

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1991 - 96

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 7, 1993

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock on Tuesday, December 7, 1993.

PRESENT

His Honour L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P., (Speaker)

His Honour T. C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., LL.B., (Deputy Speaker)

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), J.P., (Prime Minister, Minister of Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)

Mr. H. deB. FORDE, Q.C., M.A., LL.B.

Hon. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B. (Hons.), (Minister of Foreign Affairs and Deputy Leader of the House)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Q.C., B.A., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and Leader of the House)

Hon. M. A. KING, Q.C., LL.B., (Attorney General, Minister of Justice and Minister for CARICOM Affairs)

Hon. W. O. FRANKLIN, A.I.C., M.I.A.S., J.P., (Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce)

Mr. H. A. BLACKMAN, B.Sc. (Econ.)

Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M.

Hon. C. V. WALKER, J.P., (Minister of Health)

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. E. E. GREAVES, G.C.M., B.A., Ed.M., (Minister of Tourism, Culture and International Transport)

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, J.P.

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

Mr. J. O. TUDOR, J.P.

Hon. D. W. BOWEN, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries)

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 the Meeting of Tuesday, 23rd November, 1993.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of the proceedings of the Meeting to which you made reference, that is, the Meeting of the 23rd November, 1993 have been circulated. I move, Sir, that they be taken as read and be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations let these Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Right Honourable Prime Minister and with the command of the Cabinet I lay the following papers, Sir:

The Annual Report of the Barbados Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1991.

The Annual Report and Accounts for the National Insurance Board for the year 1992.

Guarantees granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A to the following:

- (a) American Benefactor Insurance Limited.
- (b) Boulevard Insurance Company Barbados Limited.
- (c) East River Indemnity Company Barbados Ltd.
- (d) PAN Providence Insurance Company Limited.
- (e) Scottish International Insurance Company Limited.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Order No. 1 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bridge Road, St. Michael for road improvement.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which we would want to regularize in respect of acquisitions of land at Bridge Road for the improvement of the highway in that area. You would recall, Sir, that from time to time over the last year or two we have come here with Resolutions to complete the acquisition of land in this area. Unfortunately this small area was left out and we are now seeking to regularize this. The area is about 13.8 square metres and was utilized in the course of the construction of the new Bridge Road.

Acquisition proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act were initiated in 1983 in respect of 21 parcels of land required for this project. You would recall that in the course of my introductions on previous acquisitions it was pointed out that certain discrepancies in the survey work came to light during the course of the acquisitions and it meant that we had to make a number of adjustments to the

original acquisition as matters came to light, so much so that instead of an original 238.28 square metres which was thought to be acquired only a small area measuring 13.8 square metres was in fact utilized.

We are seeking now to regularize this. The survey plan which shows this area is available for perusal by Honourable Members. As I said we are now seeking to have this particular matter regularized as far as this acquisition is concerned and I am therefore moving, Sir, that the Resolution to acquire 13.8 square metres of land which was utilized in the construction of the new Bridge Road do now pass.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WALRONS, CHRIST CHURCH FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Order No. 2 was called - To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Walronds, Christ Church for road construction.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker this is another matter which we are seeking to regularize because some years ago Government constructed a road at Walronds, Christ Church and in the process of carrying out that work some 184.6 square meters of land belonging to the estate of Joseph Best was utilized. 12.25 p.m.

The acquisition process was put in place and the notices for the acquisition were duly published. Again this matter is one which we are seeking to have regularised because the land has already been used in the construction of the road and we are now seeking to have the approval given. I am therefore moving that the Resolution to acquire this 184.6 square metres of land at Walronds for road construction be now passed.

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

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have made repeated calls to the Government to supply a copy of the plan before these matters come before this Chamber, the reason being that one could acquaint oneself with the area and make some meaningful input wherever possible. I have just got a plan here but here again I know the area very well and I have no difficulty with the Minister's explanation but I take issue with the addendum as set out in this Resolution.

The addendum states that the purpose for this acquisition is for the purpose of road construction. I am sure that a better form of words could have been found to explain this matter. The addendum does not really square with what the Minister has said. I am going to try as far as possible to put this whole question of the Walronds acquisition into proper perspective.

I am aware that Government has built roads in the Walronds area. These roads were built during the time of the Barbados Labour Party. It was a tenantry. I was there up to this morning. There are areas

Asides.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was up there because as a Parliamentarian who takes his work very seriously indeed it is my duty to go and see and establish for myself what we are dealing with in this Parliament. That is what I am in here for.

Mr. Speaker, the question of Government going into tenancies and providing roads and facilities is one which has got to be reviewed otherwise you are going to find a situation where, as is obtained at the moment, a lot of problems relating to the beneficiaries of the roads will arise.

Mr. Speaker, in Walronds which I said was a tenantry, roads were provided but there is a particular problem. The problem is that once Government provided the roads the landlords, that is, the persons who owned the land, have proceeded to ask the tenants to pay, in most cases, an unfair price for the land and that is the issue. When Government acquires land, as in this case, in Walronds, pays the landlords for their land and then provide roads at a cost to the taxpayers, what in fact the Government is doing is enhancing or improving that particular area.

I am saying that I feel very concerned when I am hearing from time to time persons in those tenancies, like the one in Walronds, complaining that landlords have been asking them to pay in excess of \$5.00 per square foot. Government must, and I am going to put this to the present Government, I am going to invite the Minister of Housing to make sure before the Government decides to go in and provide roads to make an order which would state that at the time the cost of land would be X, Y, or Z. If it is \$2.00 or \$3.00 at that time without the provision of a road, the order should state clearly that the landlord should not ask anything more than \$2.00 or \$3.00. That is the way forward. I am not satisfied that the manner in which we deal with this matter is satisfactory. It is far from satisfactory and it is leading to lots of disorder and discontent that it would be best for us to avoid at this point of our development.

I feel that once the roads have been put in at a cost to the taxpayers that the landlord should not benefit. In the case of Walronds ...

Mr. SPEAKER: For the sake of clarity, are you saying that there is a charge of \$5.00 per square foot to the people in Walronds?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, persons in that area that I know very well have been asked to ...

Mr. SPEAKER: What I wanted to clarify is that since we were dealing with Walronds, if that was a specific charge that is clearly outlined that what you are saying is the cost per square foot pertains to the people at Walronds. That is all I was asking.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am making a general and specific point. What I am saying is that I am aware that some of the tenants who live in that area are being asked to pay \$5.00 and more for land that was developed by Government and this seems to be the general pattern. I am saying it is wrong and the answer to it could be an order made by the Minister, stating clearly that the landlord should not sell at a price above what it was before the improvement took place. I think that would be easier.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is another way of doing it. You could acquire the tenantry and then try to dispose of the plots. I feel that is too tedious.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in St. Michael North West there are areas similar to this one where the Government has put in roads and are yet to put in other roads and I am saying that it will not be long before you hear similar complaints. I am saying the time is now when Government can move in and act. Everyday I am hearing residents complaining. 12.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand. I have to be a little bit careful. Did you say St. Michael North West?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Sir. It is a similar situation because persons have told me that it is the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you sure that it is in St. Michael North West?

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can identify the area. I am saying that right in the area at the bottom of the University where Government built those houses...the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister knows

of which I speak...a road is needed. The road is a rough road and there are tenants there. I am saying that when Government proceeds and comes to the Chamber, as I hope it will do to acquire the land to improve the road, that Government will take my advice and issue an Order so that residents will not have to pay an unfair price. At the same time this causes misery. This is serious. It is the human element that one is concerned about here because it is all right talking about going to a lawyer, but that involves money, Mr. Speaker. Families are disrupted psychologically. This affects people when they get up in the morning just before Christmas and hear that a landlord is speaking in terms of a figure which they can ill-afford.

I am saying that I want Government to look at this in this way. I am not seeking to raise any matter which people may think will be highlighted at this point. I am talking about a general policy and how best we can alleviate these problems. I think from this side and as one who is au fait in these matters that I should put to Government alternative suggestions which it could endorse as a policy and which would find favour with everybody. Otherwise, you will find a situation where people are going to run to a lawyer from looking at the Act to see how best we can amend it. We can see Parliament being visited with another Resolution possibly where we may very well have to come here to deal with.

I am saying to the Minister who introduced this Resolution to look at this seriously.

Aside,

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: No, no. I am talking about the future where people can come in now and say that we want to have Government put this tenantry under the Tenantry Development Act. So why go that way? I am hearing all different things being put up. I think that sometimes Government is criticised unfairly. I am not seeking to score any political point on this. I am looking at this realistically and I hope that Government will take my advice on this. It augurs well for the stability of the country especially in those depressed areas. Let me say this. One thing we must all remember and note here that the poorer people live in those areas which are regarded as depressed areas and we do not want that around. It has happened in Lower Estate.

There is another point which I want the Government to look at too. In this whole thing of road improvement although it has not happened in Walronds, I know that between No. 1 and No. 2 there is need for a road to come through to link up at the back of the eastern end which will butt and bound the Hopefield Land. I am aware the road was laid out in Lower Estate like the one put in at Walronds, but you have a situation where persons were

allowed - I am choosing my words carefully - and now they have put houses in the path of the road. As I said quite clearly, between Walronds No. 1 and 2 to the southern side and one to the northern side, you can link to the eastern end. The road has a turntable. I am asking the Government to try and link that so as to avoid any landlord putting houses there in the footpath. If that is allowed, it will pose a problem and then Government is involved in unnecessary spending of money in times like these when we can ill afford it. Because you will have now to incur the cost of removing the houses and resiting them and that will be at the cost of Government. If Government wants to provide for improvement, then Government as a general rule usually undertakes to incur the cost of removing and resiting.

Sir, I am saying that I cannot as a taxpayer and the taxpayers of Barbados should not be made to pay this unreasonable price when it can be spotted and corrected up front. These are things that I have seen from time to time. I do not think that we need to have this. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. It would not be beyond an unscrupulous and unreasonable landlord to go and do that, although the very law is there and they should know the law. The Chief Town Planner should know the law and I think he knows the law, because in a case like this as in Walronds any vacant lot once it is a tenantry and it was developed by the Government or by the landlord, the landlord should seek permission from the Chief Town Planner to dispose of that lot. But we have seen cases where Government has tried to have an orderly development and this is prevented because a landlord would have been granted permission by the Chief Town Planner, since he is responsible too, and he would have seen that. I think it is the duty of the Chief Town Planner to insist that the house which falls in the path of the road is removed or resited.

I am saying that and I am calling on the Chief Town Planner. I do not want the Minister to be involved in this. This is a duty. That is why we delegate certain responsibilities to officers. I am calling on that Department to see that it does not happen in Walronds and where it has happened like in cases at Lower Estate that this is corrected and save us all the unnecessary harassment by people who want to score political points. It does not get us anywhere at this time of our development. We have come far and, as I have said, there is time for politicking. I want to make this point quite clear. I do not have to politic to make a point. I am only going to say this to the Government that like Walronds I am in total agreement with what has been done to provide the people with a road and I am also supporting Government in its effort to come and correct this. As I said, please look a little further because I can see the signs there where people will seek to embarrass the Government. I do not have to worry because you know when in Opposition you like everything to come down

on the head of Government. But I say that I still have a national responsibility and I would like to say that we can afford some of these things so that we can have some normalcy in some areas and avoid these unnecessary criticisms.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister will take my point. It is coming from this side and I know that in some cases Government sometimes is reluctant to take the advice when it comes from the Opposition benches. It is a matter for the Government. All I will say is that a word to the wise is enough on this occasion. I would hope that we can have the Walronds area developed. It is a nice area and, as I said, we need to do a bit more. I think just to the north eastern side of Walronds going onto the area of Walronds Village itself, there is a road that can be cut from the No. 1 right onto that road. There are a couple of houses in there which should also benefit from improved road conditions. After all, they are people too.

All I am saying is that when you go into an area I think that you should look at it so that you can develop it properly. Do not half develop it. As soon as Government fails to carry out its plan, because in some cases Government plan a project, but there are people who want to put pressure on the Government and they will do all sorts of things that are wrong in order to frustrate Government. As a politician, I do not want to be dealing with matters that I think are simple and straightforward. I am saying that, when you are building the road from Walronds No. 2 into No. 1, it can go right down into Walronds onto the East/West Road. That will provide the residents who are living in the same Waldronds tenantry who also are entitled to the same road improvement and then we will not have this sort of thing where people are saying you have given this and you have not given that. But, as I said, Government is operating under certain constraints. I hope that Government will look at it and at least provide the plan, so that when money becomes available this could be done. 12,45 p.m.

Getting back to the Addendum, Sir, when I saw the Resolution I was tempted to ask the question, how come Government is in a position to build a new road when in fact there were other areas... For instance, I had asked about providing a road in Lower Burneys for 50 tenants and I was told in 1991 that Government had no money. I am only asking the Ministry, and the Government as a policy, to wherever possible go into the tenancies and see where you can develop and come with a plan so that we can have acquisitions, if the Government does not have the money, that future governments could take the decision to develop them. I would hope, when the Government does this, that the Government remember Lower Burneys.

I am supporting this Resolution, but I want a trade-off too. I hope the Minister will hear my plea, because I cannot force his hand. I am asking the Government to consider Lower Burneys where 50 people cannot get out when the rain falls. The former representative had promised, a survey was taken, to look at the land and provide the road. I am only begging for a little piece. The people up there are people too. The Minister is nodding and I am sure that he will help me.

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: And in Rockfield. I have mentioned St. Michael North West. I drive through it and I am asking that we have development so that the people would feel happier in being able to get out of their houses. I will support the Minister when he comes to Rockfield. I have always supported him with developments, anything at all for the people of St. Lucy and in St. Michael North West. I am hoping he will hear my plea and go a little eastward. Come across and help his friend who has been supporting the Resolutions from time to time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L. L. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Resolution insofar as it helps to implement the policy of Government generally to improve the lot of people living in areas that are somewhat depressed at some point and at some time. Like the Honourable Member who just sat, I believe there is need for the Ministry of Housing and Lands to make available to residents of these areas which Government has gone into and has made improvements by road, by water, by natural gas, whatever it is, information which informs them of their inalienable right, their right under the Freehold Tenancies Act to purchase that lot of land as long as the area is a tenantry. It is also their right, Mr. Speaker, that if they are unable to purchase the land, even if the landlord wants them to purchase that land, to remain on that land through the security of tenure under the Act, as long as they pay their rents. They have a right to remain on that tenantry until they can come to some form of understanding over the price that may be offered.

In supporting this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I am only highlighting the fact that the Ministry of Housing and Lands, in my view, should take this opportunity, because there are concerns which people have, to enlighten all residents, who would in any way fall under this bit of legislation of the Freehold Tenancies Act, what are their rights and what are their privileges under this Act I think, Sir, that even in the matter which is very much in the limelight at the moment it would be very helpful if tenants and residents can have this information which tells them what they can and what they cannot do when landlords want to be in any way unscrupulous in their demands for either purchase price or rent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to this Resolution.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, obviously I am going to be supporting the Resolution, but there was a point raised by the Honourable Member for St Michael South East which on the face of it sounds all right, but I just wanted to put in the record that there would be a constitutional difficulty, it seems to me, if an order such as the one he is proposing were made.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order. The Honourable Member has given way. Under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act an Order is made that the land price should not exceed 10 cents per square foot, so it could be done in that way as well.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: That is agricultural tenantry land. There is a difference in that particular Act, as I remember it, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the other tenancies, and it is very important therefore that we have a very clear picture, because persons reading tomorrow that this is suggested might become confused as to whether it is possible, and might in fact accuse the Government of not, by a stroke of the pen, bringing in something that seems on the face of it simple. The fact is that it is still not possible in Barbados at the present moment to say to someone what price they must sell their land at. What is possible is a development order to tax persons after they have sold the land after the Government has put in the facilities.

Aside.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: You know about that. You can speak about that. My lawyer told me I must not mention that name. The Honourable Member who is doing this measure will be able to speak to the issue he is raising.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put that into the record. It is a fact that many persons with tenantry land, on attempting to sell it, put prices on the land that are not commensurate with what is reasonable. We know about that in our respective constituencies. We have the small tenantry areas which suddenly have become very expensive. What I have been doing with my constituents, when they have come to me and the price is exorbitant in my view, I do not seek to make a public spectacle of the issue, because I do not believe that there is a great amount of politics in what in essence is a commercial activity, but what I do is to have a discussion with the landlord, or with the lawyer representing the landlord, and point out the inequality and the immorality in trying to gouge people who have been tenants on a piece of land for 30 and 40 years. 12.55 p.m.

I have to say that in my Constituency so far most of the landlords, including one of the largest, have come to a reasonable conclusion. I have actually walked through the Constituency with one of the landlords and pointed out that there has to be a distribution between those who were functioning as commercial entities on the tenantry land and those who are living as prior residents. I have to say that that particular landlord who is not known for a soft heart in any respect did find some sense in what I was saying.

Needless to say, I had drawn to his attention that failure to agree with me would result in some other discussions. But I just want to put on record that it would require a constitutional amendment or at least constitutional action. So if the Honourable Member is saying that such an Order would find favour for constitutional action on his side, even then one would caution that you have to be very careful how you are amending the Constitution to interfere with what is essentially a private transaction. That is all I wish to say, Sir.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad to hear the intervention of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East. I cannot agree with him more that in situations - and I am not talking of a situation where an area of land has been declared as a tenantry - but in situations where the Government or a Minister of Government has taken a decision to build a road in an area of land which would open up possibilities for development, some kind of development duty or something of that nature, in accordance with the law, should be imposed on that particular development or that particular developer.

In sitting and listening to the Honourable Member from the Other Side who intervened on this matter, I wonder where he was in 1985 or 1986 when a matter was raised in here with respect to a development in Trents in St. Lucy where the then Minister for Transport and Works built a long road through his land which has opened up large areas of his land for development purposes at public expense. The Honourable Member at that time defended that particular development.

Mr. DeL.O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I am sorry. I am so accustomed to his being in here that I did not realise he had lost his seat.

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: The Honourable Member did not object

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I just want to set the record straight because when Hansard is read I do not want anyone to have the wrong impression. I did not...

Mr. SPEAKER: You see the difficulty in broadening a Resolution beyond its parameters. Now you have allowed the Honourable Member to introduce a wider scope. I have been cautioning Members to stick very close to the Resolution itself. I don't think I will allow the Honourable Member to develop that point beyond just passing reference. It will not be debated at any length.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling but that is not the point. I am just concerned that the Honourable Member has made a statement that is not true and I am asking the Honourable Member to withdraw it.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member could tell me which part of my speech was not true I am willing to withdraw it.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be contentious. The Honourable Member said he was referring to this Honourable Member who spoke from this side and I was the only one. He says that I did not support...

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: I said you supported it.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, the record will show that that is not true. I did not support it and I would hope that the Honourable Member would withdraw those remarks which I take strong objection to. They are false.

Mr. SPEAKER: In a case like this, I don't have to do much because it is in reference to official records of the House. If there is going to be any dispute I will ask that that particular record be produced in order to settle it. I am not going to allow any backward and forwarding in this matter. It is either correct or incorrect.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: All I am saying, Sir, just to put this beyond any doubt, is that the Honourable Member was a Member of the Cabinet and the Cabinet and the then Government of Barbados took a position on this. I remember reading the records and the general view of the Government then was that there was nothing wrong which was done.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order. That is not true. The Government did not defend it I was a Member of the Cabinet then but the Cabinet did not take any decision stating that there was nothing wrong. That is absolutely untrue.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: That matter came up in this Honourable Chamber. It is a matter of record, Sir. I am just baiting the Honourable Member. I want the Honourable

Member to come out and continue to deny this because I will go for the record. Not today, I will use it on another occasion. There was a debate in this Honourable Chamber in 1986 or late 1985 and the records are there. I have the records at home. I have more than a passing interest in this matter and I knew that the time would have come when I would have had an opportunity with it.

I am saying that the then Minister of Transport took up Government funds and built a road through his property and on both sides of his property there is potential for development. The Honourable Member would have the whole country to believe that when this Democratic Labour Party raised the matter it was lying and was trying to show up the then Honourable Member in a bad light. They tried to make it look as if the road was in a tenantry and we were causing all sorts of unnecessary trouble. The road of which we complained was nowhere in any tenantry whatsoever. Up to this day there are no houses in that area, except one at the very end.

We said at that very same time that it would have been easier and cheaper to have moved the house from there and brought it over into the developed tenantry but the then Member decided it was better in his interest to put the road right out to that house at the end, over 300 or 400 yards in the distance. So I agree with the Honourable Member.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am glad to see that my friend has given way. I am addressing the point in which he involves the Cabinet of which I was a member saying that we took a decision to defend the then Minister of Transport in relation to the building of that road. I would just like to say that to the best of my memory the Cabinet of Barbados of which I was a member took no such decision, albeit the political party did take a decision to oppose the Resolution of No Confidence.

I want to say quite honestly an additional thing. In the absence of a site visit both the Party and the Cabinet had a misappreciation of the exact location and the extent of that road. I don't think I can better it in my language but I hope the thrust and the intent of what I am saying is taken.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I have never heard it put so elegantly. As a matter of fact, Sir, I believe this is the first occasion on which I have heard the word "misappreciation" used in such a delicate way. In short, what the Honourable Member is saying is that his Cabinet colleague, on that occasion, I would not say lied to, but misled the Cabinet into believing that what the

Opposition was then saying was untrue. But, however, let that rest for the time being. There will be other opportunities created when this issue will come back to the fore. I can give the Honourable Members the assurance of that. I only wanted to get the Honourable Members who were then Members of the Cabinet to, at least, make an intervention and state their position. Now we know the position of the Honourable Members on this, as I said, this matter will be dealt with, I am sure when it comes back up at some other time. 1.05 p.m.

Let me just refer to a comment made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East. Basically, I am in agreement with the points which he has made. If Government has put roads into an area which is not a declared tenantry, and which is still a private tenantry, and landowners are going to benefit from this development, then we should put in train some system to ensure that people's eyes are not gouged out. I am aware that this situation could very well arise. I have no doubt that what the Honourable Member has said is true and that there are situations developing where, as a result of the Government putting in roads and water, the owners are seeking to raise the price of the land to potential purchasers. I believe that we have legislation on the statute book to take care of that, and if we do not, then it would seem as if this is an area to which we would have to pay some attention.

The Honourable Member raised another interesting point and it is a matter that I have complained about on more than one occasion. The Honourable Member identified Lower Estate Development where either with or without the knowledge of the land owner, persons have gone and put down houses and some of them have put them down in the areas where the roads are supposed to go in and have caused all sorts of chaos in the planned development there. This points to a level of indiscipline and lack of concern in the society for order particularly when it comes to housing developments, and especially in areas where the Government is involved.

You would recall, Sir, that I made reference to this kind of indiscipline in the Parish Land area in Christ Church where the National Housing Corporation has planned out the area, where the roads had not yet been put in but the stakes have been put down for the roads. It was therefore clear to everybody where the roads would be going. I remember when I was Minister of Housing paying a visit to that area and it was interesting to hear what some of these people had to say about previous representatives for that particular constituency. They claimed that representatives have gone into the area and told them to put their houses on these particular spots. It has created a number of problems. When I did go up there they

mentioned the predecessors of the present representative and they were very clear to point out that this present representative for Christ Church East was not one of the ones at fault.

Aside.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Sir, this is a real problem. In St. Peter you had a similar problem with the former representative for St. Peter who went and put people in an area and now you are getting a situation where the present representative is coming and asking for the Government to put in roads and to resite people's houses. In the Six Men's area, an area of land owned by, I believe, a Mr. Broome, we are getting a similar kind of development taking place where people are just taking it upon themselves to go and put down houses on people's lands and feel that they have a right to do that.

I am saying, Sir, that we have to check this indiscipline and when the Town & Country Planning Department moves against people and have things in place in order to have these houses removed, then you get all sorts of political interventions to mislead people and encourage them in that kind of indiscipline and illegality. I am saying that I am glad to hear the Honourable Member who is the spokesman for the Barbados Labour Party 5n matters of this kind, coming out in this way and indicating that these things are wrong because, invariably, when it comes to resiting people then, then those who are resited expect the Government to move them and to also repair their houses. If they do not have running water the Government is expected to provide all these things and to put them in a position which is better than they were before they were resited.

I am saying that these are very serious matters. It affects Government finances, not only a Democratic Labour Party Government, but any Government. If we get ourselves caught and locked into that position we are going to run into very serious problems here in this country. I think we have to decide once and for all, in a non-partisan manner, to deal with this matter and to inject some discipline into this whole area of housing and tenantry development in Barbados so that I am agreeing with the Honourable Member for St. Michael South East

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East raised the question of tenants being informed about their * rights particularly in tenancies. I would say that there is a section in the Ministry of Housing which looks after providing information to tenants in the various tenancies across Barbados. They do visit the areas and provide information for the prospective tenants. I think, like everything else, that kind of information dissemination

could be stepped up. It could be improved on. I would certainly indicate to the present Minister that one of the things which should be done is to step up their public education programme as far as the rights of tenants are concerned and the general kind of information which is necessary to be provided for tenants in the various tenancies across Barbados.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the acquisition of 184.6 square metres of land at Walronds, Christ Church, for road construction, do now pass.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3.

ORDER NO. 3-TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HOYTE'S VILLAGE,
ST. JAMES, FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, Cabinet in meeting on November 15, 1990 agreed that a portion of land at Great Glory Road, Hoyte's Village, St. James, which was utilised some years earlier for road improvement, should be formally acquired by private treaty. This approach was abandoned when it was realised that there was a grave disparity between the assessments of the value made by the Commissioner of Land Tax who we always use as a guide and the counter offer submitted by the owner. As a result it was agreed that we should proceed under the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228. The required section notices were published and a survey of the area was carried out. The survey plan, which I now make available to Honourable Members on the other side, certified on August 15, 1991, confirms that the area utilised is 348.77 square metres of land. I am therefore seeking the approval of Parliament, through this Resolution, for the acquisition of 348.77 square metres of land at Hoyte's Village, St. James for road improvement do now pass. 1.15 p.m.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, here again I am lending my support. The Opposition support the measure as outlined by the Honourable Minister. But inasmuch as we are talking about road improvement in this very area the road that abuts and bounds on to this - I think it is an extension of the road - the same Hoyte's Village area that corner, I think it is called Prior Park corner there is a very dangerous corner there. The one that comes from Redman's Village gas station going into Hoyte's and on the left it goes further down...

Aside.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Yes. That is right. It is very dangerous. While we are talking in terms of road improvement, I am aware that they have barber greened the road leading from Queen's College right on to the gas station. I hope that Government will realize that. This is a matter of planning. They could have done the acquisition there and widened the road at the same time. What you have got now is that the road is already barber greened and when you seek now to improve that corner, you would have to encroach on the barber green. In other words, what in fact you are doing is that you are spending more money. What you could have done is proper planning. As I said this is a matter of people sitting down and planning properly. This could have been done, the recommendations could have been done at the same time, Government would have acquired the land which abuts around the two roads and have it widened so that it would not become a so-called blind corner. It is a blind corner and everybody is aware that blind corners pose threats to life and lots of accidents. All I am saying is that I would like to see a reduction of accidents and actually reduction of possible injury and loss of life. I am asking the Government to look at it. It is reasonable. It is a very busy road, Mr. Speaker, because people take that road now that Queen's College is located in that area. It is a road which takes more traffic now than before. That is why people come from St. Lucy and St. Peter and they hook up on the highway and they take that road.

The volume of traffic will improve significantly when the Highway is completed. I am looking at future planning. Because the Highway would take more traffic, they would take that road as a near cut, the obvious near cut. Obviously they come from the same Redman's Village area. I am only asking that something could be done about that corner. The natural thing is to have the land acquired and at the same time the people who live in the Hoyte's Village area I am only asking that something be done. It is very bumpy and it lends itself to a very untenable situation. I am not asking the Government - I am realistic - to go down there and barber green the road but I think that some of the potholes could be attended to from time to time until such time when Government can find it possible to include that particular road leading into Hoyte's. That would help to complement the area and the network of roads in that particular area.

I hope that the Minister will consider or the Government would consider having the blind corner removed so that it would improve the road in that particular area.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I understand the point which the Honourable Member is making. I think the Honourable Member is a little confused with the

area because he used the example that now that Queen's College is located where it is that people coming from the north, St. Lucy or St. Peter would use this road to get to Queen's College. I live in St. Peter and if I were going to Queen's College that is the last road that I would take. I would come across, turn down by Redman's Village and go through Prior Park and come out there by the...

Asides.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: But that is not Hoyte's Village.

Asides.

Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Sir, I said you come off the Highway, come down Redman's Village right on to Queen's College. That is what I said and you are saying the same thing I said.

Hon. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what that has to do with this Resolution. Because we are talking about Hoyte's Village which is the road when you come off Redman's Village. You turn to the right and it will bring you back out by St. John the Baptist Church.

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

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

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL, 1992

Order No. 6 was called - To move the Second Reading of the Offences Against the Person Bill.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill, the Offences Against the Person Act is a part of the continuing process of the reform of the criminal law on which we have embarked. You would recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1992, I think it was this House passed the Sexual Offences Act. The law relating to sexual offences had originally been in the Offences Against the Person Act. This Offences Against the Person Bill which is now before us would not include any reform in relation to the law relating to sexual offences because that had already been done and completed in the Sexual Offences Act which is already on the Statute Book.

You would recall, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of other criminal law matters which this Parliament has already passed, the Criminal Law Arrestable Offences Act, the Criminal Damage Act, the Theft Act, the Public Order (Amendment) Act and then there was an Amendment to the Constitution which removed the distinction between

felonies and misdemeanours consequent on some of the legislation which this Parliament has already approved.

The Offences Against the Person Bill which is now before us is an Act which would revise and amend the law with respect to offences against the person. The first part deals with murder and manslaughter. I will just spend a little time on this because it does not change substantially the law relating to murder or manslaughter.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Not substantially I said. It does change it but not in substance. The first thing to note, Mr. Speaker, is that the Offences Against the Person Act of Barbados of 1868 did not create the offence of murder. Murder was always what was called a common law offence as distinct from an offence which was created by an Act of Parliament. What the Offences Against the Person Act 1868 did do was that it did provide for the sentence to be imposed on any person who was convicted of murder, and that sentence was a sentence of death. Any person convicted of murder by statute was required to suffer death. 1.25 p.m.

Now this Bill which is before us does not alter that position. The sentence for anyone convicted of murder still remains death.

Now, perhaps one needs, in order to put the debate in perspective on this issue, to indicate very briefly what murder is. Perhaps everybody knows what it is, but it has been defined in law as the unlawful killing with malice aforethought, while manslaughter on the other hand is the unlawful killing without malice aforethought. The term malice aforethought was derived, Mr. Speaker, from the common law. So that because this term malice aforethought determines whether an offence is murder or manslaughter it therefore became, in law, a term of very great significance and importance. One needs to understand clearly what this term meant in order to keep it in proper perspective, because whether an offence contained the element of malice aforethought or not made the difference between whether the person was convicted of murder or manslaughter.

An acceptable definition of malice aforethought is that it consists of either an intention to kill or to cause grievous bodily harm. It is not malice in the sense in which you know malice in common parlance. Malice aforethought consists either of an intention to kill somebody else or an intention to cause that person grievous bodily harm as a result of which death results.

So those are the elements of malice aforethought, Mr. Speaker. If I form an intention to kill, that is malice aforethought. If I form an intention to do a person

really serious bodily harm and death results, that is also malice aforethought which would attract a conviction for murder.

Now, over the years of the development of the common law, we find that the definition of malice aforethought included two elements. There was either expressed malice or implied malice and these have been respectively used to define the intention to kill and the intention to cause grievous bodily harm. Expressed malice was invariably used to define the actual intention to kill. If I intend to kill that is an expression of malice - the actual intention to kill - that is the expression of malice and therefore the law calls that expressed malice. If I intended to do you serious bodily harm and I did not intend to kill but I intended to inflict really serious bodily harm on a person and that harm resulted in death the law called that implied malice because implied in my doing you serious bodily harm and having that intention was the intent to kill. So that was the difference between expressed malice and implied malice.

Now there also developed in the common law another form of malice, Mr. Speaker, known as constructive malice and this is where the difference will come. Now, constructive malice applied where a person killed another in the course or furtherance of a felony so that a person may not necessarily have intended to kill another or to inflict grievous bodily harm. All that was required for constructive malice to apply was for the wrong doer to intend to commit a felony. So that if for instance the felony was robbery, and a person was in the process of committing the felony of robbery and had no intention to kill anybody or to do anybody serious bodily harm but death resulted in the course of that robbery the wrongdoer was guilty of murder because of the application of the doctrine of constructive malice.

Now, the other situation attracting constructive malice was where a person killed another while attempting to prevent lawful arrest or custody. So, the mere intention to prevent lawful arrest or custody, that intention alone was constructive malice where death resulted in the course of trying to prevent arrest or custody. So that was the common law position, expressed malice and implied malice and constructive malice. That is still our law at the moment and it remained the law in the United Kingdom until the common law position in relation to constructive malice was altered by the Homicide Act of 1957. That Act did not alter the position in relation to expressed or implied malice but only in relation to constructive malice and the Homicide Act of 1957, section 1 provided that

"Where a person kills in the course or furtherance of some other offence the killing shall not amount to murder unless done with the same malice

aforethought expressed or implied as is required for a killing to amount to murder when not done in the course or furtherance of another offence, and

(2) For the purposes of the foregoing subsection a killing done in the course or for the purpose of resisting an officer of justice or of resisting or avoiding or preventing a lawful arrest or of affecting or assisting an escape or rescue from lawful custody shall be treated as a killing in the course or furtherance of another offence."

So that the purposes of the Homicide Act amending the common law was to limit malice aforethought to those conditions of expressed or implied malice, that is, killing with the intention to cause death or having an intention to do serious bodily harm as a result of which death results.

Now, Clause 3 of the Bill which we are debating today, Mr. Speaker, will abolish the doctrine of constructive malice and leave intact and fully operative the concept of malice aforethought express or implied. Thus it is murder if a person kills another intending to kill that person or if a person intends to do really serious bodily harm to another and ends up killing that other person. So that the only alteration is in relation to constructive malice, but the principal elements in relation to expressed or implied malice remain. 1.35 p.m.

Now another major reform, Mr. Speaker, which had been introduced in the United Kingdom's Homicide Act by Section 2 was the "defence of diminished responsibility". I do not need to dwell on this defence, Mr. Speaker, since this defence has already been introduced in our law by a 1973 amendment. This Bill before us preserves the defence of diminished responsibility in the same terms in which it existed in the law as amended by the 1973 Act.

Mr. Speaker, really to do this Bill thoroughly you have to go through the thing clause by clause. But I do not think that I want to spend time on every particular clause.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Mr. Speaker, in going down the clauses, I just want to turn to defence of provocation. The defence of provocation remains as was the case in the existing law. Punishment for manslaughter is life as was the law before and then there is in Clause 7 a special position where this clause re-enacts the existing law which gives Barbados' Courts jurisdiction to try an offence involving death where the victim dies in Barbados or where the victim dies outside of Barbados if the act causing his death began in Barbados.

Now Clause 8, Mr. Speaker, sets out a number of situations where the law deems a person to be guilty of murder or manslaughter and these are cases where death is caused not necessarily by the direct act of the person but as a result of some contributory act. I will spend a little time on Clause 8 because it probably needs a little more explanation.

Clause 8 clarifies the law with respect to death caused by medical treatment of an injured, refusal of medical treatment or neglect by the injured person and it also encompasses other intervening acts or events. In these circumstances where there is an act by a person as a result of which another person has to get medical attention and that person dies as a result, the person inflicting the act may be guilty of murder.

Just let me spend a little time to expand on that in order to clarify the point. Clause 8, Mr. Speaker, says this:

"A person charged with murder or manslaughter of another shall, although his act was not the immediate or the sole cause of that other's death, be deemed to have killed that other where:

- (a) he inflicted bodily injury on that person in consequence of which that other person underwent surgical or medical treatment which caused death."

What I will do in relation to all these clauses, Mr. Speaker, is to give some illustration of some of the decided cases which would clarify the point. I am using Smith and Hollands text on "Criminal Law, Sixth Edition". Just to give an example of a situation where death was caused by one person inflicting bodily injury on another in consequence of which that other person underwent surgical or medical treatment which caused death. Smith and Hollands at Page 231 begins with this comment:

"The 19th Century cases seem to lay down that where the immediate cause of death is the medical treatment received by a person consequence on his injury by (b). (B) is guilty homicide whether the treatment was proper or improper, negligent or not.

(Aside).

Hon. M. A. KING: Now in Jordan's case, Mr. Speaker, it was this. In the course of a fight between soldiers of different regiments, (b) stabbed (p) twice with a bayonet. One of (p's) comrades in trying to carry (p) to the medical reception station twice tripped and dropped him. At the reception station the medical officer who was trying to cope with a number of other cases did not realise that one of the wounds had pierced a lung and caused hemorrhage. He gave (p) treatment in the light of the information regarding (p's) condition available at the time

of the trial was thoroughly bad and might well have affected his chances of recovery. (B's) conviction of murder was upheld and counsel's argument was that the Court must be satisfied that the treatment was normal and that this was abnormal was brushed aside. If at the time of death the original wound is still an operating cause and a substantial cause, then the death can properly be said to be the result of the wound albeit that some other cause of death is also operating. Only if it can be said that the original wounding is merely the setting in which another cause operates can it be said that the death does not result from the wound. Putting it another way, only if the second cause is so overwhelming as to make the original wound merely part of the history can it be said that the death does not flow from the wound."

So that is an example, Mr. Speaker, of a situation where one person inflicts bodily injury on another person and in consequence of which that other person underwent surgery or medical treatment that caused death.

The second situation, Mr. Speaker, is in the marginal notes where we find killings in special cases relate where one person inflicts bodily injury on another person which would not have caused death of that other person had that person who was injured submitted to proper surgical or medical treatment or observed proper precaution as to his mode of living. Example: A person inflicts bodily harm on another and the bodily injury which was inflicted would not by itself have caused death. But the person who was injured did not submit himself to proper surgical or medical treatment nor did he observe proper precautions as to his mode of living. That, too, attracts the sanction of the law. 1.45 p.m.

An example of that is Holland's case where B waylaid and assaulted P, cutting him severely across his fingers with an iron instrument P refused to follow the surgeon's advice to have the finger amputated, although he was told that if he did not his life would be in great danger. The wound caused lockjaw. The finger was then amputated, but it was too late, and P died of lockjaw. The surgeon's evidence was that if the finger had been amputated at first, P's life could probably have been saved. Mr. Justice Small told the jury that it made no difference whether the wound was in its own nature instantly mortal or whether it became the cause of death by reason of the deceased not having adopted the best mode of treatment. The question was whether in the end the wound inflicted by the prisoner was the real cause of death. Holland's case was of course followed by a whole number of cases.

Aside.

Hon. M. A. KING: Holland was 1841. The next situation, Mr. Speaker, relates to the situation where by actual or threatened violence one person causes another

to perform an act which causes his death, such being a means of avoiding such violence which in the circumstances would have appeared natural to the person whose death was caused. One of the classic examples, again. B was guilty of murder if P had thrown himself into a river and had been drowned from the apprehension of immediate violence by B. A similar principle was applied where P accidentally fell from a window in an attempt to escape immediate violence.

The next case, where by any act or omission one person hastens the death of another person from any disease or injury which apart from such act or omission would have caused death.

In Harewood's case, Mr. Speaker, E, who was in -a condition of violent excitement and had expressed his determination to "give his wife something" chased her from the house into the road using violent threats against her. She fell dead. She was suffering from an abnormal heart condition, such that any combination of physical exertion or fright or strong emotion might cause death. Justice Ridley directed the jury that no proof of actual physical violence was necessary, but that death from fright alone caused by an illegal act, such as a threat of violence, was enough,

The next case was where a person's act or omission would not have caused death unless it had been accompanied by an act or omission of the person killed, or of other persons. An example, Mr. Speaker. B's child, P, was in the care of a nurse, X. D, intending to murder the child, delivered to X a large quantity of a substance called laudanum, telling her it was a medicine to be administered to P. X did not think the child needed any medicine and left it untouched on the mantelpiece in her room. In X's absence, one of her children, Y, age 5, took the laudanum and administered a large dose to P, who died. All the judges held that the jury were rightly directed that this administration by an unconscious agent was murder.

Section 8 then deals with a series of special situations and seeks to codify this aspect of the common law which deals with these special situations and these are now encoded in clause 8 of this Bill.

Clause 9 of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, codifies the offence of attempted murder and it also makes the attempted killing by omission a statutory offence if the intention is to kill another person or to endanger that person's life. Any person convicted of an attempt to murder or an attempt to kill by an act or omission is liable to a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

There are a number of other clauses, Mr. Speaker, which are re-enacted in this Bill, like clause 10, for instance, sending letters threatening to murder, which is a re-enactment of the existing law. In 11 we have a new clause in relation to conspiracy to murder:

"Any person who conspires with any other person to kill any person, whether such person is in Barbados or elsewhere, commits an offence and is liable on conviction on indictment to imprisonment for a term of fourteen years."

This section creates a statutory offence of conspiracy to murder and provides a term of imprisonment, a maximum penalty of 14 years.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Attorney General intends to carry on for quite some time yet on this particular Bill. I think it now is a good time for us to take a break.

I move, Sir, that the sitting at this time be suspended until 3.00 p.m. today.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.56 p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr. SPEAKER:

This Sitting is now resumed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there has been substantial interference in the power supply which would make it difficult for us to continue. I therefore beg to move that the House be adjourned until Tuesday, December 14, 1993 at 12.00 noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 3.10 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES****Hon. P. M. GREAVES**..... 4049Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of
Tuesday, November 23, 1993.**PAPERS****Hon. P. M. GREAVES**..... 4049

1. Annual Report of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation *for* the year 1991.
2. Annual Report and Accounts of the National Insurance Board for the year 1992.
3. Guarantees granted under the Exempt Insurance Act, Cap. 308A to the following:
 - (a) American Benefactor Insurance Limited
 - (b) Boulevard Insurance Company (Barbados) Limited
 - (c) East River Indemnity Company (Barbados) Ltd.
 - (d) PAN Providence Insurance Company Ltd.
 - (e) Scottish International Insurance Co. Ltd.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**Hon. P. M. GREAVES**..... 4050

Suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 for the remainder of the Sitting.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 1 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BRIDGE ROAD, ST. MICHAEL ____ 4050

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4050.

ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WALRONDS, CHRIST CHURCH 4050

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4050, 4055; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 4050; Mr. L. L. Brathwaite, 4053; Hon. B. M. Taitt, 4054; Dr. R. L. Cheltenham, 4055.

ORDER NO. 3 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HOYTE'S VILLAGE, ST. JAMES 4057

Hon. E. E. Greaves, 4057, 4058; Mr. DeL. O. Bradshaw, 4057.

ORDER NO. 8 - OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL, 1992 4058

Hon. M. A. King, 4058.

SUSPENSION 4061

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4061.

RESUMPTION

ADJOURNMENT 4061

Hon. P. M. Greaves, 4061.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BRADSHAW, Mr. DeL. O. (St. Michael South East)
BRATHWAITE, Mr. L. L. (St. Michael North East)
CHELtenham, Dr. R. L. (St. Joseph) **GREAVES, Hon. E. E. (St. Lucy)** **GREAVES, Hon. P. M. (St. Michael North)** **KING, Hon. M. A. (Christ Church West Central)** **TAITT, Hon. B. M. (St. Michael West)**