
THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 – 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 12, 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)
Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B., (Leader of the Opposition)
Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Health)
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.
Hon. C. V. WALKER, (Minister of Education)
Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)
Hon. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Hon. W. W. HALL, G.C.M., H.B.M., (Minister of Tourism and Sports)

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Community Development and Culture)
Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, 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. D. W. BOWEN
Mr. G. W. PAYNE
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 Tuesday, September 17, 1991.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Minutes for Tuesday, September 17, 1991 be taken as read and confirmed.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the Accounts and Statements for the months of July and August, 1991, as prepared by the Accountant General.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

- (1) The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1991;
- (2) Letter of Intent under the Proposed Adjustment Programme between Barbados and the International Monetary Fund;
- (3) Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1990/91;
- (4) The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1991.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Cabinet to lay the following:-

The Air Transport Licensing Authority Report for the year 1990.

On behalf of the Minister of Justice, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Police for the financial years 1988 and 1989.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following:-

- (1) Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1991;
- (2) Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of Barbados of repayment to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development of Loans made to the Caribbean Development Bank for financing investment projects.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: May I just make an observation in respect of a motion which was submitted to me by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. It was submitted in time but I felt it needed a bit more consultation. I have asked that we consult a little bit more on the Resolution to get it in line. I hope the Honourable Member would accept the situation as it stands.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, you informed me before the House met that you would wish some more consultation. I would consult on the matter in the hope that

the Resolution, acceptable to ourselves and within the framework of the Rules of the House, would be on the Table of this House.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Andrew re the number of persons laid off from the Public Service.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the secretariat does not have the questions in the proper form. I am not in possession of a copy as yet.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed.
12.25 p.m.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of the Civil Service:-

Will the Minister please state:

(1) how many persons have been laid off from the public service and statutory Boards since the 31st July, 1991? (2) the number of persons laid off from each Ministry and Statutory Board? (3) how many more persons are scheduled to be laid off from each department and statutory board? (4) whether the formula "first in last out" is being used for these "layoffs" and if not what formula is being used? and (5) what principles are being applied to the termination of persons with over ten years service and to retention of persons with under 5 years service?

To ask the Minister of the Civil Service:

Is the Minister aware that persons - Question No. 26.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one moment. I would just remind the Honourable Member that each Question deserves a separate introduction. Therefore I have heard the first one. I have not called the second one yet so I would do so now.

By the same Honourable Member, settlement of outstanding termination benefits due to former public employees.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of the Civil Service:

(1) Is the Minister aware that persons with over 16 years service in the public sector are being terminated without notice, without payment in lieu of notice and

without any severance payment? (2) Will the Minister please state how soon Government proposes to settle outstanding termination benefits due to former public employees?

Mr. SPEAKER: By the same Honourable Member, policy of Government with respect to new appointments to the public service.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of the Civil Service:

(1) Will the Minister please state the policy of Government with respect to new appointments to the public service? (2) Will the Minister state whether any temporary or other appointments have been made to the public service including statutory boards since 31st July, 1991 and identify the posts which have been created and/or filled?

Mr. SPEAKER: By the same Honourable Member, repairs to public roads in St. Andrew.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the following public roads in the Constituency of Saint Andrew are in urgent need of repair, namely: Boys School Road, Worrell's Road, Franklyn Douglin Road, Isolation Road, Belmont Road, Chalky Mount, Farrell's Road, Jackman Alley, Cambridge Road and Hopewell Road? (2) Will the Minister please state when the repair work on any or all of those roads will be executed?

Mr. SPEAKER: By the same Honourable Member, policy of Government regarding Walkers Bridge in St. Andrew.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

(1) Will the Minister please state the policy of Government regarding further use of Walkers Bridge in St. Andrew? (2) Is the Minister aware that the closure of Walkers Bridge and the failure of Government to repair it are causing grave inconvenience to motorists travelling between Belleplaine, Walkers and Bawden and that the diversion of traffic through Babylon Tenantry Road as a result of this closure, is causing serious disruption to traffic on that road especially during peak periods? (3) Will the Minister state whether Government intends to repair the said Bridge and/or widen and upgrade Babylon Tenantry Road?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member, introduction of transfer system on bus service.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of Public Works, Communications and Transportation:

(1) Is the Minister aware that most commuters in outlying country districts such as the St. Andrew constituency must use more than one bus to travel to work? (2) In view of the recent increase in bus fares would the Minister please state whether Government intends to introduce a transfer ticket system on bus services?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member, extension of natural gas supply to various areas of St. Andrew and St. James.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs. Will the Minister please state whether Government has plans to extend the natural gas supply to the residents in Hillaby and, White Hill, Saint Andrew and Orange Hill, Saint James especially as those districts are in the vicinity of the natural gas pipeline?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member, lack of maintenance in the National Housing Corporation units in Belleplaine, St. Andrew.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands:

(1) Is the Minister aware that, despite the recent increase in the rents of the units owned by the National Housing Corporation stated as due to increased operating costs, no maintenance has been done to the units in the Belleplaine Housing Area during the past 5 years and that a number of roofs of houses in that housing area leak profusely when it rains? (2) Will the Minister give an undertaking for early repairs in this housing estate and state whether the tenants will be required to pay the increased rent before the repairs are effected?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member, Government's policy on the sale of its rental units.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask the Minister of Housing and Lands:

(1) Will the Minister please state the policy of Government on the sale of its rental units? (2) Is the Minister aware that tenants in Belleplaine Housing Area who wanted to purchase their units were given the undertaking by National Housing Corporation that if they cleared their arrears, no further sums would be payable until finalisation of their conveyances? (3) Is the Minister aware that the National Housing Corporation's legal representatives are now threatening renewed legal action against tenants in the Belleplaine Housing Area?

notwithstanding liquidation of those earlier arrears and the delay by Government in completing the conveyances?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same Honourable Member, severe flooding at Shorey Village, St Andrew after recent heavy rainfall.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: To ask of the Minister of Housing and Lands:

(1) Is the Minister aware that land recently acquired by Government for housing purposes at Shorey Village in the parish of Saint Andrew abutting and bounding on the St. Andrew's Parish Church was recently subjected to severe flooding after the recent heavy rainfall? (2) Is the Minister aware that the said land is flooded even after periods of moderate rainfall? (3) Is the Minister aware that the said land is unfit for housing purposes? (4) Will the Minister please state whether it is the intention of the Government to abandon this acquisition and, if so, what alternative site will replace same?

Mr. SPEAKER: After some clarification a notice was submitted in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Andrew but I understand it is for the Honourable Member for the City who is not now in her place. Most likely that Question could probably be held over for the next meeting.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

His Hon. T. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, if you are referring to the Select Committee I beg to report that some progress has been made and seek leave that sitting continue for that Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, then leave is granted.
12.35 p.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the suspension of Standing Orders prior to the deliberation of Public Business. The Standing Orders which I now move the suspension of are Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43, and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the order of the day. Order No. 8.

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING A CAR PARK AND PLAYING AREA FOR ST. MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE CITY OF BRIDGETOWN

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution speaks for itself more or less. We are seeking the approval of this Honourable Chamber for the acquisition of the area of land described in the Resolution for the purpose of constructing a car park and playing area for the new St. Mary's Primary School in the City of Bridgetown.

The history relating to this acquisition is as follows. In 1985, to be precise on October 24th, 1985, the then Cabinet approved the procedure to be set in place for the acquisition of 1,223 square metres of land with the building housing the St. Mary's Junior School at Mason Hall Street for the construction of the new St. Mary's Primary School. The Barbados Dioceses Trustees were identified as the owners of the area of land. On July 10, 1989 five parcels of land at Mason Hall Street became vested in the Crown for the purpose of constructing the new St. Mary's Primary School. This school was among several constructed under the second World Bank Education Loan Scheme.

The acquisition of this parcel of land was delayed as a result of a surveying problem relating to the boundaries of the area of land belonging to the Anglican Church and the surrounding lands owned by the Crown. It made it, therefore, difficult for the surveyors to determine the exact area of land which was owned by the church. The difficulty was subsequently resolved to the satisfaction of the Barbados Dioceses Trustees and the Crown. The area to be acquired is now known to be 832.6 square metres as indicated on the Survey Plan No. 31691 certified on March 27th, 1991 and recorded on March 28th, 1991.

With that background, Sir, I would like to move that this Resolution do now pass and I hereby make a copy of plan available to Honourable Members. I will have to double check on the cost and get it for you. But I know there were some very tight negotiations on the amount which was eventually settled for this particular area of land. In my reply, I will identify that amount for you.

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

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

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Housing and Lands has resumed his almost weekly practice when the House meets of bringing a number of land acquisition matters before Parliament. I am a little bit concerned, Sir, about the period that elapses between the passing of these Resolutions and the payment to the owners of the property for their land. Now that situation, Mr. Speaker, was bad in good times. So the question naturally arises – What will happen in bad times? The Government has said that its expenditure for the remainder of this current financial year will fall by about \$116 million and that they project that there will be a reduction in the overall Central Government expenditure to 30.5 per cent of GDP in the year 1991/1992.

Now that represents a major slash in expenditure. As I said, in good times, people could not get their money. The Government was compulsorily acquiring land from a number of people in this country as far as I know, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong. In fact, as far as I am told, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, the Government owes well in excess of \$1 million to small land owners for land acquired by the Government.

There is no point, Mr. Speaker, of our going through the charade of passing these Resolutions for compulsory acquisition when the Land Acquisition Act makes clear provision for compensation. So it does not make much sense in our going through this exercise all of the time of doing (a) taking the people's land and (b) not paying them. In this context also, Sir, the Government has said that they are going to review the expenditure on Education but nobody has said as yet, Mr. Speaker, in what areas are these cuts going to take place. The Letter of Intent that has just been made a document of the House spells out that there have to be cuts in the area of education and one wonders, Mr. Speaker, whether the Text Book Loan Scheme that is going to be under siege according to the document and when the School Meals Service...

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the Honourable Member is a very articulate person and I would not want to divert him from the main context of the Resolution. But even if I give a little room I hope you will guide yourself.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not a question of being articulate. We are talking about the acquisition of land for education.
12.45 p.m.

That is what is before the Chamber. In view of the fact that the Government has articulated a policy of cuts of expenditure in education, I am asking the Government about the whole question of priorities in relation to these things. In other words, Sir, I am submitting that the expenditure for land for a car park, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West mentioned, is not an area of priority when one sees that the school textbook scheme is

being targetted for cuts. I wish the Honourable Member for St. Lucy, the Minister of Housing and Lands, and indeed the Minister of Education, the Honourable Member for St. George North, could give the House some clear indication as to how this happens to be a priority for Government expenditure, if indeed it intends to pay the owner of the land and when, because that is part of the answer we should get.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: It is not a reflection, Sir, the whole reflection on the Government is there for all to see, I do not have to mention it, but I would like the Government to be able to tell us today, because it is important, when they intend to pay the owners of this land, and I would like the Government also, particularly through the Minister of Education, to tell us how when you are cutting money for education you can find money to buy land for a car park, but have some difficulty in maintaining the integrity of the textbook loan scheme.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George South enquired from the Minister how soon the payment for this acquisition will be made. I want to take up that particular point and expand on it. It is very important that this question be answered.

The point is, all of us should be aware that the longer the Government takes to settle, the more it will cost the taxpayers of Barbados. There is a cost involved. There is a question of interest if the matter is allowed to drag on for a period of time. This is not a time for Members on the other side to feel that this is a petty question, it is very serious. We are all concerned about the debt that Barbados owes and the commitment. Any acquisition in these difficult times means that the Government would have its hands full. We must understand that. We have seen some acquisitions brought in here before which dragged on over five or ten years and as a result the Government ended up paying interest. The interest in one case was actually more than the principal or the amount of money the land was acquired for.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be very careful. I do not expect the Minister to get up in here today and say the money is going to be paid tomorrow or on a particular day, but I am urging the Government to make sure that this particular matter is settled within a short period, less than a year, so that the people of Barbados will not incur any additional expenses. That is what I am going to ask the Government to consider.

We cannot dismiss these matters. It is all right for the Government to acquire land. In this case I am supporting the acquisition on the grounds that I understand it is to

provide a car park and a playing field. I feel that these two things are very important, but what I am saying is that we cannot ignore it, because this is causing the Government, and will cause future Governments, embarrassment. Therefore, I want the Minister to take this question that was raised by my colleague, the Member for St. George South, as very important as well.

I do hope that this matter is addressed and, as I said, in all future acquisitions my concern will be that the Government makes sure that the acquisition is absolutely necessary and use every measure to make sure that what we come in here for, and the money that is spent on acquisitions, is relevant. We cannot afford to spend money as we like now, we do not have it and we do not want any more embarrassment of people going to court and trying to settle because Government has taken away their land. We want to know that if they have entered on the lands and have utilised the people's lands, as in this case, that if you are going to settle the negotiations out of court, settle it and let us know. We do not want anything dragging on. If you can settle it out of court, then let us have some amicable arrangement. I think that this will suit all of us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the point which was made by the two Honourable Members from the other side who intervened in this debate, particularly relating to the question of the payment for properties acquired by the Crown, is a point which I do not believe any Honourable Member in this Chamber would disagree with. I think it is a point of principle that when the Crown acquires land from any person for public purposes, then the owners of the land should be compensated, and compensated as soon as possible. But I think that one has to be realistic in these matters.

It does not fall easily from the mouths of the Barbados Labour Party, as it were, washing their hands clean of this particular matter. Indeed, Sir, the history of acquisitions in Barbados over the years has shown that Government does not have the best of records in the swift payment for properties which have been acquired. I can cite a number of examples. There is a property in Cheapside which was acquired in 1975. The Barbados Labour Party sat on it for ten years and nothing was done relative to the settlement of it. As a matter of fact, a Resolution was brought to the House some months ago to finalise the acquisition. We are in the process, hopefully, of paying the person for the area of land. Now, it is a fact that Government's finances are tight.

12.55 p.m.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: That is just one example. I am sure that the Honourable Member would recall when he was Minister of Housing and Lands that there were a number of parts of properties which were acquired for the construction of Arawak Cement plant in St. Lucy and the Charles Duncan O'Neale Highway. Let me give you some examples. Today, we have not been able to settle all of those matters. It is not so much a question of the Government not having money to settle these amounts but really in truth and in fact because we could not get the matters resolved between the surveyors and the owners and the usual difficulties which arise from time to time.

I think that when an Honourable Member gets up and tries to give the impression to the public that this Democratic Labour Party Administration is so insensitive, so inhuman as to go and take over people's land without paying them and without any particular urge to pay them for the land, I think that that is unfair to this Administration, recognising that they themselves have been in government for ten years, recognising the difficulties which are involved in that area. We would like to be able to settle these acquisitions as quickly as possible but it is not always possible, given all of the factors which have to be taken into consideration. Sometimes you acquire an area of land and the person does not have a clear title to the property. Then the boundaries may not be clear. There may be dispute with the surveyors about the boundaries. Then there might well be a dispute relating to the price because it is a fact that people sometimes when they are selling land to the Government ask exorbitant prices for the particular land, and if you took their valuation and tried to place a valuation on it then they would want to say that the property is not worth anything. As long as the Government is involved then it is worth large sums of money. All of these are problems which we have to negotiate to come to an amicable understanding. This Administration is not one that will go in and begin work on people's property without their even knowing. It is not one that will just run rough-shod over people. We prefer to sit down and negotiate and try to make sure that all of the matters which have to be settled are settled before the acquisition is completed.

So, Sir, in response to the question raised by the Honourable Member for St. George South about the price which has been settled to the satisfaction of the Church and the Crown on this area of land, I would want the Honourable Member and the Chamber to know that the amount agreed to is \$330,000. This value relates to the land and the building which was demolished.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member is pressing to find out when we will be able to pay this

amount of money. Now, I think it is clear that there is an acquisition... But the Honourable Member doesn't want to hear.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: There is an acquisition vote, Mr. Speaker, and quite naturally we would have to see whether or not, with all of the competing claims from years ago, how this will fit into the amounts which we have left back. I cannot give you any guarantee that we will be in a position, save coming for some additional money to Parliament, which is unlikely that we will do for the balance of the financial year. I would not be able to guarantee that the Church will be able to get this money in the immediate future. It must very well be understood that in cases like these where the Government does not pay on time then it is obligated to pay interest to anybody from whom it has made an acquisition so that persons will not be disadvantaged. We, obviously, would not like to know that interest mounts up but that is a fact of life.

One should also mention that the Church has a lot of property in Barbados and I believe the Church owes a lot of taxes too, so that what I am saying is that one has to understand that there must be give and take in this particular matter.

I would want to say that as a matter of policy I have asked my officers to examine those outstanding amounts which are owed to people and to try to settle the smaller amounts as quickly as possible so that we could try to get off as many of them as possible. This is a matter of principle but there are some large amounts which we cannot accommodate entirely within what remains. Indeed, in some areas where we have been able to sit down with some persons for whom we have settled an amount and negotiate part payment, and they are agreeable to this. We are trying all sorts of arrangements to try to accommodate people as much as possible in the light of the particular situation that we have. I do not think that an impression should be left in this Honourable Chamber that this is the first time that a Government has owed people money for acquisitions for a long period of time. History is replete with that.

I beg to move, Sir, that the resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ORDER NO. 9 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE PUBLICATION IN THE OFFICIAL GAZETTE ON THE ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND SITUATE AT BALLS IN CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a resolution concerning the abandonment of the acquisition of 2 347 square metres of land at Balls, Christ Church. This land was acquired from the Barbados Horticultural Society and became vested in the Crown. It was part of an area of land acquired for the construction of the ABC Highway. Agreement on the purchase price of 25 cents per square foot had been reached but to date no funds have been disbursed. The attorney-at-law for the Barbados Horticultural Society approached the Government with a request that the acquisition be abandoned since his client had found a willing buyer for the property and the offer was 60 cents per square foot.

Cabinet at its meeting of June 6, 1991 agreed to the proposed abandonment, especially since there was nothing which we saw that we could do productively with that particular area of land. In pursuance of the Cabinet decision we therefore required that a resolution be brought to Parliament for its approval so that the abandonment of this acquisition can take place.

Sir, it is this resolution which is before Parliament now and I beg to move that this resolution do now pass. The copies of the plot to the area of land are available.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

ORDER NO. 10 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BOVELL'S GAP, SPEIGHTSTOWN, ST. PETER FOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the area in question is 720.5 square metres of land at Bovell's Gap, Speightstown, St. Peter. We are seeking to acquire this area for the purposes of highway improvement. As a matter of fact, the Government had acquired a portion of land belonging to the estate of Mr. Deane comprising 163.4 square metres to facilitate the construction of the Speightstown By-pass Road and this resulted in the creation of a narrow strip of land, confirmed by the Ministry of Transport and Works to be of such a shape and width as to render it economically useless to the owner. 1.05 p.m.

The Government therefore decided that rather than allow that strip of land to lie there which was no use to the

owner that it would be acquired. Generally speaking, we are trying to rationalise an existing acquisition and, presumably, would be able to form part of whatever beautification there is along that particular area of land.

We are, therefore, seeking to approve the compulsory acquisition of this area of land and I so move, Sir.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I beg to second that, Sir, and reserve my right to speak.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SALE TO GEORGE
HOLDER UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE CROWN
LANDS (VESTING AND DISPOSAL) ACT,
CAP. 225, OF LAND AT ROCK HALL,
SAINT ANDREW, TO BE CONVERTED
AND USED AS A RESIDENCE

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the Government has, over the last year or so, been coming to this Chamber from time to time with resolutions of this nature for the sale of disused public conveniences. This is yet another one of these.

I know that Honourable Members have questioned the way in which we are bringing these resolutions. In an attempt to head off such a question, just let me repeat that as soon as they are ready and the discussions and consultations have been completed, we try to get them to Parliament. Of course, one approach could be that one could wait and bring 15 or 20 together. Another approach could be to wait until all of the decisions and conclusions have been arrived at and then come with them. We think that since there are individuals involved, when once we have completed discussion and arrangements with them that, actually, we should try to get them out of the way.

The Government's policy basically is that we put a notice in the newspapers advertising these public conveniences around the Island for sale. Where there are community groups who have an interest in the utilisation of them for community purposes through the Ministry of Community Development, we have stated very clearly as a matter of policy, that we would look very favourably in turning these units over to them in collaboration with the Ministry of Community Development trying to make sure that they are utilised for community purposes and developed for that particular purpose. I know already that in some constituencies this has been done. We have in the pipeline requests from a number of other people who have

identified conveniences for such purposes. Those which do not fall into that bracket and we are disposing of, quite naturally we would put them on the market for sale.

In this particular instance at Rock Hall, St. Andrew, after advertising and the necessary applications, there is a Mr. George Holder who offered the sum of \$1 000 for this area of land. Cabinet agreed that it should be sold to him subject to approval being obtained from the Chief Town Planner for the purposes for which he requires to use the area of land.

It is my understanding that Mr. Holder applied to the Chief Town Planner for the use of this land as a residence. He wants to erect a residence on this site. This has been approved. We are seeking, therefore, through this Resolution Parliament's permission to dispose of this area of land to Mr. George Holder under Section 5 of the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act, Cap. 225 at Rock Hall, St. Andrew to be converted and used as a residence.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, while I have no great quarrel with Mr. Holder getting a piece of land on which to build a house, I am not sure what is the community purpose of it. It seems to me that the Minister is moving away from his own articulated policy. Although we on this side have no quarrel with the Government taking decisions to get rid of the disused public baths for the community I think they are dragging their feet on it. This has been going on a long time.

The Minister should know that there has been an application by the Malvern Cricket Club of St. George for the acquisition of the disused public bath at Ellerton for community purposes. It is not only that Malvern is now the best cricket team in Barbados, but again, Sir, at a time when people are being laid off by the tonne, there are a lot of people around St. George, the Ellerton area in particular, who could use the public bath at Ellerton, if acquired by Malvern, for useful recreational purposes.

The Honourable Minister of Community Development who has an obsession with CARIFESTA, I am saying that parenthetically – the first time he ever had a half decent pay cheque was at CARIFESTA in dubious circumstances. I believe that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee should use that Committee to investigate how certain people got money out of CARIFESTA.

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister knows that the Minister has no part in this case. It is worth investigating. But the Honourable Minister of Community Services, instead of living out his constant obsession with CARIFESTA, should really look at the files in his own Ministry in relation to application for disused baths, the one at Ellerton in particular, but also one in South District in St. George, and make sure that instead of marking time that he expedites action in collaboration with the Minister of Housing and Lands to make sure that these facilities are made available to the people of the respective districts, particularly at a time such as this where large numbers of young people are just hanging around the street corners. We would like to see their energies, if they have energies left, after the thrashing they have been having, being used in a very meaningful way.

I would therefore ask, Sir, that greater attention be given to speeding up the process of transferral of ownership of these places from Government to the interest groups that have applied for them.
1.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Andrew.

Mr. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset that I have a professional interest in this particular Resolution and, notwithstanding my professional interest, I still support the Resolution.

However there are one or two concerns which I have relative to this Resolution and I would just like briefly to mention them.

The Honourable Minister did mention about the problems being encountered relative to the bringing of this Resolution at this time. I am somewhat concerned at this piecemeal approach of bringing these resolutions relative to the sale of public baths, seeing that we had a number of them in the past, certainly since I was elected to this Honourable Chamber. I do not quite agree with the Honourable Minister when he says that there are certain procedures that must be completed before these Resolutions are brought and that in this case the procedure has only now reached the stage where this particular Resolution can be brought before this House.

This particular permission from the Chief Town Planner was obtained – if you may look at the actual Resolution – on the 13th February, 1990. Certainly these delays in bringing these Resolutions for the sale to persons who have already earmarked... seeing that in this case Cabinet had approved this sale on the 16th March, 1989 is certainly bringing some inconvenience to purchasers especially at times like these knowing that people might have made certain arrangements as to the type of structures they would like to have on this particular area.

I would think that maybe the Minister of Housing should probably go through the various sales which have already been approved and instead of having this piecemeal approach where we come here just to pass one resolution relating to these matters and similar concerns are expressed, we could, perhaps, have all of these resolutions dealt with at one time.

I would also like to say, too, that maybe the Honourable Minister of Housing could probably look at the possibility – certainly I do not see anything wrong with the legality of it – of having all of these properties vested in the National Housing Corporation. In this way it would be totally unnecessary to waste parliamentary time in coming here just to talk about acquisitions and concerns when we are doing it over and over again. I believe that all of these matters are in the process where they can be dealt with.

My second area of concern relates to the policy certainly of the Barbados Labour Party, the Members on this side, relative to the use of these particular facilities. The Honourable Member for St. George South mentioned them a little earlier when he said that he did not see any community use in this particular Resolution.

While I support this Resolution – and certainly the element of community use is not relevant here seeing that a community centre is located just 200 yards away from where this spot is – I am somewhat disappointed that the Ministry of Community Development has not been doing its homework in undertaking a proper survey of these baths and trying to ascertain areas where the residents of the community have been using these public baths, so that, instead of every time we are coming here dealing with Resolutions for acquisitions by persons for residential or commercial use, we will be dealing with the type of Resolutions that the Honourable Member for St. George South has spoken about earlier.

Certainly I could think about the public bath in Chalky Mount which has been used by the residents of Chalky Mount for some time. I must say that these residents have had difficulty even in communicating with the Ministry of Community Development in obtaining water facilities for themselves and yet we have a Resolution like this for a sale. In this connection I believe that if the Ministry of Community Development had been doing its field work, it would also have been able to lend some assistance to the residents of Shorey Village who have recently remodelled the public bath in that particular area. And to my knowledge they have made certain representation to the Ministry of Community Development for assistance in covering the public bath – it is now leaking – and getting a few concrete blocks and they have not been getting any assistance whatsoever from the Ministry of Community Development. I would hope that I

do not see a Resolution at some particular point in time for someone acquiring a public bath like that. Those are my concerns.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker Sir, I would hope that every time acquisition matters come before this Chamber that we would not be treated to precisely the same speech from the Honourable Members for St. George South and St. Andrew. We had a debate in here already in which the Government....

Mr. L. R. TULL: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. John is misrepresenting both the words, the context and the thrust of my speech. I never talked about Malvern before nor providing facilities for the people at Ellerton. So I do not know what repetition he is talking about, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, let me get to the substance. I have no time for that kind of sophistry. The point is the Honourable Member for St. George South indicated to me some time ago that he wished the public bath at Ellerton for the purposes of community activity. There are other facilities, as I understand it, at Ellerton and when I raised it with the Community Development Department they said that there are already existing facilities and they would carry out a survey of the catchment area and talk to the groups to find out the extent to which they would contribute.

The Honourable Member took a piece of paper in Parliament one day and wrote down his request on that piece of paper and dutifully handed it to me and the matter is being dealt with. He knows that the Government's money is not appropriated on an *ad hoc* basis; that there were already projects relating to the refurbishing of public baths and so on in the pipeline for which the Estimates had approved expenditure; and your project will come on stream too. It is not a big issue. You know more than anybody else, as a former Attorney-General, the long legal process that is involved in matters of this sort.

Any of the Members of the House who have concerns about community development facility can raise those concerns. It is not a big issue in which, every time you have a land acquisition, it has to be raised just to demonstrate that you are championing causes that everybody already knows that you are championing. In fact, that is the point, Sir, that the causes that he should have been championing in 1981 he was not.

The only dubious distinction I have of receiving any cheque for community development or cultural purposes

arose out of this Sir: There was something called CARIFESTA in 1981. I was summoned from my house one morning early and told this thing is a total disaster, we need people like you to come and manage some government properties during CARIFESTA. I was conscripted by the Defence Force – not the Minister, he had lost control. I would not tell you who in the Defence Force but I have almost some witnesses but I am not going to go so close to the line. I was conscripted by the Defence Force to manage three Government properties – Combermere School's auditorium which had been refurbished, the Auditorium at George Street, and a tent at the CARIFESTA Village. At 17 years of age, I knew more about CARIFESTA than a Minister that was receiving more than \$3,000 a month and sitting in an air-conditioned room. Now let us be serious about this, Sir.

1.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure it was not intended that should be the body of the Resolution.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, that is not it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that I will give latitude but please.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am only responding to the question of receipt of dubious cheques.

Mr. SPEAKER: Respond with caution.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point is, Sir, that history repeats itself because the young people of Shorey Village, who like me, are enthusiastic apparently have taken it upon themselves to develop a public facility. That is admirable. If the Government cannot assist right now, we simply cannot assist them. But that does not mean that we will not attempt at sometime in the future, funds permitting, to assist them. But let us not have this idea and offer some leadership in your community. Offer some leadership. Do not offer silly criticism. Praise the group. Encourage the Government to praise them as well and to help them with whatever means the Government has at its disposal. That is part of the task. Money cannot be everything in community development. There are certain intangibles and, if you are the representative who benefits from the good will, the dedication, commitment, and the tenacity of the people of Shorey Village, you should be grateful. Do not come in here and complain about concrete blocks and so on. As a Member of Parliament, we have all given concrete blocks to groups. That is nothing big. Pull your pocket as well. Do not just talk about the people in Shorey Village. Pull your pocket too. Why do you not buy some concrete blocks and assist them instead of coming in here and expecting me out of the blue, a Cabinet Minister of only ten months and only one set of Estimates have passed, and you are telling me about Shorey Village as if

it was in some kind of plan? Pull your pocket on this occasion and in the next Estimates I will ensure that Shorey Village, Ellerton, and South District are given the consideration that is necessary.

We are not going to have \$30 million to blow like CARIFESTA. We will not blow \$30 million or \$40 million. But we may have two or so million dollars to assist in the rational development of community facilities. We do not have any \$30 million to blow and squander. We only have a small amount and it will be used judiciously throughout the communities of Barbados. As Minister, I will take an active personal interest in that development instead of remaining in an air-conditioned office and then the Defence Force will have to come and tell me how to appropriate funds in my Ministry. I will take an active interest in ensuring how the funds that are applied to the development of community centres in this country are expended. I offer and extend to the community of Ellerton my full support for their efforts and equally the community of South District and Shorey Village, *et cetera*.

The Government has a stated policy. We have stated it in here since January 22nd and we will maintain that policy and ensure that the funds are used judiciously. There is no occasion for grand-standing and "pom-pasetting". I have nothing to defend and least of all the blowing of \$30 million. I will ensure that what comes within my responsibility will be judiciously and usefully spent among the communities in Barbados. I invite any Member of Parliament to do like the Honourable Member for St. George South and put pen to paper as he did and indicate that this is a particular area where we need assistance and we will work towards that assistance. If we do not have the funds in Government, we will have to find the funds from elsewhere. That is part of the process of community development planning.

Mr. L. R. TULL: On a point of elucidation, Sir, I have not said anything about Government providing any funds for the facilities of which I spoke. The Honourable Member knows nothing of what he speaks. The public baths are being...

Aside.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I am elucidating, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Make the point. Make the point that you are making.

Mr. L. R. TULL: This is what I said to the Ellerton people for the Government to hand over the disused public baths to them, not to give them any money to refurbish them, Sir. He knows that, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, let me just make the point again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow this Resolution to broaden to the point where we forget that we are dealing with land acquisition from George Holder. I am sure that we need to get very close to that point.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, can I make a final point on this? The policy of the Ministry is to facilitate handing over those properties where there is a perceived need. You do not just hand over the properties. I have said to the Honourable Member for St. George South that the analysis is being carried out by the social workers. I cannot carry it out and the letter he sent had three lines in it. It has not explained to me how many young people are involved or that there is a need. Once that work is carried out and it is established that that Government property can be properly used it will be handed over. You just do not pick up properties and hand them out to groups willy-nilly. He has to understand that is part of the process.

Therefore, Sir, the policy has been stated and, as I have said, we will offer whatever assistance that we can in ensuring that these groups of young people are given the facilities to carry out their community programmes. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Resolution before the House concerns itself with the sale of Government property. In this instance, Sir, it is a piece of land on which was formerly located a public convenience. But I fear that the House may be in the process of straining at a gnat, Sir, but swallowing a whale. If ever there was a time when there was a need for clarity in relation to Government's policy on the sale of property, Sir, and if ever there was a time for clarity as regards the mechanisms by which the sale of Government property is used, it is now. I say that without going outside of the bounds of this Resolution which deals with the sale of Government property and I say that very advisedly.

The Financial Administration and Audit Act, Chapter 5 refers to the process by which the sale of some aspects of Government property has to be handled. Of course, Government's real property has to be sold by way of the Crown. Whenever Government is selling real property like land, it has to come to the House. But under the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Sir, Cabinet may draft rules in circumstances where Government is proposing to sell other property, securities, stamps, shares, and whatever else. The particular difficulty in this particular matter, Sir, and why I am raising it now is that although Cabinet may make rules, Sir, when one peruses the rules consequential upon the Financial Administration and Audit Act, there has never yet been a set of rules prepared by Cabinet regarding the sale of, for example, Government shares.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am raising the matter because Section 39(1)(f) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act provides the process by which Government shares are

to be sold. Cabinet may make the rules and it also says, Mr. Speaker, that the rules drafted in relation to the sale of Government property in that respect will be subject to a negative resolution.

Sir, I am saying that I am very anxious for the whole matter of the disposal of Government property, whether it be land or any other aspect of Government property, to be so governed as to allow all matters pertaining to the sale of Government property to proceed without unnecessary dispute and to proceed without unnecessary heat and too little light being brought to bear on the particular matter. 1.35 p.m.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we can have a situation even now where some aspects of Government property, particularly the shares, as governed by section 39(1)(f) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act is being handled without the benefit of the rules that the Act requires. I want to see the rules, as required by the law, drafted and put in place to govern the disposal of Government property other than land. It is very important. I say this, because in the absence of the rules Government obviously has to be using some prerogative power and we already know where this debate about the use of Government's prerogative power is leading us.

The point I am making is this, Sir, that a lot of purpose could be brought to bear on some of the action that Government is now proceeding on if the rules governing the process – for example, the sale of Government's shares – could be set out such that if those of us who have been elected by the people to administer the people's business have any objections to the process, we can do what the law requires, we can bring a negative resolution to talk about the rules.

I want to say this in general. I would be happy if Government is proposing to enter into the disposal of Government's shares as a matter of policy – and I have said in my response to the Mini-Budget that I expect that in the context of our time the Government will, like Mr. Trump did, or Plantations Limited did when it was short of cash, it will sell shares, it will sell assets. I have no difficulty on this side with the Government selling assets, but I want the whole business of the sale of the assets to be governed by law, to be governed by what the legislation provides for, and that my relationship to it should be what the law requires. That if I am unhappy with what the Government is doing, then I should bring a negative Resolution as provided for by section 39(1)(ii). I am anxious for this to start to happen, that if the Government of Barbados wants to sell 20 properties it should set up a privatisation office, because the sale of Government property is a complex matter that requires expertise. It must not be done in an *ad hoc* manner, it has to be done in a structured way. I want to see rules, Mr. Speaker, that if the

Government wants to sell our assets to whomever, that I can be satisfied that the public interest is being protected, particularly where those assets which are being sold are monopolies.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to analyse the British experience in the sale of all its assets, the Government through the sponsoring Minister always retain what is called a golden share, to make sure that the Government, having disposed of the property, can still have a determination in what those enterprises, many of them in monopoly positions, continue to do after they have been sold. That is why the rules are so necessary, and if this matter of Government property is now to occupy such a central part of Government policy, let us deal with it properly and within the four corners of what the law provides. Therefore, I have to ask the Government directly, in the absence of any rules, as required by section 39(1)(f) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, what has been guiding Government in its various transactions with the entities to whom Government purports to sell Government property. What has been guiding Government? I really would like to know this. There must be a policy and I am asking what is the policy. I want to be sure that the rules are so structured that there can be no public confusion about the question as to whether or not property is sold at its proper value.

We get ourselves in this country into too much confusion, when we can handle these things up front. I want to see rules that protect us, whether it is that Government or us soon, in relation to the sale of public property that would not have us, every time public property is sold, to be castigated because of the suspicion that the property may have been sold at an undervalued price or something like that. The rules would circumvent all these kinds of things.

I am asking, therefore, that even in the midst of our deliberations week to week, 28 big men and women, concerning ourselves with the sale of latrines and so on, let us remember that the Government of this country is also selling things that are more expensive, more valuable than latrines, and in the same way there are rules governing the sale of latrines let us make sure that they must be required by laws governing those other things.

My intervention, therefore, is to enquire of Government if it is the intention of Government to comply with section 39(1)(f) of the Financial Administration and Audit Act in relation to putting in place rules governing the sale of Government securities, because I believe that in the context of the prevailing economic circumstances, where the sale of Government property has now become an

intrinsic part of Government's economic policy, that the drafting of such rules could pre-empt and obviate a lot of the unnecessary controversy that can creep into a matter on which, from my point of view, there ought to be less controversy than there is at present.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I think the intervention by the Honourable Member for St. Peter has some interesting points but not really applicable to this particular acquisition. He is arguing for the establishment of rules for the sale of Government property other than land, because that is already covered. The public must clearly understand that there are rules which are applicable for the sale and disposal of Government property, which rules are applied by this administration. There is a procedure.

As far as the sale of shares is concerned, obviously there would be need for some and one has to look at that. It is a new phenomenon and I would take the point that we ought to look at it to ensure that everything is done in a proper manner and that the Government gets the best advantage out of that.

Now, Sir, let me make the point that when a piece of property comes up which is on the market for sale, the procedure, as, for example, with a public convenience, which is followed is that the property is advertised and people are invited to make bids. The Land Valuation Department is asked to provide a valuation on the property and generally speaking the Ministry of Housing and Lands, which has responsibility for this, is guided by the Land Valuation Department. In addition to that, there is a committee which the Honourable Member is aware of, the Standing Valuation Committee, which is made up of representatives from the Ministry of Finance, the Land Valuation Department and the Ministry of Housing, basically to represent the Government's interest in any disputed matter when it comes to a price, because the Government does not necessarily accept a price which a seller is proposing to the Government. So, we do have to bargain. The Minister is not involved in those discussions. It is done by members of the Public Service, and when they have reached an agreement, it is then that the Minister comes into play. He then has the responsibility of taking the matter to Cabinet for approval and bringing it to this Honourable Chamber for agreement. So that procedure is a very transparent procedure. I think this has to be known. I would not want any Honourable Member to give the public the impression that the sale and disposal of Government property as we presently do is done behind a corner, at the beach or in some guest house somewhere. It is done in the Ministry by public servants and the procedure is very clearly laid down as far as this is concerned. It is even also covered under the procedures

laid down under the Land Acquisition Act. There are a whole range of procedures there.
1.45 p.m.

I would take the Honourable Member's point that we need now to look at procedures for the sale of other property but whereas there is a connection, I really think that he has been forcing an issue in an area where there is no need, because I am sure that as far as Government is concerned we would respond favourably to those suggestions. I thank you.

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

ORDER NO. 12 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SEAVIEW ST. JAMES FOR ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sir, this is a simple resolution and has to do with the acquisition of 71.6 square metres of land at Seaview, St. James for road improvement.

On August 24, 1989, Cabinet agreed that an area of land at Seaview, St. James which was utilised for road construction should be acquired from the owner, Mrs. Alberta Worrell. This is one of these areas where we are seeking to tidy up work which was already done. The road was improved but the acquisition had not been completed. We could not conclude the acquisition by private treaty, and as a result we had to go the route of acquiring the land through the recourses of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228.

The notices in respect of this compulsory acquisition were duly published and we are now at a point where we are seeking parliamentary approval for the acquisition of this 71.6 square metres of land at Seaview, St. James for road improvement. Honourable Members would have copies of the plot to show where this area of land is.

I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I heard correctly, the Honourable Minister of Lands indicated that the work has already been done and that it is just a question of regularising or rectifying the situation. However, Sir, there are a number of legitimate concerns that the residents who make use of that road and who live around that road have raised to me in very recent times.

There used to be a time when the road was very much what we in Barbadian parlance call a "cart-road". It was so structured by Government as to become a very

nicely paved Barber Green road, if you permit me to use that expression, Sir. However, at the point when the road was paved leading some 100 metres inland from Seaview Main Road to the residence of an attorney called Mr. Mayers, the road was elevated in the process and what has happened now, Sir, is that when rain falls it flows off the road onto some lands on the west adjoining the road resulting in some undesirable lakes which harbour mosquitoes much to the chagrin of the surrounding residents.

Interestingly, too, Sir, is the question of the land owner's own position. I made it my business to engage the land owner, Mrs. Worrell, in a conversation on Saturday. Even though the Honourable Minister has indicated that the property was acquired by notice, I know that in these matters notice in the *Official Gazette* and notice in the newspapers would construe notice to the world. What the lady is saying is that she is completely in the dark in that notice was not served on her personally. In my view, if there is one land owner surrendering her property to Government then notice to her in a direct way should have been served. So, here is a case, Sir, where the land owner has lost land and did not know in what circumstances, only that she saw a road being built.

Clearly, too, Sir, as the Honourable Member for St. George South raised earlier, the question of compensation is an issue in that she does not know how much compensation she is entitled to and, naturally, when that compensation will be paid. However, Sir, even if we take the assurance of Government that some day she will be paid, the fact remains that after this nicely paved road has been constructed there is a problem right below it of flooding and the related problems that are caused by flooding. I would like the Honourable Minister for Transport and Works or the Minister of Health to visit the area – because these things affect their Ministries – and do something so that the problems that are now being faced by the residents thereby can be solved.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is quite fair to say that the lady concerned was not aware of what is going on. The files here show very clearly that the matter was being handled by her attorney. The government did not appoint the attorney concerned. She has an attorney and presumably if there is communication between the Minister of Housing and Lands and the attorney for Mrs. Worrell then it would seem to me that it would not be fair really to say that there was no communication. It is the responsibility of the attorney. As I look across over there, there are a barrage of attorneys.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The way in which you relate to your clients is not a matter for the Government. It is a matter for yourself and the client. I don't think it is really

fair to say that the Government has not told the lady anything. The file is replete with letters which have been communication between her attorney and the Ministry on this particular matter.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The fact of the matter is that this matter has been dealt with in a humane manner and we have tried to deal with it as solicitously as possible, but again as the previous resolution relating to Rock Hall in St. Andrew, there were problems concerning the property, the will, the line marks and a whole range of things – the usual problems which you normally get in a situation with properties in Barbados. All of these things have got to be straightened out and all of these things have been communicated to the lady's attorney-at-law. Whereas one understands the criticism, it is not necessarily a criticism of the Government but maybe a criticism of how lawyers operate in Barbados. I thank you, Sir.

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

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Are there any private Members' bills?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that brings us to the end of Government business. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 19, 1991 at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. M. A. KING: I beg to second that.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: I wish to let you know, Sir, that I said I would consult in relation to the no-confidence motion. Those consultations have not been concluded as yet but I have taken the amendments which have been suggested. I hope during the course of the day, before we have left the dining room or, certainly, during the course of the week, to have an amended motion that would be acceptable to the Opposition and to Your Honour the Speaker.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: No shouting. I am hearing the Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. H. deB. FORDE: Thank you, Sir. In those circumstances, I would wish to give notice of it in time that it could be circulated so that the House could accommodate the motion next week on the adjourned date. I believe it is of such importance that I would wish to give you notice that we would wish to have the matter covered by the electronic media with the leave of the House and with your leave, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I need to put this matter straight. The amendments or suggestions as to how the motion should come did not originate with the Government. It is purely a matter that when resolutions come before this Chamber we sit down and try to get them as closely as possible suitable and adaptable for debate in this Chamber. Therefore, the consultations that we are having are based on just some kind of adjustment to get that Resolution in proper order.

The second point is this, that since the Honourable Member has sent in his Resolution to date, I did not nullify the Resolution as one for the Order Paper completely but at the ending of this day, if we could come to a conclusion, we would have had it on today's Paper so that still holds. The Honourable Member is assured that his Resolution would be in time for Tuesday.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that you have clarified to some extent the attempt which was obviously about to be made which would give the impression that we, over here – let me speak for myself. I saw a Resolution in the newspaper and I heard it on the radio that that was the Resolution that is coming. I want to make it clear that I have not seen any resolution yet because I have people...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: No interruptions.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: I do not want the electronic, the print media, any in-between media or the black and white media to get any wrong information about any resolution. When the Resolution is distributed – I feel that when resolutions are coming to the House for debate that they should, at least, come to the Speaker and be distributed to Members before they are given to the Press. But then, again, they may have some intrinsic value.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: The Letter of Intent is not the business of this House until it is laid. Their resolution is a resolution in this House. Their resolution is not a Letter of Intent. I do not want to get into any controversy, Sir. I just want to make it clear that no impression must be given that we amended any resolution by the Opposition. That is the

point I want to make crystal clear. We do not want to amend any resolution they bring. Bring the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet let me say that...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. The House has not been adjourned. Every Honourable Member has a right to speak. Has the Honourable Member for St. Michael West concluded?

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, it is important that we establish that nobody in here can send away anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we should get on. Make the point.

I only want to make one other observation. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West has raised the question of electronic broadcast. I have to suggest to the Honourable Member that he is aware of the procedures that are adopted for such to take place. I think it is fair to say that kind of machinery is still in operation. I think it has worked well in the past. I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition to explore that opportunity.

The other point I want to raise is that for some time I have been very concerned about matters that come to me that have been reported in the papers to have been accepted by myself because if it is said that there is a resolution in the House as such, then it is giving the impression that I have already sanctioned it. Resolutions, as a matter of courtesy to myself, should first be given approval and thereafter....

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with the general public. I am the Presiding Officer of this Chamber. What takes place outside is another matter. Therefore, I want to suggest...

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not making a rule or a resolution. I am only throwing it out for the safety of information which, obviously, would be conflicting. If a resolution comes to this Chamber and it then has to be amended, then two impressions are given such as the Honourable Member for Christ Church West in this one.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 19, 1991 at 12 o'clock noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
2.05 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Confirmation of Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday September 17, 1991.....	1109
--	------

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER	1109
-------------------	------

Accounts and Statements for the months of July
and August, 1991.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD	1109
--------------------------------	------

1. Duties, Taxes and Other Payments
(Exemption) (No. 9) Order, 1991.
2. Letter of Intent under the Proposed
Adjustment Programme between Barbados
and the International Monetary Fund.
3. Report of the Accountant General for the
financial year 1990-91.
4. The Civil Establishment (General)
(Amendment) Order, 1991.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	1110
-------------------------	------

Report of the Air Transport Licensing Authority
for the year 1990.

Hon. N. K. SIMMONS.....	1110
-------------------------	------

The Annual Reports of the Commissioner
of Police for the financial years 1988 and
1989.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	1110
-------------------------	------

1. Resolution to approve the Civil
Establishment (General) (Amendment)
Order, 1991.

2. Resolution to approve the guarantee by the
Government of Barbados of repayment to
the International Bank for Reconstruction
and Development of Loans made to the
Caribbean Development Bank for
financing investment projects.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. H. deB. FORDE	1110
-------------------------	------

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. G. W. PAYNE	1110
-----------------------	------

1. Question re the number of persons laid off
from the Public service.
2. Question re settlement of outstanding
termination benefits due to former public
employees.
3. Question re policy of Government with
respect to new appointments to the Public
service.
4. Question re repairs to public roads in St.
Andrew.
5. Question re policy of Government
regarding Walkers Bridge in St. Andrew.
6. Question re introduction of transfer system
on bus service.
7. Question re extension of natural gas
supply to various areas of St. Andrew and
St. James.
8. Question re Government's policy on the
sale of its rental units.
9. Question re severe flooding at Shorey
Village, St. Andrew after recent heavy
rainfall.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

His Hon. T. C. ESTWICK	1112
------------------------------	------

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES.....	1112
Suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44.	

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 8 – RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND TO CONSTRUCT A CAR PARK AND
PLAYING AREA FOR THE NEW ST.
MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE CITY
OF BRIDGETOWN..... 1112

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1112, 1114, 1115; Mr.
L. R. Tull, 1113; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 1113.

ORDER NO. 9 – PUBLICATION IN THE
OFFICIAL GAZETTE TO DECLARE THE
ABANDONMENT OF THE ACQUISITION
OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT BALLS IN
CHRIST CHURCH..... 1115

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1115.

ORDER NO. 10 – COMPULSORY ACQUISITION
OF LAND AT BOVELL'S GAP,
SPEIGHTSTOWN IN ST. PETER FOR
HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT..... 1115

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1115.

ORDER NO. 11 – SALE OF CROWN LANDS TO
GEORGE HOLDER AT ROCK HALL IN ST.
ANDREW 1116

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1116, 1121; Mr. L. R. Tull,
1116, 1117; Mr. G. W. Payne, 1117; Hon.
D. J. H. Thompson, 1118, 1119; Mr. O. S.
Arthur, 1119.

ORDER NO. 12 – COMPULSORY ACQUISITION
OF LAND AT SEAVIEW, ST. JAMES FOR
ROAD CONSTRUCTION..... 1121

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 1121; Mr. R. C. Eastmond,
1121

ADJOURNMENT..... 1122

Hon. B. M. Taitt, 1122, 1123; Mr. H. deB.
Forde, 1122, 1123.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Mr. O. S. (St. Peter)
BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
EASTMOND, Mr. R. C. (St. James North)
ESTWICK, His Hon. T. C. (Christ Church East)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)
PAYNE, Mr. G. W. (St. Andrew)
TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)
THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John)
TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South)