to believe that all of the lands which have gone out of sugar production has gone into housing. Those persons who have been pushing this argument have not recognised that some of the land which has gone out of sugar production has gone into vegetable production, livestock production, pasture land and some of the lands have been abandoned and are still lying idle. Those lands have not gone into housing.

Indeed, Sir, I think that the Chief Agricultural Officer, on the weekend just past, was making the point in a headline of the Sunday Advocate, June 23 - "Arable Land not Falling to Housing". I know that I am not permitted to quote from a newspaper. I am not quoting. I am only giving the reference where the information can be found. According to him, Sir, he said that just 10 per cent of the land which has gone out of sugar production over the last decade has been lost to housing development. He gave a breakdown in a number of areas. For example, he said that in St. Peter, of the 5,218 acres of available land, 3,253 is arable. He said that two-thirds of the arable land is in sugar cane but 12 per cent is doing nothing. In St. James, where the total acreage stands at about 2,147, the arable land is some 1,136 acres. There are about 278 acres lying idle and 475 planted in sugar cane.

4.20 p.m.

The information is there. I think that the Ministry of Agriculture in collaboration with one of the agencies of the Ministry of Housing, the Chief Town Planner, the two agencies are working at gathering information on this specific area which will show very clearly what the situation is. I think that one of the major problems which we have in this country, as far as arable land is concerned, is the once arable land which is now lying idle.

Another point which I would want to make and I think this has to be made very forcibly is that over the years there have been a number of areas which have been passed for development. I am told the estimate is about 20 000 vacant, but serviced lots, which are lying unused, that is, permission has been given, to a large extent they have been developed but people have not built on them. The result, of course, of all of this is that more and more pressure is being put on the Government to provide areas for housing.

We are at a particular critical juncture where the demand, I believe, for housing now is greater than it has ever been because of a number of demographic and social factors which did not come into play before. I can give you some examples where permissions have been granted but the developments have not as yet taken place – Fortesque, Ruby/Union area and Maynards in St. Peter. Yes, some houses have been built but there is still a lot of land which has been passed for development but which has not yet been taken up. A lot of this, as I understand it, has to do with the fact that a number of the persons who are in the development areas are selling the lands to people overseas. Some people are slow in building. They buy the land and hold it. Then, of course, in some areas some people have not been able to get the finances together to build on it. This does create some problems for us. I think it ought to be known and very clearly.

Certainly from the point of view of the Government we have a programme to provide serviced lots, sites and services. We have to look and see how this can be done and identify areas where this can be done. But these are the kinds of pressures which we have to face. The Government has, therefore, to do a balancing act where we have to balance development with our agricultural production needs, tourism, housing, the environment, conservation, the whole range of interests which have to be brought to bear in the decisions which are made.

The Physical Development Plan, therefore, has to be seen in this particular context. As I have indicated, under the law every five year period a review has to take place. Obviously even as we go through this process reviews will have to be undertaken on a continuous basis. We are looking at the Greater Bridgetown Development Plan now. We are looking at the Development Plan for the ABC Highway and the one for the towns, Oistins, Speightstown and Hometown and then the centres. There is a lot of work which is going on in this particular area.

I would want to repeat the assistance which we have been able to receive from the United Nations Development Project. I think only recently their assistance went even to the extent of the computerisation of the operations of the Town and Country Planning Department. It is my understanding from the point of application right through that the system has now been computerised. One would hope this would assist in further speeding up the flow of

applications through the Town and Country Planning Department to the eventual making of a decision.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East made reference to the situation in the Belle. Let me say I think it is generally known that the Chief Town Planner issued notices to 15 persons who were occupying lands in the Zone 1 area in the Belle. They were told that they ought to move from that area by June 23, 1991. I would like to indicate that as of today 12 of those 15 persons have moved. The Government has provided some lots in the Haggatt Hall area for their accommodation. We have dug pits but that is the extent of the Government assistance because I believe, as I have said before, this has to be a cooperative effort. One cannot expect the Government to be providing all of the finances for this particular accommodation. The three persons remaining there will be dealt with. If there is any compassion to be exercised, such compassion will be exercised but to be certain, I want to say very clearly, they have to move and they will be moved one way or the other.

The Chief Town Planner has the law to exercise. This Minister will not impede the Chief Town Planner in exercising the law which he has to exercise in this particular respect. In short, what I am saying is that the Chief Town Planner will be issuing instructions to the Ministry of Transport and Works to assist in getting those houses removed from the area. If removal means removing and they do not have anywhere to go they will just have to take whatever it is because we have a situation where one of the persons who still occupies one of the lots was served with a notice. When he was served with the notice the house was just a frame and he proceeded to continue to construct the house to the point where he is living in it. This is a clear disregard and you talk about disregard for the authority of the Chief Planner but this is a clear disregard for the authority of the Chief Town Planner.

This is something which we have to show very clearly that we are serious about this because we cannot allow that situation to continue. There are some other areas in Barbados where decisions have been taken to remove a number of buildings which have gone contrary to the decisions of the Chief Town Planner, persons who have applied to the Chief Town Planner who have been turned down but who proceeded to build in areas which are Zone 1 areas. There is one particular area at Ashton Hall in St. Peter. There is Bellevue, Waterford, St. Michael, Wildey, and Rices in St. Philip. Where decisions have to be taken against these people these decisions will be taken. I am saying very clearly that the Minister will not be expected to intervene in this.

4.30 p.m.

I am just sounding a warning now because I want it to be made very clear when actions have been taken that

people must recognize that it is the Law with which they have to conform.

I should like to say that as far as this Government is concerned we have taken note of the suggestions. One suggestion certainly which we cannot take on board is the suggestion to refer this matter to a Select Committee because as I said this has had very wide public discussion and very wide public ventilation and as a consequence, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question Time. The Honourable Minister of Community Development and Culture. Question No. 3.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to question No. 3 is as follows:

The Government is fully conscious of the role that community development should play in national development, including issues relating to children, youth, women and the aged. In this context, the Development Plan for 1988-1993 proposes the building of two additional centres, one in St. Philip and the other in Christ Church. These will be provided subject to the availability of funds. No decision has yet been taken in respect of the site for the additional community centre for Christ Church. An assessment of the alternative uses to which the old St. Matthias Girls' School building might be put is being carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Supplementaries?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Will the Minister state what alternative uses are envisaged?

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: As far as the Minister is aware that assessment is now presently being carried out by various Government departments in conjunction with the present owners of the property the Ministry of Housing and Lands.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Will the Minister state whether it is intended to allow the St. Matthias School to remain closed for any period of time and for how much longer?

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No. The Minister will not be able to tell you the length of time for which it will remain closed. I can tell you that as soon as the assessment is carried out and the St. Matthias School is needed for any purposes for which the Government wishes to put it, including purposes that may relate to the Parliamentary Question, then it will be opened for those purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any other supplementaries? End of Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, at this time I am moving the Adjournment of this House until Tuesday, 9th July, 1991 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly at 4.36 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of meetings of June 4 and
June 11, 1991..... 760

Hon. P. M. GREAVES..... 760

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD..... 760

The Annual Report and Audited Financial
Statements of the National Petroleum
Corporation for the period April 1, 1989 to
March 31, 1990.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS..... 760

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 760.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPUL-
SORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT FOUL
BAY, ST. PHILIP FOR RECREATIONAL
PURPOSES 761

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 761; Hon. H. A. Blackman,
761.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE AMEND-
MENTS TO THE BARBADOS PHYSICAL
DEVELOPMENT PLAN OF 1977 761

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 761, 781; Mr. L. R. Tull,
764; Hon. H. A. Blackman, 770; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 771; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 773; Mr. D.
A. C. Simmons, 777; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 780.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION NO. 3..... 783

Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 783; Hon. H. deB.
Forde, 783.

SUSPENSION..... 772

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 772.

ADJOURNMENT..... 783

Hon. M. A. King, 783.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BLACKMAN, Hon. H. A. (St. Philip South)
BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael East Central)
BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)
GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)
SIMMONS, Mr. D. A. C. (St. Thomas)
TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South)