



THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 17, 1995

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.15 a.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT, B.A., Dip. Ed. (Speaker)
His Honour R. D. MARSHALL, (Deputy Speaker)
Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.),

J.P.

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT, B.A. (Hons.), M.P.A., LL.B.(Hons.)

Mr. L. A. WEEKES, G.C.M., J.P.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs, Information, Defence and Security)

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Q.C., LL.M. (Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.)

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

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

Hon. Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, Q.C., M.A., M.Sc. (Econ.), (Minister of Tourism, International Transport and the Environment)

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and International Business) (Leader of the House)

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

Hon. G. W. PAYNE, (Minister of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, J.P., B.A. (Hons.), Dip. Ed., LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development)

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

Mr. D. CARTER

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE, B.A., LL.B. (Minister of Labour, Community Development and Sports)

Mr. G. A. CLARKE, (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing)

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

Mr. F. J. STUART, B.A., LL.M.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, J.P., B.A., Dip. Ed., B.Sc. (Chairman of Committees)

Mr. H. F. LASHLEY

Mr. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Minister of Health)

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, LL.B. (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs and Culture).

Prayers were led by Rev. Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes of this Honourable House of Assembly for December 20, 1994 which have been circulated be taken as read.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to announce that I am in receipt of the accounts and statements for the month of October 1994. These statements and accounts are prepared by the Accountant General. I am also to announce that I am in receipt of the Report of the Auditor General under Section 28 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, Cap. 5 for the year 1994.

PAPERS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay:

Report of the Accountant General for the financial year 1993-94;

International Business Companies (Iroquois Capital Limited) (Rate of Tax) Order, 1994;

Annual Report of the National Insurance Board for the year 1993; and

Airport Service Charge (Exemption) Order, 1994.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the Annual Reports of the National Cultural Foundation for the years 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1995 and the Juries (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Constitution be read a first time.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Juries Act be read a first time.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44 be suspended for the rest of this day's sitting.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. SPEAKER: Government business is now the order of the day.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Honourable Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Honourable O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Chamber is now in Committee of Supply.

ORDER NO. 7 - RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE ADDITIONAL SUM OF \$1 355 300 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 1994-95

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, it is imperative that I explain to this Honourable Chamber the circumstances in which the Ministry now finds itself again before this House, to seek a further supplementary for the grant of monies to fund the Sanitation Service Authority.

Some weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. John, the Leader of the Opposition, made a statement on the resiling of the landfill which is indicative of the approach of the last Administration to the landfill and, indeed, sets the background for why we are here today. He is reported to have said that the siting of the landfill in St. John would amount to punishment of the people of St. John and that is why the Government is contemplating siting it at St. John.

Mr. Chairman, that attitude, that the disposal and collection of garbage, that the issue of solid waste management was not to be viewed as a global national problem, requiring broad and creative initiative, requiring an approach which not only required that the Sanitation Service Authority be managed and operated the landfill in the most sanitary conditions and in a manner conducive

to the development of Barbados, informed the approach of the last Administration to the landfill at Mangrove. It was sited in a constituency that was perceived as a BLP stronghold.

The siting of a landfill in itself is not a problem. The problem will come where an administration fails to adequately provide for the management of that landfill and where that attitude is allowed to filter down to the personnel who are directly involved in the day to day management, to the extent that it is not recognised as the adverse impact which a badly managed landfill can cause for the economy. That is exactly what happened at Mangrove. Adequate resources were not provided. Money, equipment and staff were not provided to make sure the landfill was properly managed. No operational procedures and systems were put in place to ensure that the landfill was properly managed.

As a result, the landfill had become so out of control that it now threatens the very plank of our economy, which is tourism, because the odours emanating from Mangrove are so offensive that they are going now as far as the West Coast and affecting tourists staying at hotels on and along the West Coast. But what are these measures of which I speak that were not provided? What are the resources? 11.30a.m.

All over the world, Mr. Chairman, there are internationally recognised standards for managing a landfill. These include the adequate preparation of the area where the landfill is to be sited. In the case of Mangrove, that was not done. Mangrove has gone into three phases and these phases have not been properly prepared.

Mr. Hubert Clarke, the Deputy Manager is on record, as are other persons in this country, castigating Government for the manner in which it prepared the landfill site and the manner in which the personnel at the site were operating at the Government's instruction. The Government cut the subvention to the Sanitation Service Authority.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member. If the Honourable Member makes a statement to the House that is blatantly untrue then I have no alternative. The Honourable Member said, as I heard her, that there were three phases of Mangrove, none of which was properly prepared. The records of this House will show that that is palpably untrue. The Honourable Member ought, I submit, Sir, not to make statements which the record can show not to be true. I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Member.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the records will show that indeed what I am saying is correct. First of all it is imperative in operating a landfill in order

to reduce the emanation of odour that adequate ground cover or soil be provided. The landfill was being managed, known to the former Ministers - both the last two Ministers of Health, whose responsibility it was to ensure that Mangrove was properly managed - contrary to international standards. That where international standards required that 6 ins. of compacted mould be used to cover the landfill the people at Mangrove were using 6 ins. only. Sir, to get to 6 ins. of compacted mould you have to start with several feet of mould before it is compacted and then have it compacted down to 6 ins. Firstly, no money was provided for the purchase of adequate quantities of mould.

Secondly, it is imperative when you have a landfill and you want to manage it properly that equipment like traxcavators and compactors be provided to roll the garbage and compact it to reduce the space that it occupies in order that minimum space be used and, thirdly, in order that all the oxygen could be excluded from the garbage to reduce the incidence of subterranean fires. No traxcavators, no D-8s, no compactors were given to the staff at Mangrove and they could not reduce the garbage to manageable proportions hence Barbados resulted in being the only country in the world to have a mountain of garbage.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister said that the Sanitation Service Authority did not have any traxcavators. The Honourable Member is misleading the House because that is one of the last things that was done by the last Board. A traxcavator was provided and whenever one broke down one was rented, so that is not true.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, you heard the language. "That was the last thing that was done by the last Board". On the eve of the election when they were getting real lashes, when Mangrove was publicised as a national issue, outside of the economy, it was then that the last Board, of which he was a Member...

Mr. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman...

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. There is one Honourable Member on the floor. I am listening to the Honourable Member for St. Lucy. Let there be order in the House, please.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order again. It was not the last thing we did on the eve of an election. It was months before the elections and we knew nothing about an election being called.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, it is true that the last leader of the Democratic Labour

Party ambushed them with the date of the election. There is no denying that. But it is a fact, even if he says that it was months before that, after operating the landfill for years without it, they were then seeking to provide what should have been provided initially.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order again, Mr. Chairman. She did the same thing in church and now she...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot refer to an Honourable Member as "she"¹¹.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister did the same thing in Church and now she is doing it in the House of Assembly. She is misleading people. The landfill was never operating without a traxcavator. You cannot say these things in church and now come into the House of Assembly and say the same things again. There is a Lord above.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the substantive point remains, and I stand on it. That no adequate provision was made to purchase the equipment necessary for managing and controlling the landfill. Had that been done in the early stages we could not have had a mountain of garbage nicknamed "Stinkeroo". It could never have happened, the reason being that there would have been adequate equipment to compact the garbage, reduce its size, the space it occupies and reduce its height. In addition to that, it would have reduced the possibility of subterranean fires. No water pipes or water mains were ever laid or provided for when the landfill was constructed initially. These water mains, had they been provided, by the last administration when it was recognised how Mangrove was developing into a major problem, the subterranean fires at Mangrove could not have become the major problem that they are.

Part of the problem at Mangrove is the fact that there was a 2 acre lot adjacent to the site where garbage was received, where it was known to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, who was then the Minister of Health, that raw faeces was being received there on a daily basis and he only made provision for the Government to supervise the area during two days of the week. The remaining three any practice obtained.

Mr. Chairman, all of that is part of why Mangrove became out of control. Mangrove became out of control because the Government could have developed other means of recycling. By now we should have been into serious programmes looking at how offal could be dealt with, as indeed, it is now being dealt with, by dumping it at sea, increasing the fish catches. That has been done under the guidance and instruction of the Bellairs Research Institute

which has indicated that it is a safe and desirable practice and has determined where and when it should be done, and the procedures are being strictly adhered to. If the offal was not being dumped at Mangrove, the odours there would not have been so offensive.

This administration is going further than just saying let us dump the offal because we recognise that jobs continue to be our No. 1 priority and that the creation of industry for making revenue and generating foreign exchange must also be paramount. Therefore, this administration has invited private sector organisations, any who choose, to get into the business of a rendering plant so that the offal can be converted to animal feed and put to good use.

Mr. Chairman, since September when this Government took office, we recognised that Mangrove had to be dealt with as a matter of priority. Immediately we set about looking for systems of recycling, looking for new ways to deal with solid and liquid waste management and disposal. 11.40a.m.

Out of that the Prime Minister had a meeting with the management of the Sanitation Service Authority and made it clear that, for this government, Mangrove was a national problem and could not be allowed to continue in the same way. It was a problem that was extremely grave, that we had inherited and saw immediately to rectify.

Apart from the fish offal, Mr. Chairman, we sent a group overseas comprising personnel from within the Ministry to explore systems for solid and liquid waste management. Immediately the two acre lot was cleaned up and no more raw faeces was being dumped out there without adequate supervision or in a manner that could be offensive.

We insisted that the site at Mangrove that is receiving garbage should be properly managed and properly supervised with adequate ground cover. That is being done and there has been no complaint about the site that is currently receiving garbage which is under our management.

In addition to that, the Government has been looking at ways of recycling. We have started, as of January 1 an education programme to sensitize Barbadians to the issue of the reduction of waste generation because we generate, in Barbados, about 400 tonnes of garbage a day. We need a new approach.

While the site that was receiving garbage was being properly managed, a system also had to be put in place to deal with the sites which we inherited where subterranean fires had been burning since June of last year at

one location and at the bulky waste site, the site which receives fridges, stoves and so on. They had been burning before June of last year but had not been dealt with.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. Again the Honourable Member is misleading the House. There were fires in June and the then Honourable Minister of Health, Mr. Cyril Walker asked for money, he was given money and the fires were put out. When they came to power in September there were no fires at Mangrove, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, it is completely offensive to sit and listen to them saying that. Mangrove has been burning continuously well before June at one site. The site which is the current problem has been burning since June of last year and at the bulky waste site before June. There are fires there that have never been put out. There are fires that are burning as deep as 200 feet underground where temperatures are ranging from 90 degrees farenheight to 280 degrees farenheight.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of elucidation. As the Parliamentary Representative for St. Thomas, the Honourable Member...

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: She has given way.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg that you treat it as a point of order, Sir. What the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has said is not a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas, are you referring to what the Honourable Member for St. James South...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy has misled this House gravely.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members could note that that is the duty of the Honourable Member for St. James South to address.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: What are you saying?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am saying the Honourable Member for St. James South should address the issue that you are now raising.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, subterranean fires have been there at the site where work is currently going on since June of last year burning continuously and at the bulky waste site since prior to June.

We have been working consistently on bringing the entire landfill under control. In December there was an omnibus Resolution on which the Ministry of Health travelled to obtain \$60 000 for staffing, the provision of a 24 hour guard service to reduce the incidence of illicit dumping in and around Mangrove because all sorts of things are dumped up there when there is no supervision. That is part of the problem that was never addressed by the last Administration. The guard service will be in place by the end of this month.

There was some \$70 000 for the traxcavator and bobcats. A further \$100 000 was requested to provide the internal water main to put out the subterranean fires that had been burning since 1994 and before. Thirty-four thousand dollars was then requested for lighting, to light the periphery of the landfill in order to reduce the incidence of the illicit dumping. Two hundred and forty-three thousand dollars was requested in December to buy foam to put out these same subterranean fires - that they are now claiming were not going on - and to provide adequate ground cover to deal with the problem.

On the first Wednesday of January the subterranean fires which had been going at Mangrove for some considerable time...

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: ...from the hell caused by the last Administration indeed. The fires increased in severity or the smoking from the fires increased in severity on that day. The smoke went down into the villages of Arch Hall and Bennetts and caused severe problems to the people living there. I want to say that they have lived through a great deal with tremendous insensitivity by the last Ministers of Health who never saw it fit to go to the people of Arch Hall and Bennetts who were suffering to speak to them about the ongoing problem.

The fires were exacerbated on that day and the Cabinet took a decision that an immediate attack would be made on the mound of garbage which was the site of the major fires. That attack started on the first Friday in January and involved members of the private and public sector providing heavy duty equipment, it involved CERO, the Barbados Defence Force, the Fire Service, the Ministry of Health, the Environmental Engineering Department, the SSA and several other organizations and individual, many private concessionaires as well, helped to truck water to the site.

We have been using at Mangrove, in an attempt to put out those fires especially at one site, in the region of 100 000 gallons of water a day. We have had to use sea-water because clearly we could not continue to draw on

the water resources in such large volumes. In the first 2 days fresh water was used but since then the operation has continued with the use of sea water. The heavy duty equipment has cost and continues to cost the Government in the region of \$350 an hour per piece of equipment. On the first day alone there were 8 pieces of heavy duty equipment that worked for 10 hours. In fact, Sir, when the cost of personnel is taken up and all of the resources being used, it is costing us \$39 000 a day to clean up an area that should never have been a problem.

The mound of garbage has now been reduced by some 40 feet and is almost level with the road reduced in circumstances when the Honourable Member for St. Michael West had said that nothing could be done to bring it under control or could be done with the problem at Mangrove.

Mr. Chairman, that...

Mr. B. M. TAITT rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you on a point of order?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member has to withdraw that. I have said no such thing in here, Sir. She cannot say that I said something which I now categorically deny that I have ever said.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I continue. Part of what is going on at Mangrove is that we are reducing the mound using the water to put the fires out, compacting the garbage to exclude all the oxygen and to reduce the size and the bulk of the garbage and then, as we do that, covering it with mould. 11.50a.m.

The exercise is going to take in the region of 6 to 8 weeks before we bring it to a state where it is completely environmentally friendly, covered with mould and capped and sealed. That will be done, Mr. Chairman, by June 30th, when we will move to a new site. But I want to assure this House, Mr. Chairman, that any new site to which a landfill moves, the Mangrove experience will not be repeated because that is the worst example of political insensitivity, of lack of vision, and incompetence not only on the part of the Minister but a level of incompetence that filtered down to the staff that helped to carry out the will of the political directorate.

Mr. Chairman, when we go to the new landfill site it will incorporate a system for solid and liquid waste management which, if we get the system we are currently looking at, would be virtually odour free. Whether or not we get this new and sophisticated system for the new

landfill, the landfill will be properly managed so that there will be an operational checklist for every staff member who will know that there are rules and procedures to be followed to ensure that the landfill is properly managed.

We will ensure that the staff there is medically tested as we are going to do with the staff at Mangrove. I should like to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that in order to make sure that this thing was not only done expeditiously, but done well and that every person up there was adequately protected, every single man and woman working at Mangrove has been covered by proper insurance.

We will make sure that at the new landfill site, adequate amounts of ground cover are used. That the incidence of subterranean fires will be reduced, not only by the proper design initially, but by providing the resources and equipment - adequate amounts of traxcavators, compactors, and other equipment necessary - if the landfill is to be properly managed. We will provide at the new landfill site, tools important to put out subterranean fires should they ever take place.

We will be looking, and are currently looking, at measures for recycling so that in fact what goes to the landfill will be reduced in quantum significantly and that instead of throwing PEP bottles and other things likely to give off toxic fumes or substances when they break down, we will get a whole new recycling industry going.

Offal will not move to the new landfill because it will be dealt with by other means and I have already indicated to this Chamber what those means are going to be. It is offensive for the Honourable Member for St. Michael East, who sat as part of that Government, knowing what was going on at Mangrove and never once called for any air pollution testing equipment but now after 4 months is insisting that we get it.

Well, I want to assure him that unlike the previous Ministers I did not cut it out of our Estimates. When the environmental engineering Department requested the air pollution testing equipment in order that they could site a mobile one at Mangrove, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, who was then the Minister, refused to give it to them. It is in this year's Estimates and it will be provided so that the fumes coming off from Mangrove can be tested. And at the new landfill site, wherever it is, precautions will be taken to ensure...

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: It is pathetic that at this stage you do not know what it is.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order in the House please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: When we go to the new landfill site, not only will there be a continuous management system in place but there will be jobs created for people because these new systems that we are putting in place are going to require staffing and so jobs would be provided for Barbadians. These jobs will be provided in a system of landfill management that will not offend any residents which may be nearby, but most of all does not offend or threaten the process of national development.

It is a shame that at this stage of our development, because of the incompetence of the last administration, that we could come to international attention on CNN for the improper management and operation of a landfill and that a story could be carried for international telecast which points to the environmental hazard that Mangrove is; which highlights the fact that it offends national development; which shows the absence of the political directorate to deal with the problem at Mangrove and that we can sit and be smug and accuse people of lying who live in the country, who are there to see and to witness the incompetence and the evidence of it.

It is sad that even if you go on the Jolly Roger or the Bajan Queen to go for a cruise that you can stand and when you look at the landscape of Barbados that part of it included, prior to last week before we reduced the mound up there, a mound of garbage - a man made mountain of garbage. It speaks to a form of confusion that must have existed in the mind of the Minister who, when he opened a hospital with 9 people and poured \$500 000 a month into it, refused to adequately provide the resources to deal with what is a national problem. It speaks to a brand of confusion and insensitivity that was endemic in the last administration.

Mr. Chairman, this administration believes that we are accountable to the people of Barbados. We do not only believe this but intend to practise it, in the way we operate with the citizenry, that I felt compelled to go the people of Arch Hall and Bennets and speak to them about what had gone on at Mangrove, what measures this administration was taking to bring "Stinkeroo" under control and what our plans were for the future of the landfill.

It was to me a matter of embarrassment that people who would think that they have large political standing in this community, who have been around for a long time, who boast that they are politician by profession, refused to touch base with the people whose interest he is supposed to have at heart. And what he is supposed to represent in its broader scope because representation does not only deal with your constituency. The minute you are made a Minister your constituency is the wider Barbados and you

have a duty to the citizens and the future of your country, and it is a disgrace that the previous Ministers never found fit, never thought themselves so accountable that they had to speak to the people of the area who were dealing with the problem. 12.00 noon.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two more minutes.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: What is the greater disgrace is that they allowed the mound to get...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member on more than one occasion and just a few moments ago intimated that I never met with the people of Arch Hall. The present Deputy Chairman of the Sanitation Service Authority, who is a man of the law, will be able to confirm to the Honourable Member if none of her colleagues will, that I did meet. When I was Minister, I met with people of Arch Hall and Bennets on the site. I wish the Honourable Member will desist from constantly putting in the record things which are simply not true. On a morning I met with them on the site and the Honourable Member for St. Thomas came later. Then he and the magistrate and the others went and had a drink, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member's memory is bad. When he opened the site that has now caused all the problems in 1992...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, no. According to her, nothing like that happened.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Just let me explain, Sir. It was a Saturday afternoon. They had a sheltered tent and I was invited. He opened the thing. Some of the residents were there and after that he offered drinks. I refused to have any drink up there with him on that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, further to the point of order. It was a Saturday morning.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot have a point of order on a point of order.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a Saturday morning I went with the residents. As a matter of fact, there is a picture of it in the newspapers when I went there. The Honourable Member was not on the site when I met with the residents. He subsequently came and he and the then Chairman of

the Sanitation Service Authority and your client had a discussion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West - your first point of order is addressing the fact whether you went to the Mount or not. You said that you did go. Your point of order is taken. You may proceed the Honourable Member for St James South.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, it is not denied that the Minister has gone to Mangrove. But there is no housing at the dump. The people live down in the village and, if you want to meet with the people, you have to go to where they are. He never sought to do that. The fact that he went up to open a site and a few people from the district walked up to curse him for ignoring their suffering is not a meeting.

Mr. Chairman, we had an organized meeting where about 250 people of the village came out from Arch Hall and Bennetts and we spoke to them in an organized and structured way. We met them face to face to see who they are, and not to wait for people to come up to Mangrove when you are opening another phase and curse you. That is not a meeting.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is telling lies. I was not opening anything when I met with the now present Deputy Chairman of the SS A and other members of the community at a site in Mangrove when in fact it was being prepared. There was not any opening. The Honourable Member does not know and must not put in the record that. I say she is telling lies, Sir.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for St. Michael West...

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. The use of the word "lies" in this context is grossly unparliamentary. It really requires to be withdrawn. The Honourable Member should know better.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have reverted to the Honourable Member for St. James South and I think that she should continue to make her speech.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, if I am a liar, then they are all honourable men and all the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts are liars. Because when I sat at the meeting with them last week, they were all very clear that the last Minister had never come and spoken to them. One woman said that she spoke to the Minister and that he said that his wife was dead and he had no time to mind her. Another woman said - and there were

long stories of reasons why he never came. So they must all be liars. Mr. Carlisle Greaves, the magistrate of whom he spoke, commended me for coming and speaking to them which he said the previous Minister had never done. So he too must be a liar.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Minister has introduced a name which I have no intentions to do. But it is true that the former Minister met with the same gentleman that the Honourable Member is referring to at the old dump and not the landfill. It was a Saturday morning and I remember the *Advocate* taking a picture of a truck disposing something that looked like water. Thank you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James South has to wind up your speech.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Whether I was telling lies or not is answered by the experience of the people of Arch Hall and Bennetts. The newspaper reports have all previously filmed and printed the evidence of all our eyes. Many people who live in the area will have the evidence of their noses.

Mr. Chairman, this administration will not repeat the experience of Mangrove. It does not matter to me that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West calls me a liar because during the election campaign they called me worse. The people of St. James South however made an investment in me and I am here today. Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Health, I recognize that I also have a responsibility to the people of Barbados. I will not repeat the errors and the incompetence of the last administration. The new landfill will be properly managed.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to move that Head 36 now stand part.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, it is unbelievable that this Resolution could take the turn it has taken, a Resolution which to my mind should be considered a national issue but somehow we have turned it into a political contest. I am not part of that political contest because, Sir, it is now reaping what it has sown. I am speaking primarily after the Minister because that is exactly what the speech had turned into. I am no wiser, I am no better off, and I believe the members of Arch Hall and the surrounding areas are no better off. I believe there must be some confusion or panic in the Government over this particular matter. It is a very serious matter. Within the last week, I believe the Minister made about 5 or 6 different statements all pertaining to the same issue, which in my mind not only has confused the issue more but may be

the people in that district are more confused. This morning I passed on that highway and contrary to what people are saying, I am speaking as a person who served on the old Sanitation Board in those days. I am speaking in that capacity more so than ever. It is something that needs to be corrected because I believe the Minister, probably in newness or inexperience, did not study the issue carefully and might have gone down the road she has gone. 12.10p.m.

To put this thing right, Sir, the landfill did not suddenly come to being like that. This landfill has its origin, or genesis, in 1985 and the background to that was that under the old Sanitation and Cemeteries Board there was almost a dump in every parish and gradually it was clear that the collection of garbage would eventually one day find difficulty in finding a resting place, and naturally the sites were reduced. This came out of the fact that the people at Kingsland demanded their property, rightly so. The garbage has to be placed somewhere and rather than turn it into a political issue, which not only started now, but every little thing that seems to have political gain we tend to turn it into a thing like this.

I am saying, Sir, even in the old Sanitation and Cemeteries Board we did not have the expertise, the knowledge. We did not even have the ability to borrow money from any place to get that done, but I want to say this. We should not confuse ourselves over the question of dumps burning, because internal combustion is going to be a natural reaction, it is going to be natural in any dump. We had small dumps. I remember the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South suffered tremendously and we never had an issue like this in this Parliament. Not only that, Sir, the present Deputy Manager was an investment that we at that time put into place. He was about the only person who had knowledge of solid waste management, and even with his expert knowledge and the limited funds we were able to create a situation where the people in those areas were able to overcome the problem and eventually the dump settled down.

With all this modern technology - and I am not blaming anyone, because management could mean a lot of things. It could mean the Government, it could mean the Board, it could mean the members who work for the Board. I am not getting into that issue, Sir, because it needs a co-ordinated effort from all in Barbados, whether they are on the Board or not - therefore when this issue surfaced I was happy to say in my mind that with modern technology we would have been able to get it under control.

The issue of the Mangrove location has nothing to do with the Democratic Labour Party, it was primarily a decision taken by the then Government. But you have to ask yourself a question, whether it was either

short-sightedness or if the hurriedness in the matter prevented the site from being properly set out for receiving the garbage. That is the problem. If you start wrong it is clear to me that that would happen. If it is the only centralised dump in Barbados, because all the other dumps are now being put out of use, it is clear that it is going to have to accept all and sundry of the garbage, whether it be motor cars or not. What was required at the time obviously was a system in which the separation would be equally well managed in such a way that it could not turn into this.

Let me tell the Honourable Member this. If the dump is not closed, no matter what you do with it, mould covering and all that sort of thing, which we have done in the past, the use of traxcavators, which is nothing new, these have been used with previous dumps, but obviously the type of garbage we are getting today is even more dangerous than the one in the past. Once that starts to create that combustion somewhere in there, no doubt you will have to create a new scientific approach. If I am not mistaken, I understand that the old Ministry had a consultation with a number of gentlemen and that they laid out... All you have said, from my recollection, is what they advocated to be done. It is nothing new.

I wish we would move away from the 6th September. The people of Barbados accepted you on the basis that we had run out of ideas, we were not capable of doing anything and therefore you had the quick fix answer. That is the problem. People are reacting to the fact that we were quarrelling over this dump over the years and we have got no further, even for the nearly five months. If you multiply 400 tonnes per day by four months, tell me if that will not give you six mountains. What I am trying to say is that within that six months the Honourable Member for St. Thomas was aware of the problems and I am sure the Honourable Minister could have relied on the Member to help her to formulate a policy that would alleviate some of those problems. What really needs to be done is that the garbage needs to be handled in a separated fashion. If you carry everything up there which used to be put in about six other dumps, plus the agricultural produce, that will cause another problem. All these things are going to be concentrated in one area, so those who originally sited the landfill there must have been aware, or must have been told, that these are things for the future, and furthermore it will cost more money. The Minister has not said it today, but we do not know if we are going to finish paying the cost of this problem, because I understand from one of the newspapers that the Minister said they are going to compensate the people and I saw some criteria laid out. The Minister is not a medical person to determine whether a person is suffering as a result of the garbage or not. Even if you go to a doctor you have to sit down and talk and let the doctor tell you that, so we do not know what the cost of this particular issue is going to come to. That is

my bother, that we need not see it in a political sense, we should see it in a national sense.

I am supporting the Resolution, because the money needs to be got and the people in Barbados must be given a better deal, even if you said that the DLP did not, but you are supposed to do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member should use parliamentary language, please. You should refer to the Honourable Member appropriately.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Thank you, Sir. This is what I am trying to say. I am supporting it from the point of view that if I were a resident of that area I too would feel aggrieved, and if I were the parliamentary representative I would expect them to hassle me and to give me all the stick that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas is getting. It is purely a reaction to a promise which they believe would have happened immediately after the change of Government. I am honest with them. That stench you get will not disappear in a day or week, no matter what method you use. It takes time and it has to take time for another reason. Until you can find an alternative where you can take that garbage that is going there now, because if you push it down now and send the garbage back up there, what are you doing? You have to find the alternative site for it. If you have the alternative site and you do not get it in place - and my view is, that it cannot be got in place in a day or two - all these things take time and we need to have the kind of patience and we need to teach people, apart from the problem emanating from this particular problem, that they too have an important part to play. They need to be told. Only this morning I was wondering if they still teach hygiene in school, because in the past the things I see being thrown into the garbage, like pampers and all that sort of thing, many of us would have had the common knowledge and understanding of the health hazards from putting those things into the garbage. That is more important, to my mind, what the people can do to help to reduce the problem rather than the money we are going to spend on it, because if we spend money on it and we do not help them to correct those bad habits and bad attitudes, then we will continue spending more and more.

I am not defending anybody. I am not here for that.
12.20 p.m.

I am here to represent people generally, in my constituency and in the broader sense the people of Barbados. I sympathise with him. I would even give the Honourable Minister for St. Thomas my sympathy as well; but he has a part to play in it too. He needed to be up front, assuring those people as now, not yesterday and last week and calling a meeting and people have to be constantly worried whether it is going to be done.

I saw a clipping saying, "Close the Dump Now". Can you imagine that? People have come to the point where they feel frustrated over the fact that neither one of the two governments seem able to handle the problem. They probably and rightly believe that this is only an opportunity to do something in order to make them feel happy. I am thinking of the long term. I am thinking of the future that we must be able to take whatever knowledge from the consultants, whoever they are and put them in place. I have heard some statements in here that we are going to do this and then this happens. A lot of things have not been done.

I hope that in a situation like this one that you are not only saying that you are going to be doing it because this is only the first blow. We want to see a consistent and persistent approach to the whole question of garbage. We are not worried about who in management is responsible because we all select them too. We have a part to play in whom we select. If I am not mistaken, the Manager of the last Board, I am not so sure who made... It is unfair after having put a person believing that he has the competence to do it and then if that person tries his best and fails like most of us do... Some politicians in here are going to be like that. They are going to fail; but that is not the important thing. The important thing is to help them not to fail and that is what we should have been doing, trying to help those persons, give them the courage, the feeling that despite the worst is happening that we are behind them.

Even though I am in the Opposition, I am behind you in trying to get those people to understand that their duty to the country is just as important as mine and yours. So I am not going to castigate anybody. That is not my role in Parliament.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side can put the record straight. The dump or the landfill was not our responsibility at the time. We found it and we tried our best with it and if some of the bad things turned out obviously we will feel let down about it but we are not going to say that, that side and blame them for anything that they have done ten years ago. I only remind them because the Honourable Member suggested - it was a very important statement - that the whole thing originated with us, and it did not. Whether we managed it badly or not is a different matter. That is for her to make a point

There were handicaps that would have been responsible for it and basically, if you lay a bad foundation it is obvious to me that this will continue. I hope that after this exercise and the money is given and all that is necessary to help bring that dump or landfill, that the future landfill, wherever it is, will not create this problem because we should now learn from our experience here. This is a tremendous experience for any Minister to learn from.

Therefore, Sir... I see you nod, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the Honourable Member to wind up.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: We need not divide ourselves on the issue but come to the rescue of an issue of garbage collection and disposal and a programme that will not only be to the benefit of one side or the other in this House but to the entire nation as a whole.

In that way, CNN will never have the opportunity again to make that statement again. I want to say this to you, whenever that goes on CNN, it is not only this member here that they are talking about because as a Barbadian it is you as well. So we need to make sure that we learn from those experiences and put - as you rightly said, which I believe you have got from your advisors - those things in place and I will assure you that you will have my support on any occasion to deal with the matter.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree vehemently with the Honourable Member who just took his seat. We are divided in here, and we are divided in here along political lines. What happened at the Mangrove landfill is part of the reason why those Honourable Members are sitting over there now in the Opposition and these Honourable Members are sitting over here now in Government

Landfills are not new to public health management in Barbados. The generations before us and ourselves, those of us who are older in here and those of us who are younger, grew up with landfills. Empire cricket ground used to be a landfill and was put to productive use. There were landfills at Kingsland. In almost every parish of this country you can identify what used to be a landfill now put to productive use.

I wish to say at the outset in support of this Resolution that I believe the landfill is still a major solid waste disposal option for Barbados in the future and I will state why.

I want to say a few words about Mangrove first. What happened at Mangrove has to do with wrong priorities, misguided and wrongheaded priorities. Nothing new about landfills. When this landfill started at Mangrove it started as they did in the past, in the correct fashion. The seat of the landfill was pasted with clay so that it would be impervious to leachate and all of the proper steps which ought to have been taken were taken. Then what happened to Barbados? The Democratic Labour Party won the Government in 1986 and everything, Mr. Chairman, that they touched thereafter turned to dross.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, the first phase of the Mangrove Pond was never properly prepared in a scientific manner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member will have to support his point of order with facts.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The records indicate clearly that the Government of the day had to hurriedly remove dumping stuff at Kingsland in Christ Church and they had to prevent dumping at the Mangrove site even though this was determined by the consultants at that time to be the best site. Dumping progressed there without a scientific base where no clay was put, no pipe for the leachate disposal, no tanks, nothing of the order. That only came into being when the second phase of Mangrove Pond came into operation in 1992.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I made it clear I am speaking about Mangrove in the time of the Democratic Labour Party. I repeat, Sir, everything they touched turned to dross. They made a fine mess of everything in Barbados. Witness all the unfinished projects. When they were pouring money into Sherbourne, when the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was starving the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and starving the Sanitation Service Authority and pumping money into the St. Joseph Hospital... 12.30 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. If the Honourable Member would allow the reports of St. Joseph Hospital to be laid, which have been in the hands of the Minister for the last five months, the lie to what the Honourable Member just said could be seen because the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had a budget of sixty something million dollars to the half million dollars they are talking about for St. Joseph. If they wish me to lay the documents I will lay them for them. She had the Reports for five months, from the time they came in, Sir, because the Reports for the St. Joseph Hospital were given to the last Minister but the House was not in session and they have not yet laid them because they do not wish the truth to be told.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member imputing improper motive to another Honourable Member?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. I am making a statement of fact that they have been in possession of the reports for the last five months and they have not laid them in this House, contrary to the law.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You taught me to talk about it. You said that the Labour Party was supposed to come in to right all wrongs so they cannot follow anything that was done by anybody else.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order for two things. Firstly, the Honourable Member for St Michael West is imputing improper motives to me. Secondly, it is not true that I have had the reports of the St. Joseph Hospital for the last five months.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, these are the reports that were given to Cyril Walker, the then Minister of Health. They are in the Ministry of Health. The Minister has had them from the day she became Minister constructively. They are here. I make them a document of the House, Sir, 1990/91, 1991/92 and 1992/93. I now make them a document of the House, Sir, so that the public can finally get them.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to continue. I hope you are making note of my time taken away from me. It cannot now lie within the role of function of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to say he is laying reports for 1990/91. Where were the reports in 1990/91, 1992/93 and 1993/94? It is a case of too little too late. The point I am making is that the priority...

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member just said it is a case of too little too late. I submit that the St. Joseph Hospital Act requires by law that the Minister shall lay the reports as soon as possible. Therefore, the fact that I had to make them a document of the House in order for them to become public information cannot be too little too late. It is a matter required by the law of the land.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, 1995 can hardly be as soon as possible for a report that is reporting on the year 1990/91, or even 1991/92, or even 1992/93.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to address a matter. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West in your point of order you did not quote from the documents. I therefore believe it would be the position of the Honourable Minister of Health to lay the Reports in the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not lay them, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did not quote from them so you do not have to make them a document of the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: With respect, Sir. I do not wish Your Honour to be misled. With respect, Sir, Your Honour himself has ruled already today that a point of order must be substantiated by information. I made a point of order relevant to what the Honourable Member had said about the mis-priorities and she quoted the St. Joseph Hospital. I brought these documents in support of my contention that the priorities were not misplaced since the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had sixty something million dollars and the poor St. Joseph Hospital only had a little bit. I need to substantiate for Your Honour what I said about the St. Joseph Hospital and hence I brought these three documents which have been in my possession ever since I was a Minister so that this Committee, and especially Your Honour, would be properly seised of the relevant facts.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is asked to note that the documents cannot be laid in the House at this point in time, and not in Committee.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the more the Honourable Member for St. Michael West speaks the worse it becomes. He is not competent to lay any documents. Even when he was Minister of Health he was not competent to do it and now he is nothing he feels he can come in here and lay documents.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is asked to note that papers must be presented by the relevant Minister, so we are not accepting your papers because they should be laid by the relevant Minister.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect. These documents which I am laying are documents which I asked to be made documents of the House. I did not ask to lay them, Sir. I am not laying anything. That is for the Minister to come and lay them and she may even lay them again. The DLP Manifesto, the BLP Manifesto, all kinds of papers are documents. I said I am making it a document of the House because I can make it a document of the House. You cannot tell me, Sir, that I cannot make it a document of the House. You can look at it and then decide that it is not authentic. The Clerk can inform you that it is not authentic, that the signature of the Chairman here is not authentic, any of those things, but once I said what I said, I have to give you the evidence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the Honourable Member is referring to a document, if he is quoting from a document he may then make it a document of the House for reference but you have not quoted from the document.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I accept Your Honour's ruling. Later on as I make reference to them I will quote from all three and make them a document of the House. I promise you, Sir, that I will make them a document of the House unless, of course, they are laid before.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to resume. As I was saying, the wrongheaded priorities of the former administration have brought the Mangrove Landfill to where it is today. In all these years that we have been collecting and disposing of garbage we have never had a mountain such as the mountain to be seen at Mangrove. It has to do with wrong priorities. It has to do with gross mismanagement. It has to do with gross incompetence. The staff at the Sanitation Service Authority can only take their lead from the Minister.

It is a disgraceful thing, Sir, that not since I was in the Ministry of Health, divers years ago, did we see in the Estimates of Expenditure a landfill compactor. Now, these are the Estimates for 1994/95, the current financial year. I see at page 119 under subprogramme 12, Ministry of Health, Sanitation Service Authority, at 625, among other things, provision for the purchase of one shredder with spares, tools, landfill compactor.

Now, these Estimates passed this Honourable House at the end of March, 1994. We came into Government on September 7, 1994 and up until that time, none of these items had even been put on order so you understand what I mean when I say that it has to do with lack of priority. I have to commend the Honourable Minister of Health for giving the Sanitation Service Authority the kind of priority which it not only deserved but needed urgently and so quickly after the 6th September. 12.40 p.m.

I have to commend the Honourable Minister of Health, Sir, for giving the Sanitation Service Authority the kind of priority which it not only deserved but needed urgently so quickly after the 6th of September as she perceived. These items are now on order and we are expecting to take delivery of them I believe within a matter of weeks. But we were 6 months into the Financial Year and nobody in the Ministry of Health under the last Administration saw fit or thought it urgent enough that these items should be put on order.

The Sanitation Service Authority has been starved of equipment from 1986. When the Barbados Labour Party left Government, at that time, there was in place a standing

arrangement with the Crown Agents for the supply of vehicles and vehicles of different capacities, bearing in mind that some streets are smaller. This is true particularly in the City of Bridgetown. We had that kind of arrangement where the rolling stock of the Sanitation Service Authority was kept at a certain level. There was also an arrangement where ongoing preventive maintenance in respect of the equipment at the Sanitation Service Authority was a feature of the work of that Authority. All of that went by the board.

The past Administration was busy pouring money into an even now unfinished St Thomas Secondary School. They were busy pouring money into an even now unfinished West Wing of this Parliament. They were busy pouring money into an even now unfinished Sherbourne so-called Convention Centre. They were busy pouring money then into an even now unfinished headquarters for the Ministry of Education, one of the more environmentally disgraceful sites in Barbados. All of that the people in this country tolerated until the 6th of September when they said, "No more!"

Sanitation was an issue for the platforms. Do not let us be in any doubt. The Minister of Health knew where her priorities were. She is to be commended for moving with speed and with a sense of urgency. She is to be commended for having taken the best professional advice that was available to her which said professional advice was equally available to the former Administration but they were bent on other things and, particularly, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was bent on the St. Joseph Hospital. I say no more about the St. Joseph Hospital at this time. I believe that the enquiry there into will bring to our attention all of the inequities and the infelicities...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Oh yes. I am never going to let it go. All of that is what helped to bring them down to where they are today.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to say that it is my opinion that, for the future, as we move towards the twenty-first century that Barbados has to look to diversify its method of garbage, solid and other waste disposal.

We are told that there is an incinerator at the Port and it works well. Sure. It works for whatever is to be disposed of at the Port and in quality and quantity that suits. It is not my opinion that incineration is the way for general solid waste disposal in this country. Incineration is very expensive. Incineration has polluting fall-out, whatever preventive steps may be taken. That is a fact of life. I believe that incineration at the Port is very good. If it works well at the Port, long may it continue to work

well there. But I have observed and I believe you too, Sir, that Barbadians have now come to understand the principles of separation and recycling.

We have seen a number of small businesses springing up in Barbados, separating and recycling in respect of paper, plastics, metals both ferrous and non-ferrous. I believe that with the public education programme which the Ministry of Health will undertake, in the end the majority of what would go to any landfill in Barbados will be largely organic matter which will biodegrade in a short time and that we will return to landfills which do not offend our health, our sensitivities and our sensibilities in Barbados.

I believe that we have to look at different methods of disposal for different commodities in Barbados. But the most important thing is that the people of Barbados should begin to accept those basic principles.

I can tell you, Sir, in my constituency of Bridgetown because people are not always complimentary about it, in what we call the uptown district in Nelson Street, Beckwith Street, Spruce Street since the beginning of 1994 one of the environmental associations in Barbados launched a separation and recycling project. I was there. I helped to do the launching. They colour coded cans and did an education programme among the people of that part of the City of Bridgetown. For a year now that pilot project has been working with much success.

For those who despair that Barbadians will learn, I say do not despair. Barbadians learnt how to bag and tag their garbage in the 1970s at a time when people thought you would never get them to do it. They will, in time, learn. Already at many supermarkets including my own local supermarket I separate, for years I have been separating the plastics out. There is a paper processing plant now in Barbados which is hungry for paper. People are beginning to separate the paper out. The bulky items, even in my time as a Minister of Health we sought to separate them out and we were bitterly criticized by the then Opposition which is now again the Opposition, for building an artificial reef off the west coast with bulky items which had been properly drained and treated, things like old car bodies, refrigerators and the like. We need to look at these many, many diverse methods of managing and disposing of solid waste.

Thank you, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one more minute to wind up.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I too would like to join this debate and I certainly do so against a background of some concern for the level of debate that I

saw emanating from the mouth of the Honourable Minister. The Honourable Minister clearly is speaking with an emotional tongue having come under fire as a result of the mouthings of the real Prime Minister on that side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to address Honourable Members by their constituencies.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The Honourable Member for St. James South, the Honourable Minister of Health sought to lay blame on the backs of the Democratic Labour Party Administration, in a sense echoing the mouthings of the real Prime Minister on that side...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to clarify who he is speaking about. He is either speaking about an Honourable Minister or he is speaking about an Honourable Member from a particular constituency. Is the Honourable Member speaking about the Honourable Member for St. Peter? 12.50 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member speaking about the Honourable Member for St. Peter?

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see the Honourable Member for St. Peter in this House so...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am speaking about the real Prime Minister on that side, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that the real Prime Minister is not in his Chak. He has not been in his Chair for some time.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member sought to address this House as a representative on behalf of his constituents and I have no difficulty with him doing that. But I recognised at that time that the path he was going down would sooner or later create a problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Which Member is the Honourable Member for St. Michael East speaking about?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am speaking about the Honourable Member for St. Thomas who sat in the House of Assembly during the period 1991 to 1994. The Honourable Member sought to take a position on behalf of his constituents and maybe rightly so but I felt that to some extent he was not entirely fair to the Government because the administration of the Democratic Labour Party had in fact noted the difficulties that were being experienced by the residents and we sought with haste to correct

the problem that he was complaining about and to progress the Mangrove development as a dumping landfill in a more scientific manner.

I think that the Honourable Member is on record as having said that he was indeed satisfied with the progress that had been made by this administration and that the problem at Mangrove was one of bad management and he had felt that the problem was indeed now corrected.

We were going through a structural adjustment programme at the time, Sir, and you would appreciate that we did not have unlimited access to funds that we could simply just like that order this, order that and just get things. We were in a structural adjustment programme and the Honourable Member was very aware that we were going through that programme. He is on record as having said that he is now satisfied that the problem was one of management and that the problem had been corrected and he appreciated the scientific approach that this administration had adopted with the introduction of phase 2 of the Mangrove Landfill.

Now, what is significant is that that phase 2 project came under control, brought the situation under control, and immediately on our losing office the new administration completely abandoned Mangrove because the Member over that side indicated that the dump had to be closed and they completely abandoned Mangrove in their minds which resulted in a mound that was twice the size of the original mound "Stinkeroo".

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The mound that has been reduced has been in that condition since March last year when I got an injunction restraining the Sanitation Authority from further dumping on that site. He is talking utter foolishness.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the landfill has still been taking refuse as indicated by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West and it has been placed on the identical mound that has recently become a significant problem for the residents of Arch Hall and Bennets. That was aggravated by the hasty approach to remedying the problem where they brought in bulldozers, sought to level it and created further problems as a result.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Honourable Member for St. Michael East is misleading the House. I will not call him a liar. He is misleading the House. The site at Mangrove that had to be reduced and brought under control had fires burning there since June of 1994. It is a site that was closed since May of 1994. No garbage has been received there since then.

The site which is receiving garbage is a completely different site altogether. No garbage has been dumped on that site. So that he is misleading the House and deliberately so. Garbage is being received at a new site also on the Mangrove compound altogether. It is an excavated site. It is not the mound. It is not the mountain that we had to grapple to bring under control.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the Mangrove phase 2 came to an abrupt end because of the amount of refuse that came unto the site within a period of seven months and you would appreciate that we on this side had 2 massive campaign for the eradication of illegal dumping. Certainly in my constituency there was a severe problem in the Belle where I myself joined residents and went into the gullies in the Belle to seek to clear garbage.

Now, if we are in fact having a campaign to eradicate illegal dumping, does it not make sense for anyone to appreciate that there would be an increase in the amount of garbage that is going to arrive at the Mangrove road side? So the phase 2 was in fact exhausted within a period of 7 months and we were in the process of progressing the second phase of phase 2 where we were preparing an extended area to the South East of Mangrove where we were preparing to take an additional set of garbage by acquiring the land and reshaping the road, infrastructure, etc. It was a detailed paper that was presented to Parliament on it. At the time we had come to Parliament and we had received a supplementary vote where we had to freeze heads and prioritise Mangrove because of the potential problem that posed at that time.

At all times, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party was conscious of the fact that the residents were being affected and we tried to do as much as we could do within the limited resources that we had.

What is significant, Sir, is that in accordance - I am reading from my notes, Sir - North American and European standards the geology and the hydro-geology of most of Barbados would be considered unsuitable for development of a containment landfill due to the lack of low permeability material, etc. Wherever you go in Barbados, Sir, you are going to have a problem, that is why it is a dangerous precedent for any particular representative to take a position that he will not allow a landfill in his constituency because it is indeed affecting his residents. When the consultants...

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I agree with him because if you said it then I would agree that he should say it as well. And that is a zone 1 area. What is important is that the consultants, as far back as the 1984/85 period

they identified Mangrove as the optimum site and the decision to go to Mangrove was not a bad one. It was the correct decision in relation to the consultants' recommendation that was made by the Barbados Labour Party to go to Mangrove because in relation to what they are telling us, however they work the table of priority, Mangrove came out as the number one area for the landfill. 1.00 p:m.

The point is and I agree to some extent with the Honourable Minister that the question for Barbados has to do with the proper scientific management of the site, but it can only be done in relation with the national budget. If we want to get into the argument of bad management, the Honourable Member made a statement that this Government was not accepting animal and fish offal anymore at the dump and subsequent to that provisions have been made where the fish offal is dumped at sea. I do not know who is paying the bill for dumping it. I would like to find out who is paying the bill.

Aside.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am not worried about any licences. You cannot derail me. I want to know who is paying the bill as far as the offal is concerned. Under her administration they are still accepting animal offal at that site up to three weeks ago. The Ministry knows about it and...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: There is an accepted method for referring to Honourable Members of this Chamber. I am an Honourable Member of this Chamber and I insist on being referred to in the correct manner. That they have no respect for women, that they have disdain for women, that they refuse to run women in constituencies where they have a real chance of winning, it is their problem. But I insist on being accorded the respect due to any other Member of this Chamber. If they have difficulty with how they treat women, the Chair must impose the discipline on them to make them do what is required.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point of order is taken. But the Chairman rules that in the context...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am making a ruling, Sir. You may have your seat. I am making a ruling and then you can stand. In the context in which the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chamber, he had referred to the Honourable Member and the Honourable Minister before. So the Chair was ruling that in the context that he was giving due homage to the Honourable Member and the "she" was just placed in the context at that point in time, but it was not meant to be disrespectful. But the point

is taken that Members must pay due regard that they must be very careful that Members do not perceive that they are being dishonourable in their comments.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would want to place on record that I have very great respect for women and all of us on this side for that matter. I was making the point, Sir, that the Honourable Member sought to introduce to this House that there was bad management that permeated the entire regime of this administration with regard to the management of the dump at Mangrove. But during the short period that the Honourable Member has had to preside over the Mangrove dump, they made a statement in November that they were not accepting animal or fish offal. Despite that, they have still been accepting animal offal at the dump up to two or three weeks ago. It aggravated the situation because the stench again was similar to the stench that occurred under the period of the last administration. It is not a question that anybody is doing deliberately and there was a genuine problem. The problem why that has happened is because there are some small farmers who are mandated to bury their animal offal and they do not have the land on which to do that, and they are between the devil and the animals. So they have been accommodated by the Ministry in a silent manner. I think it is offensive for the Minister to know these kinds of difficulties that are experienced in Barbados and come to seek to politicize an issue when we should in fact be addressing and paying attention to the scientific report that was adopted by this administration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one more minute to conclude.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Sir, I had better return because I have quite a bit more to go.

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour the SPEAKER and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER reported to the House accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House be suspended until 2.20 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before we go on suspension please, I would like to draw the attention of all Honourable Members to the presence in our Speaker's Gallery of the Hon. Tom Foley, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives. We are pleased to know that you are

with us and Senator Anne Cools presence and also Ricky Craig who is our Consul General in New York. We welcome all of you.

The question that the House do now suspend until 2.2C p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it shall now revert.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This House is now in Committee of Supply.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the first essential of this debate is that Members ought to make themselves conversant and familiar with the geography of the landfill at Mangrove Pond. When the Honourable Member for St. Michael East spoke, it was clear that even though he had visited the landfill a day last week he failed to have any appreciation of the problems or the site that was the cause of the problems.

Let me just explain what we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, when we speak of Mount Stinkeroo and the Mangrove landfill. At this time, 1995, we are not speaking of the old site. Perhaps if I could describe it for Honourable Members, because the former Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, also spoke with a high degree of unfamiliarity with the area.

If you turn off Highway 2A and proceed up the road that says Mangrove Pond, when you get to the top of the hill you come to a site on your left, which was the first dump. That is now grassed and capped. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West was in office when that was closed, capped, and it now poses no problem. There is leakage of leachate, but apart from that there is no problem. On the right, as you come up the hill, you come to a hut which is at the entrance to the new landfill, and as you go through the gate on your left, east of the hut is a big mound where the old fridges, car bodies and so on are dumped. The only problem that you have on that mound is a constant outpouring of a vapour which smells of a chemical. It is not stink, it does not smell like offal or anything like that. I think myself that that is because there are old tyres there giving off that vapour, because a lot of

car tyres were dumped on that site, and indeed if you look at it now you will see another heap of car tyres. West of the hut was this vast mound that they call Mount Stinkeroo, but even though you have Mount Stinkeroo at the western extremity, the old car site on the eastern extremity, between the hut is a road leading you into a depressed area which has been dug out. That depressed area which has been dug out and is of very solid rock is where dumping is still going on on a daily basis.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Right. But there is really no smell coming from that. The problem was this piece on the end that went up in the air. That is Mount Stinkeroo, and that came about because when the site to the south of that reached a height, they left a gap and started to dump, and Mount Stinkeroo went to 40 feet in the air. The consequence of going 40 feet in the air, apart from any offence that was caused to the landscape and the fact that it was no longer aesthetically pleasing to the eye, was a real problem for the Authority. That is to say, it was so high and so sheer that when it caught fire the Barbados Fire Service were not able to get to it to extinguish the blaze. The most recent flare up we had in December/early January came at that site.

I wish to say, Sir, a number of things about how this matter was dealt with. First of all, I want to read into the record again, because certain suggestions were made on the other side this morning. In mid 1984, before I was in the House of Assembly for the second time, when I was in the Senate, the Mangrove Pond site was identified as the site for a landfill. It did not become a landfill in the sense that it did not start receiving garbage until October, 1986. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West tried to suggest otherwise, but I quote for his elucidation and the edification of all men from page 4398 of the House of Assembly Debates for 1994 in a ministerial statement made by the Honourable C.V. Walker, as he then was, Minister of Health. He said this, Sir:

"Operations at what is now known as the old Mangrove landfill commenced in October 1986, following the granting of approval by the Town Planning Department and the Ministry of Agriculture."

Then he went on to talk about how much garbage it used to receive.

The first point I wish to make in this debate is that the Barbados Labour Party never managed or bore responsibility for the management of the landfill until September 7, 1994.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: It is here, he said it. Walker made the speech in here.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The point I was making has nothing to do with management of this landfill, it was how the site was located, not management.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: The decision to locate was taken, but I just want to make a very simple point, that it all boils down to management. Could anybody explain to me why is it that for a period of four months you never hear any problem from the landfill, all of a sudden it flares up. Why is that? If you can operate it without it being offensive for four months, you ought to be able to operate it for 12 months without it being offensive. Who is to accept responsibility but the management? We have forgotten, in the emotion of this debate, the principle of ministerial responsibility. Nobody says the Minister has day to day responsibility for a dump, but if a dump is under the suzerainty of the Ministry of Health, the Minister of Health must ultimately be answerable and accountable for its management. Last year in this House of Assembly I located the problem then as one centred around the management at the Sanitation Service Authority.

Aside.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I am not changing my position about anything, but I am concerned when I read statements in the Press and hear today that the matter should not be a political matter, and suggestions have been made that I politicised the issue. Let me just explain. We seem to think that the problems at Mangrove began in December. When there was the old dump, before that was closed down there were problems. I have in my diary, I think it was in 1992, for about ten days it burnt, raw flames, and it affected the people in Arch Hall. 2.35 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West can remind Honourable Members in here that every year since 1988 I used to complain about the offence that was caused to the people in Arch Hall. We got the old one sorted out. We went to the new one. In 1992 when that was opened - I think it was in June or September, in the middle of the year - the Honourable Member for St. Michael South West promised then that according to the information that he was given there would not be any more problems, because for the first time they had laid a lot of light green pipes in the bottom with holes then covered with sand, gravel and with clay and they put something down on the bottom of it now to take the leachate which they said they would use back. All of that was done.

The residents were told the Saturday afternoon that they had followed a state of the art profile and that nothing

would happen. Notwithstanding all of that, for a period of time at first we had no problems; but we continued to have problems and efforts were made not in respect of the new dump but in respect of the old dump because of the illegal dumping and so on. Efforts were made for a period of six months as a result of the complaints of the residents to put in a security guard service. There were no complaints. There was no illegal dumping and then they withdrew the security guard service. I am just maintaining that if you had proper security, if you had lighting, a lot of the problems that ultimately transpired would not have transpired.

Be that as it may, last year in the ministerial statement in respect of what I call Phase 2 the Minister then said:

"I would like to give assurance based on the technical advice I have received that the area to be completed shortly should pose little or no problem to residents. Cover will be applied daily and additional equipment being added should assist greatly in its management. It should be noted that approval has been granted for the ordering of one landfill compactor and two trucks. Lighting is also being installed to enhance security at the landfill."

This was March 15 last year that Walker made the ministerial statement in here.

The compactor on January 17, 1995 is still not in use. The lighting that he promised to enhance the security is still not in use. The compactor has been ordered and a shredder in an attempt to deal with the problem.

Let me come now, Sir, to the more immediate circumstances. When we became the Government, the Prime Minister was so concerned about the problem at Mangrove, because we made it a manifesto pledge that we would close it, that he called a meeting on Monday, November 14 with members of the Ministry of Health and officers of the Sanitation Service Authority in the Cabinet Office, and he told them that he wanted no further problems from Mt. Stinkeroo. It should have been capped and sealed since last year when the Court made the order. It was not.

He explained to them that if they needed funds he would make the funds available by way of supplementary provision and they had to do what was necessary to prevent Mt. Stinkeroo from being a problem, especially having regard to the oncoming tourist season.

I well remember that when he explained that money would be available, the Manager of the Sanitation Service Authority could not respond initially and when he did respond he made the point that he was dumbstruck

because for the first time he was being told that whatever funds were necessary to rectify the problem would have been granted. By implication he was saying that the previous Administration had starved the Sanitation Service Authority of funds specifically to deal with Mt. Stinkeroo. It may have had to do with the structural adjustment and so on, but the fact is that funding and equipment, was denied the Authority. That is what he was saying and he said it in an open forum.

On that evening they were told that they could rent equipment, they could purchase additional cover material, they could install six-inch mains from Bucks to the Mangrove landfill by December 15 and they were going to get a small supplementary then but come with a much larger one, which they came for Tuesday before Christmas.

A work plan was devised as a result of the meeting of November 14 with the Sanitation Service Authority and the Environmental Engineering Department and the staff of the Ministry to put into operation procedures for bringing Mangrove under some reasonable control.

Weekly meetings were held with the Minister after that and one of the conditions that the Prime Minister laid down was that every week the Sanitation Service Authority had to provide a work schedule to Cabinet and to the Ministry, of course, in respect of Mangrove, Church Hill in Christ Church and the pulverisation plant.

The people got two consultants to come in, Mr. Robert Tye and Mr. Bill Peck. They went up on the site with the Chief Fke Officer and they made a report. They wanted a lot of money and generally, the thing worked reasonably well until just around Christmas when it flared up. It flared up high up in the air on the southern side and nobody could get to it. We all saw the people on television complaining. Some of them were coughing blood. It became very offensive and oppressive and at the meeting in the Cabinet Room... I want to say that the only true thing that has been written of me in *Cou cou* and *Flying Fish* was written two Saturdays ago. They said that I got on bad in the Cabinet Room. That is true. I am not talking about a vote. I am not disclosing a vote. We had the Sanitation people there and everybody. It was not a closed Cabinet meeting. We invited the Sanitation Authority and the Ministry of Health to the Cabinet room. I complained bitterly.

Asides.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: We asked them to come in and tell us why this problem had developed. Let me say, Sir, that this Resolution is before us today because a solution was offered. The solution which I put up and which has been carried out is to this effect. Let us declare Mt. Stinkeroo a national disaster area calling for speedy

and emergency action to deal with the problem once and for all. Bring in CERO, the Defence Force, all the agencies of Government, all the private contractors, get all the equipment up there! We would meet at the site the next morning at 8.30 a.m. They worked out a plan overnight. We moved in and we determined with the Fke Chief that the best thing to do was to pull it down. 2.45 p.m.

Now, in pulling it down we were uncovering all that had been under there for two years. That was bound to be offensive, but we knew that. The Minister made a statement which appeared in the Press, at a Press Conference held the same afternoon at about 4 o'clock saying that there would be smells, and she asked the public to be understanding and to show restraint because in solving the problem there would be a period of discomfort.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has one minute to wind up.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sk. We pulled it down from 40 feet or whatever it was up in the air, to about 10 feet now off the ground. When it has been pulled down, we have been able to level it, wet it, deoderise it, put mould on it, put clay on it and compact it and if you have been up there recently, the areas that have been compacted have no smells. We were there on Friday afternoon and there were no smells. You are getting the smells from the areas that have not been compacted.

Now, I want to finally say this, Sir. I was a little shocked last week to read that BAMP and the Environmental Association had front page pieces in the papers calling on the Government to do something. For six years, and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West would know that I used to pester him, and I read out the correspondence in here in one debate. I used to pester him every year, two, three times a year about that problem, over a six year period and I never saw BAMP, I never saw the Environmental Association come out and lift a finger in support of what I was doing on behalf of my people who were suffering, but when the wind shifted and took it now down into the middle-class areas, I heard them come out hollering for murder. I just wanted to say that. It has taught me a lot.

Mt. Stinkeroo is the only thing in my political life that has frustrated me and made me feel powerless, unable to do anything for people who were suffering because several times I was in here over a six year period asking for help and never got the help. I have got the help now from the Honourable Minister of Health, and the Barbados Labour Party Government, and Mt. Stinkeroo shortly will be no more. It can be rechristened Mount Branford, if you like.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, there is a point of significance in this debate that should not be missed. This is the second occasion in less than four months that this House is being asked to vote a very substantial sum by way of a supplementary to deal with the problems at the Mangrove Dump. In each instance the House is being asked to vote more than \$1 million. I think that point must not be missed in this debate.

I want to enter the debate, Sir, to make a number of very simple points. What is happening at Mt. Stinkeroo illustrates what can happen in developing countries when national and major matters of urgent public importance are made the victims of false budgeting of false economies. A Structural Adjustment Programme was put in place in this country that put at the centre of its concern financial programming that reduced all problems in this society to the same denominator. Even if there was a problem that could wreck this society and undermine the health of the people of this society, it was made secondary to a process of financial programming. As a result, adequate financial resources have not, over the course of the last few years, been provided to deal with some of the most serious environmental problems facing this country. The Mr. Stinkeroo situation was allowed to get out of hand as a result of what I call false budgeting.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about how there was a need for equipment for proper management systems at Mt. Stinkeroo. A case was made over and over again that they could not find the resources to do so. I feel that there are some national problems for which the resources just simply have to be found. In a small society the management and the protection of the health of the people, and the management and the protection of our environment, are matters of such grave significance to me that the resources just simply have to be found. We must not use any excuse now, nor in the future, for our inability to deal with problems such as those that are operating at Mt. Stinkeroo.

I do not have to blow a trumpet but on November 14, as the Honourable Member for St. Thomas has said, I called all the people involved and said let me know what you want in terms of financial resources to get the job done. They put a case for \$1 million and they got it. There is going to be no financial programming from within or from without that will stop us, and must ever stop us, from dealing with matters that are of the character that Mt. Stinkeroo poses to this country.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I just want to make a very simple point because I also want to go on to the future, Sir.

We have to bend our minds to the fact that we are going to have to be creative in the regimes that we use in this country for the management of solid and other wastes. We also have to be creative and bend our minds to the fact that the resources will have to be found in a small society, highly urbanised, highly service oriented, to make sure that environmental problems do not act as a constraint to the development of the society and the economy in general.

I am saying all of this, Sir, to say that as Minister of Finance, I have agreed that two supplementaries should be brought here because people must never again be able to say that lack of resources forced them from being able to get to deal with a matter that is embarrassing, unhealthy and wrong. I will be asking for the support of the House in the future, if we have to protect our environment or enhance it, in order for us to carry out the kinds of programmes that are necessary to make sure that these threats to the health and the progress of this country are not repeated. That is my contribution to this debate.

We are prepared on this side to make sure that the resources are provided to prevent the occurrence of problems of this nature. We are prepared to provide the resources even now to minimize the damage caused to the society in general by that blight in St. Thomas. I have already made it very clear to the public that I am prepared to lavish concession on any industry or enterprise that wants to convert garbage into resources. As a result, Sir, we have been in receipt of a large number of project proposals, some to do with the creation of rendering plants, others to do with the conversion of garbage into energy and other by-products. The Ministry of Health is now in the process of evaluating them. But an appropriate regime will be created in this country within which enterprises involved in the business of solid management will know that they can recoup their capital and realise reasonable rates of returns for investment in these newest important national areas. We need that regime urgently.

I also want to say to the House that if this Government has in the future to spend considerable sums of money to make sure that any future landfill, wherever it is located, is properly designed and properly managed, I am now serving notice that I will be asking all members of this House to join in that particular endeavour. 2.55 p.m.

This is an object lesson to us, as a developing country, as to what can happen when we allow foolish and false criteria of financial efficiency and financial management to override our concerns for the people's welfare and it must never, ever, ever again be allowed to happen in this country.

I say no more about this matter at this stage.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the last 2 interventions in this debate are more than interesting in the context of the attitude which the Minister and subsequent speakers brought to this debate at the beginning.

I want to say that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, in his presentation, put for the first time in this debate the facts before this Honourable Committee. Because this is not a matter that is being debated for the first time. It is not the first Resolution coming to this Committee or the first matter coming to the House of Assembly dealing with environmental health or in fact dealing with the problems of Mangrove.

One of the things I detest in public life in this country is that persons who ought to know better continually seek to distort the Record in pursuit of a very pernicious decision that certain persons in the community should always be the butt and beneficiaries of vilification. I have been Minister of Health in this country for 8 years and I do not have to write my own epitaph in that regard. Anyone...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The only person I never mashed up is the Honourable Member for the City!

Mr. Chairman, there is no one who can write an epitaph of my sojourn as Minister of Health who will not recognize that I brought to that portfolio a keen interest in raising the plateau from which we regard the health of this community.

On the question of environmental health and in particular the disposal of solid waste in this country, soon after I became Minister I asked the Government to allow me to visit 3 places in the world where solid waste disposal has become a fine art if you will. I went to Montreal, I went to Vancouver and I went to Berne in Switzerland; and I saw incineration plants. In the case of Switzerland the plant is literally within the neighbourhood. That came as a result of our wanting to find a solution to the problem of solid waste disposal in this country. As soon as I returned in 1988 we agreed to go to the Inter-American Development Bank and ask them to underwrite a project that would deal with the totality of solid waste disposal in Barbados because we envisaged that it was going to be a problem for this country well into the twenty-first century.

Such a project was agreed upon and the Inter-American Development Bank financed a pre-feasibility study and a feasibility study to look at the solid waste disposal problems of Barbados and to make recommendations. It is interesting that that study is still in process, that the Honourable Members would have been in receipt of the Report, which Cyril Walker as Minister of

Health finally received at the end of the feasibility study and which made firm recommendations on the disposal of solid waste in this country.

The solid waste disposal recommendation was that 108 acres of land should be found for a landfill. I raised the matter with the then Minister of Health as to where in Barbados we could find 108 acres to dispose of solid waste that would not be in proximity to some neighbourhood that would raise the same questions and issues that had been raised in St. Thomas. As a result, the Cabinet of the day asked the Minister to ask the experts to revisit the issue. It is in the context of that revisitation that the Report - which is available and which is in the Ministry of Health and should be available to all the Cabinet Ministers - made recommendations and it is on that Report that the Government of Barbados is to respond to the Inter-American Development Bank so that they could then move on to the larger issue of the solution to the problem. That is how the priorities including Mangrove, Blowers, Greenland and all of the other areas came to be in the marketplace of ideas because that forms part of the Report that was submitted by the expert that had been chosen by the Inter-American Development Bank with the approval of the Government of Barbados.

The question of the disposal of solid waste in Barbados has been part of the comprehensive examination by the Democratic Labour Party Government. That is nothing to do with the issues relating to the facts which the Honourable Member for St. Thomas fairly put in the debate and which I do not intend to repeat except to say this. I find it passing strange that the facts have been so distorted that no one can clearly recognize that, first of all, there was a problem with the original Mangrove landfill and that the Minister of Health of the day agreed that that landfill had to be closed and kept and beautified so that it could become an object for tourism by its beauty.

We went next door to a second landfill. We got \$100 000 from PAHO for fencing it. I found it strange that the Minister could be reported as saying there was no fencing when in fact the fencing was put in place.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have no doubt that it is gone. But what they said was that the Minister said that the Government had made no provision for fencing. We got \$100 000 from PAHO which they gave us for fencing the landfill. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas can confirm that we had fencing around the landfill. We made provision for what has been described as a...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The fencing on the eastern side with the bulky stuff

does not exist because they piled it so high, it pushed down the fence.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, Sir, but I stopped being responsible for the landfill a long time ago. I am speaking about when I left it. When I left it they had a very tall fence in place that had been paid for by PAHO.

Furthermore, Sir, we laid leachate pipes to ensure that leachate would not go into the water table. We made sure that all the provisions that had been recommended by a group headed by Arthur Archer, Kenneth Belgrave and an officer who is now Manager of the Sanitation Service Authority... They prepared a Report which was the basis for the building of Phase 2 of Mangrove.

In September, 1992 I went to Mangrove and I was so happy that I was able to say that I had done something I had promised to do especially after taking the barking from the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. He is right. He used to persecute me and I used to respond. We read out the correspondence in here and I find it unacceptable that any Minister could be unaware of that, if the Minister is seeking to master his or her portfolio. These are matters which form the Record and therefore if a Minister is going to make public statements concerning the attitude and behaviour of a public official, that Minister has a duty to the public, to say nothing of the duty to himself or herself, to be accurate in the statements that that Minister makes. 3.05 p.m.

I find it passing strange, but that notwithstanding, Sir, we did and it could be deemed to be said that we did all that we possibly were required to do in that respect in terms of starting the new landfill. What happened thereafter, Sir, has been documented, has been commented upon and again we are back at the stage where we have to go at it again.

The Honourable Member for the City, in that manner to which we have become accustomed, sought to suggest that there was a difficulty of priorities with regard to Mangrove and in the course of discussing those priorities she felt it necessary to invoke the bogey which they invoke on a constant basis - the St. Joseph Hospital. Another pernicious myth that has been perpetrated by a series of wicked people.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Of course not. A series of wicked people who continue to use St. Joseph Hospital as some supposed sword of Damocles.

Now, Sir, I have in my hand, three documents and each of them included a letter addressed to the Honourable Cyril Walker and signed by Leo Leacock G.C.M., J.P..

Each one has this letter, Sir, "Pursuant to section 11(1) (a) and (b) of the St. Joseph Hospital Act, 1989-30, I have the honour to submit the First Annual Report and Audited Statements of the Hospital for the Financial Year 1990/1991. In the case of this one.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: May 31, 1994. In the case of this one, Sir, I quote the same identical words, except it says for the Financial Year 1991/1992. And in respect of this one...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: An Honourable Member is raising questions about these documents, Sir.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member for St Michael West is quoting from documents and I am not sure that those are authentic documents. I would like them to be available.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I give this Committee the assurance that as soon as I am finished with these documents I shall make them documents of the House so that Honourable Members will have the opportunity to refer to them. I give the Honourable Member for St Michael South, the right Honourable gentleman, and I give the Honourable Member and gallant Member for Christ Church South that he too will have an opportunity to peruse these documents which have been signed by his good friend, the Chairman.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South raised a very serious point, Sir, and it is passing strange that a Report for 1990 should be presented to a Minister in 1994 and therefore it can cast some doubt about the seriousness and authenticity of the Report. I think, therefore, Sir, that the House deserves to be satisfied about the authenticity of the document that the Member for St. Michael South ...

A 1990 report that was sent to a Minister in 1994 reflects upon the Minister as well and this House ought to be satisfied...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It may do so and the House may take note of that, Sir. It is a fact the Minister was very recalcitrant in laying them, Sir. There is no question about that that the Minister of the day ought to have laid them. Had he received them I have no doubt that he would have laid them. But, Sir, as I was saying this one is for the financial year 1992/93. I now formally make them documents of the House and I hand them in to the Clerk.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir, a report such as the Honourable Member for St Michael West wishes us to believe is what it truly is can only be authenticated by the Ministry of Health, can only come from the Ministry of Health. I do not know about the authenticity of that. That could be a mock document from anywhere and I do not care who has signed it. A document professing to be what this document professes to be cannot emanate out of the hand of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West. I therefore propose, Sir, that it is not a document which can be laid on the Table of this House.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: To make it a document of the House there is an old-fashioned term that we use. It has to be laid on the Table of the House. I am saying that it cannot even be made a document of this House because there is no proof it is what it purports to be.

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to draw to your attention that you must satisfy yourself that the document is the original document. You must satisfy yourself otherwise it could only be laid as a document which the Honourable Member was reading from. It cannot possibly be a document which is the document received from the proper source, by the proper person. Otherwise the Honourable Member will not be in a position, nor must the records of this House reflect that that document is the original and authentic document.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, the Honourable Member is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The ruling is that the document may be viewed. It is not deemed as laid neither is it a document of the House. If there are any Members who would like to see the document they can see the document.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not know what you are saying, Sir, but I will say, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South is absolutely correct. He is saying correctly that I cannot lay the original document because the original document is in the Ministry of Health and the Minister of Health has had it since she became a Minister, or ought to have had it, and it should be laid. And it is in breach of the law that it has not been laid. So what I am laying here, Sir, are mere copies.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am making it a document of the House because I quoted from it.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What do you know about privileges in here? You cannot tell me about privileges in here. I know you do not want the public to know about these documents which have been here since May 31, 1994.

Loud Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order...

Mr. Chairman rises.
3.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress to His Honour, the SPEAKER, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your privilege, Sir?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: During the course of a debate of the Committee, Sir, I quoted copiously from three documents which I have in my possession. I quoted from the letters of transmittal of three documents which I have in my possession which I received in my official capacity as a Minister of the Crown. I, therefore, know that the documents are authentic because I received them when I was a Cabinet Minister. These documents, Sir, relate to the Annual Reports of the St. Joseph Hospital for 1990-91.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, what is your point of privilege?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have to develop it, Sir. It is customary...

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the Standing Orders, that is not a point of privilege.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir, I have not made the point yet. According to the Standing Orders, my privileges in here extend to my explanations, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, I believe things have gotten out of hand and I have no alternative but to suspend this sitting for the next 10 minutes.

RESUMPTION

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: We now revert to Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. CHAIRMAN took his Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This House is resumed for Committee of Supply.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a matter of privilege. All matters in the House cease when any Member rises on a matter of privilege. This is my understanding of the Rules of Parliament and no ruling can take place on a matter whilst a Member is on his feet. My rights are protected under the Amenities and Privileges Act of this House made under the Constitution of Barbados. As a Member for St. Michael South Central sent here by the people of St. Michael South Central, I demand a hearing when I rise on a matter of privilege and that right will not in any way be curtailed, abrogated or in any way offended by any Member of this House. I wish to be heard on a matter of privilege. Mr. Chairman, are you prepared to hear me or not?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: What is that matter of privilege, Sir? It is a fundamental responsibility of every Member of the Opposition in this House to make sure that the privileges of Parliament and the privileges of each Member is in no way affected. I am deeply concerned, Sir, of any ruling which seeks to say that a Member may not read from a document unless that document specifically excluded by the Standing Orders of this House, again made under the Constitution of Barbados. There are only a few documents that are so excluded. If you look at the back of the Standing Orders of this House, you will see that they are made under the Constitution. What we are dealing with, Sir, is a constitutional matter that cannot be ignored or swept under the carpet.

In the further development of my point, Sir, we have had several instances. I understand why the Honourable Member for Christ Church South gets a bit upset when documents which are transmitted from one area of Government to another area of Government fall into the hands of Members.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot rise on a point of order if I am on a point of privilege. You cannot.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Yes, I can.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: A point of privilege brings everything else to a standstill.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: You cannot rise on a point of order whilst I am on a point of privilege.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I would wish to bring to the attention, Mr. Chairman, Standing Order No. 76 of Privilege:

"1. A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business.

2. Any Member desiring to raise a matter under this Standing Order, shall first obtain leave of the Speaker who shall determine whether the Member is entitled to raise the matter as a question of privilege."

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: That is a matter of privilege arising outside of Parliament, not a matter arising during a debate. That is the wrong Standing Order you are quoting from. Read the Rules of Debates and you will see.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central please proceed.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: If I may continue. It is very important, Sir, that this House does not entertain any ruling that may become a matter of precedence, which denies a Member the right to read from and make available to the Honourable House anything that he reads from. Because the fundamental assumption of Parliament is that the Member is responsible for the authenticity of the document that he or she reads from and the House, of course, will reserve the right of censure of any Member who acts outside of the parameters as established by the precedence of Parliament. But you cannot deny a Member of Parliament the right to read from and make available to the House any document which is not specifically excluded by the Standing Orders of this House. 3.40 p.m.

Therefore, I think it is a big mistake you are making, because these things become precedents. I refer way back to April 1986 when I was prevented from making

a document of this House a Report of the Central Bank of Barbados and then later another Honourable Member on the Government side read from the same Report and made it a document of the House in the Budget debate of 1986. Mr. Aaron Truss read from it and made it a document of the House. The document was allegedly taken by someone in transmission between the Central Bank and here. The point I am making, Sir, is that we cannot make a ruling like that It is wrong and it infringes the privilege of a Member. The time is going to come when someone on this side or on that side may get in their possession a document on a matter of public security, and if they cannot bring it to this House then there is something fundamentally wrong.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The Chair cannot stop me from rising on a point of privilege. You are wrong. Billie, you are wrong.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central has finished his point.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The point I am making, Sir, is that we cannot infringe the privilege of any Member, because if you do that you are violating the Constitution of Barbados. That is the point I am making. It is a constitutional matter.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, on a point of privilege. I wish you to report to His Honour the Speaker that during the course of a sitting this day when I was on my feet making a point of privilege that His Honour abruptly brought the sitting to a Suspension. I feel aggrieved.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not reflecting, I am asking him to...

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of privilege. The same applies.

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. I beg to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Honourable Member is casting aspersions on the Speaker's conduct, and the only way he can cast aspersions on the Speaker's conduct is by bringing a motion of no confidence against the Speaker, and I ask you to rule on that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am casting no aspersions on Mr. Speaker. Did I feel constrained to cast aspersions, Sir, the House would be in total confusion at the moment. The Speaker got up and I abided by his action, and therefore I cannot be casting aspersions. I am inviting Your Distinguished Honour to draw to the Speaker's attention my hurt, not his judgment, that in the course of making a point of privilege I was not permitted to complete that point of privilege. I wish now, Sir, to draw to your attention that I am concerned about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is asked to note that he cannot make any ruling in this matter about privilege and that this Committee has no ruling over the Speaker.

I will now make my ruling in relation to a previous matter. The Member for St. Michael South Central is asked to note that no ruling had been made previously and therefore any comments that he made are therefore deemed irrelevant.

In relation to the matter of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West and his document, the Honourable Member is asked to note that official documents must be laid by persons in official capacity and also in official custody of the document. In this case the Honourable Minister of Health would have to lay that document, according to Standing Order No. 13. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West quoted from the three documents which he had in his possession and I am ruling that Members who want to see these documents may see these documents, for accuracy or whatever, but these documents are not deemed as laid in the House and are not being accepted as documents of the House.

That is the ruling.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hear your ruling. As a Member of this Honourable House I have no alternative but to hear your ruling and abide by the ruling. However, I just wish to say therefore that on the basis of the three documents which I have, the statement made by the Minister that \$1 million could not be found at St. Joseph Hospital is proved to be untrue, not correct and absolutely without foundation, and that I hope that it will not be long that the Minister of Health will lay in this House the Reports from the St. Joseph Hospital, as required by the law, so that we can get the accuracy of the documents.

These documents are available and I will make them available to the Press, because I do not wish to believe ever that the Barbados Labour Party is going to revert to its tactics of the other day when it was the Government, when it sought to bring legislation in here to preclude persons from speaking on matters which it deemed... The Prime

Minister need not look at me, Sir, he was not a member of that Government, but the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central will call - Section 25 - when the Labour Party wanted to bring a Resolution...

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is irrelevant, in my submission. The subject matter before you, Sir, is the question of a Resolution to approve a sum of money with respect to the Ministry of Health. Any comment that the Honourable Member is making now has absolutely no relevance as to that, Sir, and I ask for your ruling.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Before Your Honour rules on that point of order, let me draw to the Honourable Member's attention, because he is getting down now, Sir, that this is a money Resolution and that the only Resolution on which you can say almost anything is a money Resolution. The Honourable Member knows that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West is asked to note that he must be relevant, according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have difficulty understanding. If Your Honour has ruled on documents that I myself cannot then refer to those documents, and that I would be irrelevant if I refer to those documents, I know that the Honourable and Gallant Member for Christ Church South is known to be acrobatic from time to time, but even that Honourable Member would not deny me the right to refer to a point that you have made, Sir.

Furthermore, the relevance has to do with the speech by the Honourable Member for the City which the Honourable Member for Christ Church South did not hear. The Honourable Member for the City is the one who put this matter in perspective and placed it in the debate. The Honourable Member for the City said that the problems at Mangrove stem from wrong priorities by the previous Government. She then cited the St. Joseph Hospital as a part of the panoply of wrong decisions. Therefore, even a blind man on a trotting horse would allow me that these things are relevant. I do not think I have to make that point., Suffice it to say that there were no wrong priorities in relation to the environmental health. We did all that we said we would do, we started a new landfill, we started it on a scientific basis and the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts indicated that they were satisfied that we were trying and the then representative for St. Thomas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, in your earlier comments you alluded to the fact that you are not being allowed to quote from your documents. Is that what you were saying?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, my interpretation of your ruling allows me that latitude.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you can quote from your documents.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I do not want to quote from them, Sir, they are here. I am going to let the Press quote them. 3.50. p.m.

The point I want to make, Sir, is that the Honourable Member, the Minister of Health, suggested in the course of her presentation that the people of Arch Hall said that I said that I did not come to see them because my wife had died. That is a fact, Sir, that my wife died. The Honourable Member is very concerned about my late wife. She spent a lot of time in her Ministry and elsewhere spending time about my late wife, and I will deal with her outside of the House.

I want to know if in fact my wife had died and I had to choose between dealing with that and going to see anybody if I should have gone to see them. You see, Sir, these little snippets...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If you were my wife you would be a lot happier. That is your problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to address the Chair. I am not a woman.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir. I apologise for that. I don't know how I could have brought that into the debate, Sir.

The point I am making is that we did make provision for the people of Arch Hall and Bennetts. We made a model as Your Honour will recall. There was a model of the landfill. There was a model of the proposals and we sent that model to the Church in St. Thomas and we made it available for the residents to come and see what we were doing and we sent the officials of the Ministry, the same officials who are now officials of the Ministry, to explain in great detail.

I happened to be in a different place at that time, Sir, and I couldn't be here but we sent people to meet with the residents and make it clear to the residents what was happening and at the end of the day when we opened the new landfill I remember I quoted the Scriptures from a lesser known writer in the Old Testament called Habakkuk. Habakkuk 2, chapter 3.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You can call it defending but I just came from Jordan and they call it Ha-bak-kuk. In that day, Sir, I said:

"For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, It will not tarry."

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know it is in the Old Testament. If the Honourable Member for St. George South says it is the Apocrypha, the Honourable Member for St. George South has been known to throw in some graphic information that was not valid but it is in the Old Testament. You will find it. Only three chapters I believe. Onesimus is the shortest book in the Old Testament - one chapter.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I just want to finish this section of my presentation by saying what I said then. As a condition of the new landfill plan and bearing in mind the projected intake of 270 tonnes of waste weekly much emphasis has been placed on the provision of an appropriate management provision for maintaining an efficient operation.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, we sent Mr. Alleyne the now Manager of the landfill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to note that we do not have leave to call.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am sorry, Sir.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Honourable Member I indicated to him and he has given way. I just wish to draw something to the House's attention. Forasmuch as we want to avoid the Official Secrets Act, I think I have a duty to remind Honourable Members of the existing law. Section 2 of the Act of 1911 says:

[I have to read it as it is, because it is a long sentence without a full stop].

"If any person having in his possession or control any secret official code word, or pass word, or any sketch, plan, model, article, note, document or information which relates to or is used in a prohibitive place or anything in such a place, of which has been made or obtained in contravention of this Act, or which has been entrusted in confidence to him by any person holding office under the Crown [for example, a former Minister] in right of its government of Barbados or which he has obtained or to which he has had access owing to his position as a person who holds or has held office under the Crown in right of

its government of Barbados, or as a person who holds or has held a contract made on behalf of the Crown in right of its government of Barbados, or as a person who is or has been employed under a person who holds or has held such an office or contract... that person shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am very grateful to the Honourable Member for drawing to Your Honour's attention. Presumably he wanted to let Your Honour know that the law precludes anybody giving information to anybody out there but the very same law as applied to Parliament you will recall... The Honourable Member knows what I am talking about. No one who is a member of the House shall be held responsible in law for having broken any law if he brings information to the House. The same Act that the... The Privilege and Immunities Act that the Honourable Member just read allows me to tell the House...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I read the Official Secrets Act which is at the back of Chapter 174. He is talking about the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) under Chapter 9. Section 4 of which says:

"No civil or criminal proceedings may be instituted against any member -

(a) in respect of words spoken"

[Not a document given].

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No. don't interpret the law. Read it

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: "... before ; or

(b) in respect of words written in a report to; or

(c) by reason of any matter or thing brought by petition, bill, motion or otherwise, before the House to which he belongs, or to a committee thereof, or a joint committee."

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Therefore, I am free to tell my colleagues in the House about any infelicities or anything else or any clarification.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will make it available.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAUT: The Honourable Member is recently here and cannot address you from her Chair, so we will ignore anything she says. The Honourable Member can only address Your Honour. In this Chamber, Sir, whatever the Chairman allows is allowable and I put it to you that you have. Why is it the Barbados Labour Party does not wish these reports to be put in the information of the House? What is it about these reports? Why don't y6u want them to be put here?

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I just want to say on behalf of the BLP Government of which I am the Head, Sir, that no matters pertaining to the St. Joseph Hospital Board has yet been brought to the Cabinet. As I understand it, Sir, before a Report suitable to be brought to Parliament can be laid... I am speaking very carefully for the records that all reports laid in this Parliament are first approved by the Cabinet and brought...

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. That is purely administrative procedures. That has nothing to do with the laws of Barbados. It has nothing to do with Parliament.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, just in case there is anything to be read into the statement by the member for St. Michael West I am capable of this matter, Sir. I just want to say for the record that this Cabinet has not yet received any report of the St. Joseph Hospital for any years. I want to say that only a Minister can lay a paper or document in this House, that in the way in which we manage our affairs, Cabinet approves these things being brought to the House. Cabinet has not yet received any report from the St. Joseph Hospital, but I give the House the assurance that at such time as Cabinet receives the papers in the same way that we have today laid a number of reports for the NCF going back to 1987,88,89,90 and 91, in the same way that this Administration has had to bring to Parliament reports for the NCF going back 8 years, I give the House the assurance that as soon as we receive the reports at Cabinet of the St. Joseph Hospital we will do what the member for St. Michael West should have done if he were respectful of the law, Sir, to have those reports laid in this House as soon as possible.

For the records Sir, lest any misrepresentation goes abroad we have not yet received as a Cabinet any report from the Board of the St. Joseph Hospital.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would just say that the Prime Minister may be perfectly right. I have not suggested that the Prime Minister is guilty of anything. All I am saying, Sir, is that on May 31st I was Minister of Foreign Affairs and had no responsibility to bring any St. Joseph Hospital Report to Parliament. Secondly, by May 31, when the Minister would have

received these reports, the House, if you would recall, soon thereafter went out of existence. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up his presentation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The question which I raised I specifically said that the Minister had the report in her Ministry. That is what I said. Therefore it is passing strange that this report has not found its way yet to the Cabinet five months after the Barbados Labour Party assumed office, given the fact that the St. Joseph Hospital was such an urgent matter. Given the fact that the St. Joseph Hospital was addressed by the Minister to the public at least four times, I would have thought that one of the urgent things that would have happened is that the Ministry of Health would have transmitted it because it can only get here if it goes through the Cabinet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up his presentation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The point is though, Sir, that it has been in circulation for some considerable time.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, lest the records again be misrepresented, in my capacity as Minister of Finance I have received draft reports from statutory institutions in my Ministry for previous years that I have had to send back as well for fuller accounts. Merely because a document is sent from a Board to a Minister does not mean that it has to be accepted by a Minister. What the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is doing is taking a report that has been sent from a Board in draft to a Minister and believes that the Minister must accept it as word.

There are reports from statutory boards for previous years that have come to the Minister of Finance that I am not satisfied with and I have asked for fuller accounts of the affairs of those Boards. It does not mean that because a document is sent from a Board to a Ministry that the Minister must bring it before Parliament. I say that in relation to the St. Joseph Hospital particularly.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I read from the document. I craved your indulgence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up his presentation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: In the light of what the Prime Minister has said, Your Honour, this is no draft report. This was the submission signed by Leo Leacock, GCM, J.P., submitted on May 31, to Cyril Walker the reports

of the St. Joseph Hospital. They are no draft reports. Therefore, the Board has sent its audited reports to the Minister. Now, the Minister is not Cyril Walker, or Taitt, or anybody else. The Minister is the functionary, therefore whoever is the Minister is the Minister, and if the Minister by name received them and that Minister has given them to another Minister it is the same. The Minister has to lay the reports according to the law. The law says they shall be laid and if after five months they are still languishing in the Ministry of Health - the Minister came in here and said that \$1 million was missing and should not have said that in light of the fact that the information was in here. I have not accused the Minister of lying to the House even though I had these reports at that time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up his presentation, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I did not accuse her because I suspected that the Honourable Member, who is now the Minister, might not have been aware.

Sorry, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have listened to many speeches during the course of this debate on the Mangrove Landfill.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, can we get order, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is asked to note that we have 15 more minutes for this session.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have found ourselves in a situation this afternoon where we have a problem, which is a national problem, and after one has listened to the lead speaker this morning, this whole debate has been turned into a political issue. All over the world we have situations where landfills are problems. Whether you are talking about the United States, Canada or England, wherever you go you get problems with landfills.

We as a country have to borrow money from countries to solve problems in our own countries when they have the same problem and we as a Government went into Mangrove because we had no choice. We found a situation where the Barbados Labour Party had started to negotiate for that. We have no fault with the Barbados Labour Party

for looking for an alternative site to the Kingsland landfill. We went into Mangrove and we operated Mangrove against our will because we had no time to prepare the site properly. We found a situation where there were no roads, no electricity and no water. All of those things had to be put in place. I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas would agree with me that I am correct when I say these things.

Mr. Chairman, we also found a situation where we had the plant in Workmans, where it was not operating at its full capacity because of age of the plant. The Honourable Member for St. George South would agree with that also. We found a situation where all the solid waste had to be moved from all over Barbados to Mangrove. It is not a situation where you had to deal with a landfill in each constituency. You had a situation where you had to bring all the landfill material to one point. That is true because the only other alternative was Workmans and that has had to be scaled down.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Tell me the other one, then.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No. That is for heavy material, car bodies, *et cetera*. It cannot be treated the same way as Mangrove and you know that.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I would not speak to the Chair like that. You know I would not do that. I behave better than that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to address members by their official titles.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I have heard something in here today, Mr. Chairman, that is worrying me and that is that fish offal will be dumped at sea. I remember when I was a member of the Sanitation Service Authority Board I questioned why it could not be dumped at sea and I was told that there is an international Convention stopping us from doing it. I would like to know if it has changed, not that I disagree with the dumping of fish offal at sea. 4.10 p.m.

I should like to find out from the Minister if that has changed. As far as I know it has not been changed. I

want to know if she is given different advice from the advice which we got as a Board.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: But you would have to ask the Manager of the Barbados Sanitation Service Authority that.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: It is not my job, Mr. Chairman, to find out which Convention it is. It was my job then, but not now. The Minister would have to do that now because if she is breaking the law it has nothing to do with me.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member knows better than to accuse the Honourable Member of this Chamber with breaking the law and I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I said "if. I would not lie. It is not a law, it is a principle and an understanding. I am saying that if we abide with these Conventions and we need to change them we need to state a policy and say we are not going to abide with them. If the Barbados Labour Party is saying that they are not going to abide with this Convention they need to say that. I am not faulting them. I am just saying that if there is a change of policy all they have to do is say so.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, I was on the Board for 8 years and for 8 years I made sure that whenever there was a problem at the landfill I went to the Board and criticized my own members and management. I do not have to deny that.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am hearing in this House that I said there was no problem. Let me explain that, Mr. Chairman. There was a deliberate lie and you would not believe it. I went to a meeting last Thursday in Arch Hall and Bennetts as a resident of St. Thomas. The Minister was not aware that I was resident of St. Thomas. She allowed the Deputy Chairman to say that I was spying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You were what? Did you say that you were spying?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: That I was spying.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Of course. But, not only that, they went further. The gentleman said that he called in on the programme and said that he could smell the landfill and I said it is not true that I am some Mr. Williams from Arch Hall. I have never called any programme and identified myself as anyone else.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, no. you know my voice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that in June when there was a problem at the landfill and I have records here to prove, when they were saying it, was internal combustion, we had evidence that it was not internal combustion and when the gentleman called in I said that the problem with the fire was not internal combustion and there was enough evidence to prove that it was not internal combustion.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: It was not spontaneous either. It was deliberate combustion.

Mr. Chairman, whenever they bring a Resolution to the House to solve the problem, they can be assured they would get my support.

I would say to the Honourable Member for St Peter that he has to be careful when his Ministers are prepared to give deadlines and they do not take weather conditions into account. I heard one of his Ministers telling people that by June we will be out. Mr. Chairman, an issue that is as hostile as that you cannot afford to put your integrity on the line. You cannot go to people and tell them that I am giving you this deadline and we are sticking by it because when the Minister speaks she is committing the whole Cabinet, the whole Government and the whole country.

We know that the problems at Mangrove landfill, that the starting procedures at the new landfill will take time. If that Government allows itself to rush into a situation where the new landfill is not properly prepared we would find ourselves back in the same situation that we found ourselves in at Mangrove.

Aside.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: I never managed because as you know on Boards it is either the Manager or the Chairman.

I am saying that I have always fought on behalf of the working class and the people of Arch Hall are working class people. I have always voiced my opinion in their favour. I would do it wherever there is a landfill. The Honourable Member for St Peter does not have to worry because he knows that wherever working class people are I will support them.

It is rather interesting. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas said in a speech earlier in this House, on my birthday last year that the hot months...

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Hot months.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The hot weather season then. Are you getting me clearly, Mr. Chairman? Hot months. Did you not hear the "th"?

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The hot weather season or the hot months.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Not wet, we are talking about hot, from May to September. In other words, what he is saying is that when you are operating landfills you expect internal combustion between the months of May and September. In other words he is saying do not mind how you manage landfills it is expected. He relied on the old people for that. He said that in a speech September last year. I know he would not deny it because he is not one for making cheap political speeches. He would admit this one.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Thomas he would not do that.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have heard about no fencing, no security guards. That is not true, Sir. The new landfill had guards and it had fencing. It also had a situation where the Honourable Member for St. Thomas asked that someone from Arch Hall should be made a security guard.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Was it not you? Was it Carlisle then?

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. The more I sit in here, the more I find that my description of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy as a loose cannon is proven true. I never asked for anybody from Arch Hall to be a guard. I asked the former Minister of Health, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West to put a resident from Arch Hall on the Board to be a link between the Board and the dump and the people of Arch Hall to keep them informed as to what was going on. He resisted it. He even cursed the persons in here. I wish to say that we have a resident of Arch Hall and Bennetts on the Board now, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have misled the House. It was not he it was his heir apparent. There were 2 recommendations made. I thought both were made by him. One was for a resident of Arch Hall or Bennetts to be on the Board and one to be a security guard.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No. He will be the Deputy Chairman. I am sure that the same recommendations that they made to us they are probably making to themselves now and I would not be surprised and I know you would not deny this, that before too long there will be somebody from Arch Hall that will be working as a security guard at Mangrove. That was not yours...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I believe you would have to query the Deputy Chairman on that and not...

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. Job No. 1 is jobs. If somebody from Arch Hall got a job as a security guard up there I am very happy. He is confused with what he heard at the meeting last Thursday night. I could put him right but not now. 4.20 p.m.

Hon. D. A. C. SIMMONS: On a point of order. Job No.1 is jobs. If somebody from Arch Hall got a job as a security guard up there, I am very happy. He is confused with what he heard at the meeting last Thursday night. I can put him right but not now.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, they have asked me for a couple minutes and I will play the game fair. But I am saying, Sir, that seeing

that landfills are problems all over the world we expect in the coming months that you will have a situation where we will be nationalistic in whatever we are doing. We will cut out the cheap politics and whenever we come to this House, Sir, that we would not find a situation where the lead speaker goes down the line in such a political way that you have to defend what you should not have to defend.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, we have had in this debate the quoting of scripture, the confessions from former members of Boards. We have seen the Honourable Member for St. Michael West smirk with near orgasmic pleasure about the reports of the St. Joseph Hospital.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this orgasmic pleasure the Honourable Member is accusing me of. The Honourable Member is very concerned with my orgasmic pleasure. I had no orgasmic pleasure when I was making my speech. I do not want her to be speaking about my orgasmic pleasure in this House.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I hope, Sir, in his quoting the Bible he realises that the Bible also tells us in the New Testament with which most of us, if not all of us, are familiar, that "the devil can cite scripture for his own purposes".

Mr. Chairman, I stand on what I said earlier that the problem at Mangrove stemmed from an absence of political direction and inadequate provision of resources, that the attitude filtered down to the management. In 1990 when that landfill was opened - where the problem we are battling with today - no equipment was provided except one small tractor. There was no traxcavator until 1993 and a landfill compactor was not bought until March 1994.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member just said in 1990 when the landfill was opened. The Honourable Member for St. Thomas would be able to help the Honourable Member to realise that the landfill was opened 9th September 1992.

Hon. H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, there have been several phases of the landfill. I do not want to further confuse the issue because I know there is now an absence of time. I stand on what I said. A small tractor was the only equipment provided. One traxcavator was purchased in 1993 and one landfill compactor in 1994. That spells volumes to the absence of equipment for properly bringing the mound under control.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member should also indicate, and I wish she would, that at that time the Sanitation Service Authority was renting massively from the private sector to provide the equipment and therefore

equipment was always on site and in fact it was an issue as to the amount of money that was spent which was in excess.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if that is a point of order. It is true that SSA did rent a tractor but that was not adequate heavy duty equipment to deal with the site.

Mr. Chairman, there is no mystery over the reports of the St. Joseph Hospital. His cabinet colleague received some of the reports some time prior to the Barbados Labour Party taking office. They went to the last Cabinet on the 5th of September, the day before the elections. When I took office I asked about the reports as a matter of priority. I met with the then Chairman, one Mr. Leo Leacock, who said to me that all of the reports were not completely available. That further information had to be obtained from the auditors on behalf of the Ministry.

On the 14th of November, a Cabinet Paper was submitted to me. When all of the Reports were received within the Ministry of Health, I okayed the Cabinet Reports and the documents for onward submission to Cabinet on the 16th December. On the 19th December it went out. The reports are en route to Cabinet. There is nothing in the Report that we are seeking to conceal from the public.

The fact is that \$11 million was spent in the St. Joseph Hospital. The ceilings down there are collapsing, windows are dropping out, the plumbing is in disrepair, there are several buildings on the compound that cannot be opened at all. The Villa Marie Convent has never been repaired. All this even after \$11 million was spent down there. One wing of the hospital holding 3 geriatrics was opened only during the 1994 election campaign after the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East appeared on television commenting about the state of the St. Joseph Hospital.

The St. Joseph Hospital has an average of 7 patients per day. It makes \$20 000 a month. The Government of Barbados spends \$V₂ million a month to keep the St. Joseph Hospital open.

Loud asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Honourable Member would lay the Reports we would be able to see that the Honourable Member came in here and told this House that they could not find \$1 million and I now charge that the Honourable Member told the House improper information. Bring the documents and show us where the money is missing.

Loud asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The million dollars of which you speak is \$1 million that nobody can to this day find out on what it was spent. But I can tell you more than that today and it is that not only will the Reports of the St. Joseph Hospital be laid in this House but a Commission of Inquiry into the St. Joseph Hospital is coming. We must determine where and how that money was spent and how is it that when the Member for St. Michael West was smarting under the political pressure brought by the investigating Public Accounts Committee of Parliament, his dead wife suddenly rose from the grave to give him a \$160,000 study built by the same contractors that were then working on the St. Joseph Hospital. It is coming.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I trust you will give me an opportunity now since my dead wife rose from the grave and even...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what point are you speaking?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am speaking on a point of order. What point can I raise when she is raising in here a question about my dead wife raised from the grave? Let me tell the Honourable Member that I would rather my dead wife from the grave than her any time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Loud asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please make your point of order.

Hon. B. M. TAITT: It is no point of order. I wish you to rule on the Honourable Member. Your Honour, you took matters out of this debate.... I want to know how the Honourable Member is going to raise my dead wife from the grave.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order,

Mr. Chairman rises.

Mr. Chairman resumes the Chair.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I believe that some decorum should be brought to the proceedings in this House. I wish to draw your attention to Standing Order 28.5 "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

And 28.7 states: "No Member may impute improper motives to another Member."

If we use very insulting and inflammatory language, Sir, whatever may be the motivation I believe you should try and prevail upon Members to withdraw the statements and that they should be struck from the records so that our equanimity in this House may be maintained. I think that there is nothing greater than that. I do not have time to speak in this debate, but I believe that in discussing a matter of such national importance that this debate should not sink to the level that has occurred. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member imputing evil motives to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: To say that his wife is dead is not improper motive, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has answered my question.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Is there a problem that his wife has died? All I am doing is stating a fact. Well, all day he has been calling me a liar and the Chair has not dealt with it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member said that she is not imputing improper motives.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. It has to be withdrawn, Sir. You cannot have the Honourable Member saying that my dead wife rose from the grave and gave me a \$160,000 study which is not even true. It is in the record here and she has to withdraw and it has to be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James South has said that she is not imputing improper motives.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am saying that the words are offensive, Sir, and should be struck from the record. If you do not rule, Mr. Chairman...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that his wife was roaming the earth in ghost form. I am just saying that he has the very fortunate...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think you understand me. I think you had better ask one of the Honourable Members who has been here before. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has to withdraw the remarks. I am appealing to Your Honour to have the remarks struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Could you please let us know what remarks you want withdrawn?

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is ruling that the statements to which you refer do not in themselves impute improper motives to you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am saying that they are offensive and insulting. They are not improper motives. They are offensive and insulting and should be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will also rule that it is not offensive and insulting language about the Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Aside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James South please continue your presentation.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. All of the matters pertaining to Mangrove will be made public as indeed will be the case in relation to the St. Joseph Hospital. This is a political issue. We have heard in this debate that we are treating it like a political issue. But that is indeed what it is - a political party without proper strength and direction inflicting suffering on the people of Arch Hall and Bennetts which threatened the very base of the economy of the country makes it a political issue. On this side and under my direction, the Ministry of Health will treat the matter in the way which it should have been treated from the onset and that is a matter of national importance. We must ensure as a result, that the new landfill is managed properly.

Mr. Chairman, I now move...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. You are going to have to send me out of the House, Sir. I want you to understand that I am not leaving that in the record. So if you are sending me out of the House, that is what will have to happen. I am not letting her say that about my wife and you do not do anything about it. Do you understand, Mr. Chairman? I am not standing for that. Mr. Chairman, come to some conclusion. It cannot stay in the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West, you said the comments to which you referred...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not leaving that in the record. Let me tell you what she said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please say what you want to be taken out of the record?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: She said that my dead wife rose up from the grave and gave me a "study" for \$160,000 and you leave it in the record. I am not sitting down. Mr. Chairman, take it out of the record. Please let us understand where we are. I am not sitting down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James South.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has said that he will leave if I do not withdraw the comment. I know how much he loves being in here and how if he does not have the opportunity to be in here, part of his *raison d'être* would be removed. In the circumstances, Sir, I will withdraw the comment and say this. That at a time when the Honourable Member was under extreme political pressure over the coincidence of how it was, that the constructing firm at the St. Joseph Hospital while he was the Minister was also simultaneously carrying on work at his residence under circumstances which caused the public to raise serious questions about breach of fiduciary duties and so on. That we learnt that his wife, who was then dead, before her death 3 years before, had given him a gift of this same study that was then being built, the cost of which had reached \$160,000. That the gift had preceded her death and that it just so happened that it was with the same firm that was building the St. Joseph Hospital four years later, if that makes him happy, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the Honourable Member for St. James South imputing improper motives to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West? We have enjoyed your previous remarks. Your earlier remarks have been struck from the record. I think we can now proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am on a point of order. The Honourable Member said \$160,000. The debate in here, Sir, was \$115,000. I indicated that it was a bogus letter written by Barbados Labour Party people. It was proved in here that the letter had no address, no date, and that the amount of work done at my house could in no way be \$115,000. It was done long before the St. Joseph Hospital operated and the whole matter was settled in here by vote. I do not mind what anybody says because they have continued to say this outside over and over again. The Honourable Member in particular within and outside of the Ministry has made it a point constantly to allude to this fact. I have no problem with that. Let it be said however, Sir, that the matter was made clear and in due course the details will come out. I have already spoken in here during a debate of no confidence which the House spoke on. Therefore, I think whereas the Honourable Member is free to use whatever language she may, I think that it is time

that she moved on. But I will speak in due course about other matters.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the inquiry is coming which will settle all unanswered questions between the dead and the living, the patients of the St. Joseph Hospital and the expenditure there. Sir, I would want to make it abundantly clear that there are 106 staff members. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member is asked to wind up her presentation.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: ...106 staff members servicing 7 patients, that there is a Drug Rehab Centre that has not had any patients for well over five months. It has a staff of about 18 and prior to that, had no patients on any regular basis. The bills for the St. Joseph Hospital are half a million dollars a month but it makes only \$20 000. These are fact.

The architectural firm involved in the little construction that allegedly went on there had the good fortune of conducting business at the Minister's house at the very same time, and one wonders therefore where the \$11 million, given the state of collapse of the building, where the \$11 million that was allegedly spent down there has gone. But the Commission of Inquiry will answer all the questions and it will reach the stage, Mr. Chairman, where the findings of the Commission of Inquiry cannot be withdrawn in the way that remarks made in this House, true as they are, Sir, can be withdrawn.

I now move, Sir, that Head 36 stand part.

The question that Head 36 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Honourable Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, Mr. Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Honourable Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Honourable O. S. ARTHUR the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ORDER NO. 1 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
EXCHANGE BY NORMA CLARKE-ADAMSON OF
HOUSE AND LAND AT WANSTEAD, CAVE
HILL, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the exchange by Norma Clarke-Adamson of a parcel of land, together with the dwelling house thereon, at Wanstead, Cave Hill, St.

Michael and St. James. Government proposes to exchange property at Wanstead, Cave Hill, St. Michael for land at Lodge Hill, St. Michael.

In 1986, the Cabinet concluded that those houses at Wanstead Terrace and Paradise Heights, owned by Government and 'used mainly to provide temporary accommodation for diplomatic staff of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs returning home and for staff recruited on a contractual basis which are determined by the Ministry of Housing and Lands to be uneconomical to maintain, should be disposed of by sale. In this regard, Cabinet concluded that the Government-owned house No. 108 which is situated on 7 140 square feet of land at Wanstead, Cave Hill, St. Michael and which is occupied by Mrs. Norma Clarke-Adamson should be sold to her at a price approximating to \$120 000 and the necessary Resolution be submitted to Parliament to give effect to the sale.

Sale of the property to Mrs. Clarke-Adamson was however not pursued at that time primarily because of her inability to purchase and further because the then Ministry of Housing and Lands was unable to accommodate the prospective purchaser through the device of an initial payment for the property with further payments over a period of time at a rate of interest to be agreed upon.

Mrs. Clarke-Adamson as Executrix of the estate of Mr. John Walcott has now offered in exchange for the property at No. 108 Wanstead, St. Michael the residual lands comprising approximately 2.370 acres of a larger parcel of land of the estate of Lodge Hill, St. Michael 7 095.1 square metres of which was acquired by the Crown for the construction of the ABC Highway. Compensation for the acquired portion of land was paid to the landowner. Meanwhile, the Commissioner of Land Tax assessed the market value of the 2.370 acres of land at Lodge Hill to be \$77 000 as at the 4th of June 1992 while the Government owned house at Wanstead was valued at \$119 000 having regard to its present condition.

Mrs. Clarke-Adamson has indicated that she has suffered a loss of income as a result of the construction of the ABC Highway since, according to her, due to her displacement, she is now unable to carry on the livestock and poultry business formerly undertaken at the Lodge Hill site. In the circumstances, Government is favourably disposed to the request of this landowner for an exchange of the properties. The landowner has made representation to the Government that she would accept a settlement which would enable the difference between the valuation of the Commissioner of Land Tax to be shared equally by the Government and herself. In which case, she would be required to pay \$21000 that is \$119200 minus the \$77 000 divided by two in settlement of the transaction. It was further agreed that the sum of \$18 000 which was

paid in rent be offset against the \$21 100. She would then be required to pay the sum of \$3 100 in final settlement.

The requests made by Mrs. Clarke-Adamson in regard to the settlement of this transaction were all given due consideration and it was agreed that in view of the fact that payment of rent was suspended when negotiations were re-opened the proposed settlement is reasonable in the circumstances.

It is therefore proposed that the Government letting No. 108 Wanstead, Cave Hill, St. Michael which was valued at \$119 200 should be exchanged for approximately 2.370 acres of land at Lodge Hill, St. Michael, the property of Mrs. Norma Clarke-Adamson valued by the Commissioner of Land Tax at \$77 000; payment of an amount of \$21 000 being one-half of the difference between the value of the house and that of the land be waived leaving a balance of \$21 000 to be paid by Mrs. Clarke Adamson; Mrs. Clarke-Adamson be credited with a sum of \$18 000 paid as rent for the house towards settlement of the sum of \$21 000 payable by her and that Mrs. Clarke-Adamson be required to pay a net sum of \$3 100 in final settlement of the transaction. 4.50 p.m.

Parliamentary approval is hereby sought for the exchange of Mrs. Norma Clarke-Adamson's 7 140 square feet of land with a dwelling house thereon at Cave Hill, St. Michael for 1.159 hectares of land at Lodge Hill, St. Michael.

I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

**ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
LEASE TO THE BARBADOS PORT AUTHORITY
OF LAND AT THE BRIDGETOWN HARBOUR,
ST. MICHAEL, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF A COASTAL CRUISE FACILITY
AND FOR FACILITIES OF THE
SANDPIT COMMUNITY**

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the lease to the Barbados Port Authority of land at the Bridgetown Harbour, St. Michael, for the development of a coastal cruise facility and for facilities of the Sandpit community.

Cabinet considered a discussion paper on the provision of coastal cruise and boat repair facilities on the east side of the Shallow Draught Basin. This discussion paper outlined the background of the proposal, the main

factor which prompted its consideration being the obvious negative security implications caused by the mixing of coastal cruise passengers with cruise ship and cargo-handling operations at the Port.

The facility would therefore provide facilities for the Jolly Roger, the Bajan Queen, the Atlantis Submarine, and in addition, would establish a boat repair facility to fill the void left by the demise of the Central Foundry dry dock at the Pierhead. In order to proceed with the construction of the coastal cruise complex and the fishermen's facilities, a lease of land where the facility is to be located will be necessary.

A lease agreement presently exists between the Barbados Port Authority and the Crown in respect of lands occupied by the Bridgetown Harbour. The lease is for a period of 50 years and became effective from January 1, 1979. There are approximately 36 years remaining in this lease.

The Commissioner of Land Tax assessed the rental value of the subject land at \$213 000 per annum. However, it was recommended by the Division of Housing that the Port Authority should be granted a lease in the 1.321 hectares of land at the Shallow Draught on similar main terms and conditions as those contained in the existing lease agreement between the Barbados Port Authority and the Crown, and as applicable.

Cabinet agreed that the rent payable by the Barbados Port Authority should be \$100 per annum payable in advance. It should be noted that the Barbados Port Authority will be responsible for bearing the cost of all development and infrastructural works. Parliamentary approval is hereby sought to lease 1.321 hectares of land at the Bridgetown Harbour to the Barbados Port Authority for the development of a coastal cruise facility and for facilities for fishermen of the Sandpit community, subject to the conditions as outlined above.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that I need to ask with regard to the passing of this Resolution for the compulsory acquisition for lease to the Port Authority. I am aware of plans that were in place before by the Government to, in fact, provide a cruise facility in the area contiguous to where the Sandpit for the fishermen at Fontabelle is presently located.

I recall, Sir, that there was some concern by the cruise ship operators because of the proposed rent that was projected to have been charged by the Government at the time and they had deemed those proposals at that time

to be extremely harsh which would certainly have put a serious drain on their operation.

I am also aware that the actual pleasure cruise operators themselves wanted to lease the land from the Port Authority so that they themselves would be the ones investing in such a project where they would probably have a lease for 90 years or however long Government may decide as against having the Government provide such a facility and dictate the rents to them which at the time they had considered prohibitive. I know that there is some discussion and debate about it but I would hope that this Honourable House is brought up-to-date with the progress of that situation.

I am aware, Sir, that there was a float of development bonds for the operation of the Port. I would also want to know if the funds were being used for that development or if, in fact, there will be a float for private citizens to get involved with activities relating to the cruise facilities. These are some of the questions I want to ask.

I have to ask these questions because I am concerned that in Barbados we have a situation where it seems to follow the Barbados Labour Party that whenever they assume office we have a change and an about turn in the fortunes of our tourism industry. I believe that it is necessary for us to make sure that these facilities are in place to upgrade the local product that is available to the visitor in light of the expected decline that has already shown its head under the present administration. What is significant is that there has been a significant performance by the Democratic Labour Party with regards to the arrivals of cruise ship passengers. The cumulative performance for cruise ship passengers in 1985 the arrivals were some 112 222.

Mr. SPEAKER: Can the Honourable Member please tell us the source of his information?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: The source, Sir, is the Ministry of Tourism and International Transport and if I have to make it a document of the House I will do that.

The figure in 1985 was 112 000. In 1986 it was 145 000. When the Democratic Labour Party left office in 1994 it had reached over 450 000 arrivals by cruise ships which represent a significant increase and it clearly demonstrates the outstanding performance of the Democratic Labour Party Government. The overview of the Ministry of Tourism and International Transport is quite startling because the overview starts by indicating that there was a complete reversal in the upward trend of arrivals being experienced so far for 1994 with a decrease of over some 3 000 people. Because the overview starts by indicating that there was a complete reversal in the upward

trend of arrivals being experienced so far for 1994 with a decrease of over some 3 000 people. I believe, Sir,... 5.00 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: In November. It represented a 7.7% decline in long stay visitors over the corresponding period for 1993,

Aside.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I mentioned both. This is a trend that we were worried about. This is a trend that had caused us some concern. We were clear that in the Democratic Labour Party's Administration we had, in fact, to put certain infrastructures in place and certain programmes in place that would ensure continued growth in the tourism sector and we were worried because the past record of the Barbados Labour Party Administration suggested that they were in fact relatively poor performers when it came to the area of the tourism industry. I think that with the advent of these additional facilities that we may hope that it does in fact assist them.

There are a number of other declines that I will not recall but I believe that the statistics will be published. This is an area that we will be monitoring because we are nervous about the performance of the Administration and we certainly will be monitoring their performance.

While we are on this matter, I should like to find out from the Minister regarding the piece of land by the Flour Mill site which is presently operated by a company called Land Reclaimers Ltd. It is my understanding that this site is used during Crop Over for entertainment purposes. It is my understanding that there is a plan afoot to place oil tankers on that land which, I am informed, is a contravention of the Town and Country Planning requirements for the general area where there was an agreement in place not to increase the number of tanks that were available for that general area by the sandpit.

I should like to find out from the Minister if he could update the Honourable House with regard to that piece of land and let us feel comfortable that it is in fact not being used contrary to the recommendations of the Town and Country Planning Department. I am informed that there is a plan afoot to place tanks on that particular site for gas and petroleum products and that there are restrictions in so doing. I am asking the Honourable Minister to make sure that those restrictions are not contrary to the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Department.

Mr. Speaker, the final point I should like to make has to do with the question of the environment in the

general area because there is, in fact, an incinerator that has been placed on the area by Shed 4 within the compound. That incinerator for some strange reason has recently started to smoke. It is emitting some fumes in that general area. I believe that we are going to have to look at that decision to place incinerators at the Mangrove landfill or at a designated site in light of some of the experiences that are presently being experienced. I have my concern. I know that there are other Members who would say that yes the country should progress to incinerators, *et cetera*. But I have my concerns. The model which is presently in place at the Port is one that we could pay some attention to because I am not convinced in my mind that it is the right road for us to go down. But it is serving a purpose at this time and I am going to ask that the Government pays some attention to that incinerator.

With those remarks, I am going to support the compulsory acquisition of this land and I hope that these questions would be answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for the City.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Resolution and to offer my congratulations to the Honourable Minister, particularly because he has seen fit at such an early opportunity to make facilities available for what is known as the Sandpit community.

The fishermen who work and do their business out of what is known as the sand pit on the eastern shore of the Shallow Draft Facility have been ignored for years by the former Administration. And then a Mr. Comissiong went down there and promised the earth and all that there was therein and nothing came of that.

I am particularly wishing to praise the Honourable Minister of Public Works, Lands and Housing that this land is going to be partly for the development of facilities for that community of fisher folk, some of whom come from the City of Bridgetown, some of whom come from St. Michael West and other parts of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am amazed to hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael East talking about a decline in cruise-ship arrivals.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg your pardon.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am sorry. In long stay arrivals. We on this side are in Government today. They are on that side in Opposition today partly because

successive Ministers fell victim before the Chief Executive Officer, the CEO or the Acting CEO at the Barbados Tourism Authority.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: There is a lot of Hollywood stirring. I should like to recommend to the Minister of Tourism that the sooner he gets rid of that whole lot that helped to bring down a whole Government and helped for 3 Ministers to leave the front bench and demote themselves to the back bench, if that is their claim to fame, the sooner you get rid of them and put people who are properly trained and suitably trained, competent to do the job, the better it would be for the tourist industry in this country and the long stay, the short stay or all visitors who we may describe as tourists.

Not by any stretch of the imagination can it be expected that this Government could be responsible for tourism arrival figures in this winter season. The home work for this winter season should have been done a year ago. 5.10 p.m.

We know on this side that every single, bar none, every single initiative taken by the Chief Executive Officer at the Barbados Tourism Authority balked - every single one. I left a Private Members' Resolution on the Order Paper of the last Parliament speaking to the fact that for four consecutive years our arrivals and revenues from North America have declined. This is nothing new. This is a pattern set in place by the Democratic Labour Party when they were in Government for four now in the fifth consecutive year. Five consecutive winter seasons we have seen declines out of North America. They tried to take the arrivals out of Europe, particularly the United Kingdom in 1994 to be a high point because we saw significant increases in those arrivals but everybody knows that that had to do with the cricket last April.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am truly amazed that all of a sudden now we are going to hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael East claiming how he is going to watch something and how concerned they are about the tourist arrival figures for long-stay visitors in November of 1994. They have to thank their administration for that. An administration rife with incompetence - a CEO whose every initiative went straight to the wall and do not let us talk about the hundreds and thousands of dollars lost.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for the City I would prefer you to address the Resolution.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The Resolution speaks of coastal cruise facility, Sir. Okay I will try to stay within coastal cruise facility.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would hope that the development of coastal cruise facilities in the precincts of the Bridgetown Harbour, and there are plans in this administration for marinas...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That too. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would hope that in the development of the coastal cruise facility in the context of this Resolution that attention would be paid to the Barbados Tourism Authority whose job it is to monitor what goes on in any cruise facility to be established or developed in Barbados.

It will be the function of the Barbados Tourism Authority to so equip itself and to so market the Barbados Coastal Cruise Facilities that the cruise ship operations from distant parts of the world would want to come to Barbados and that Bridgetown Port would become a popular destination for more and more cruise visitors.

I remember, Sir, well before 1986 when at the time Mr. Leroy Sisnett was the Parliamentary Secretary in the relevant Ministry. I remember when the Barbados Labour Party refurbished the cruise facility at the Bridgetown Port. So much did the then Opposition which is now in opposition again want to criticise without good reason the Barbados Labour Party, that they boycotted the official opening of that cruise facility. I remember well. I was there. They refused to come. They had every bad thing to say about it but I have lived to see that in the last 8 years they saw fit, not only to get busy with that cruise facility at the Bridgetown Harbour, but to do everything in their power to upgrade it. And when they were in extremis in the last election campaign the Honourable Member for St. John was even heard to say that he was going to develop a second cruise facility for the so-called small people because they gave all of the shops at the new cruise facility to the big people. All of that I heard with these two ears. I have it in writing. That was when he was in extremis and promising everything. He was going to put vendors in Broad Street and he was going to build a new cruise facility for the small people. That is when the people of Barbados had him nailed up to the cross and he was in extremis, all of that we heard - all of that foolishness we hear!

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Calling me an idiot is not going to solve the problem. That is why you are there and not over here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: He has this propensity for calling people idiots. But I told him already all of us came

up these steps by the same route and there are no fools in here. The people knew what they were doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Barbados Tourism Authority, I hope in its new dispensation, will so market Barbados that the cruise ship arrivals will double and triple and quadruple because there is a lot of market share out there for Barbados and there always has been but we have fallen down in the tourism industry always on marketing. So I am very pleased and again I compliment the Minister that this land will be developed so that we can further develop the coastal cruise facility business and that the Sandpit fishermen will have better and decent conditions under which to work.

Hon. Sir Harold St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that this Resolution has come before the House because it reminds us of the undoubted power of the House as being the only competent body to dispose of Government land and there are many people out there who believe that this House is not in a position to voice its own views about the terms and conditions of use of Government land.

Now, Sir, this particular area of land that we are speaking of is reclaimed land and there were plans for the development of a mini-marina in this area many years ago. I would wish and hope that the Government would revisit all of the plans that were made to ensure that on the seaward side of the Spring Garden Highway in so far as is consistent with the depth of the water within the Inner Harbour or the Shallow Draft Facility, that it is developed to the hilt.

As I understand it, Sir, the decision has been taken to move the coastal cruise facility to this area. I do not believe that has been implemented to the hilt because I still see coastal cruise vessels operating on the other side. I am not going to call the name of the vessel but there is a converted tug that still berths on what is known as the Shallow Draft. 5.20 p.m.

I would want to know, Sir, whether the area that is now being developed is not suitable for that, because it is a waste in my opinion that all of that body of water which starts from where the Government Central Purchasing Warehouse is right down to the reclaimed area known as the Flour Mill site is not utilized to the fullest.

It is also in my view necessary that a clear decision be taken about the terms and conditions of all concessions that are granted at the Port. I want to see the maximum opportunity being given to all Barbadians by the Port Authority to make proposals for the utilization of any area of the Port that the Port Authority has made a decision

that it will allow private contractors to operate in. I do not want, Sir, the situation to arise where a few by reason of association of some kind or another can have the opportunity to make proposals and others are denied that opportunity. I want to say that when the appropriate time comes, I am calling for this House to be given all of the information with respect to any concession that has been granted, whether to one cruise terminal or otherwise at that Port. That Port was built with the taxpayers of Barbados money. It was built when the very same people and their predecessors were offered all kinds of inducements to incur the expenditure. When they failed to take the risk, it was the taxpayers of Barbados who took that risk. It is our duty to ensure that full benefit accrues to the taxpayers. I do not want to hear of any joint venture by the Port Authority with any other group unless specific proposals are advertised inviting all interested parties to put in proposals. It is a very important point of principle that we must deal with. I hope that when this matter comes at Estimates time the Minister will bring all the documents and let us see them, because we cannot operate a system in which Government property is disposed of in a secret manner whether by the Government itself or by statutory boards operating as agencies of the Government. That is a very important point of principle and, if you start that at the Port, you are not going to be able to contain it in the rest of the country.

Sir, I do not want to have a debate on tourism now. I do not wish to have a debate on tourism. I welcome the opportunity when it comes for us to have a debate on the contribution of the cruise ship industry. I believe that I can have some legitimate claim for having the foresight years ago of seeing that cruise ships would eventually be one of the principal means of people enjoying a holiday and also that the Caribbean would become one of the premier cruising destinations in the world. When I was Minister of Tourism, all of the documentation came to the Ministry, and at that time we had a Research Centre in the Ministry. We were not depending on any private sector to do research. There was research capability in the Ministry as opposed to the Board and as opposed to the private sector in which long term possibilities with respect to the Ministry and with respect to the industry were studied. It was clearly envisaged that super-sized ships were being built. We took the decision to send the Parliamentary Secretary to go and have a look together with the Port Authority the world over to see how other places were trying to deal with this matter. I am very glad to say that as a result of that exercise that a number of contacts were made and Barbados has started to become a whole port. So that when we talk about the cruise ships and the development in the cruise ship industry, you must remember that one of the sheds that was no longer needed because of containerization was converted as long ago as 1985 for cruise ship facilities. All that has happened which is usual is that others saw the potential, having failed to see it

beforehand. But when somebody else did it, like copy-cats they rushed in thereafter and dealt with it. That is all that has happened.

Now the cruise industry is still an area that the Caribbean has fantastic potential in. All that I have read, Sir, indicates very clearly that with the exception of some of the Pacific Islands or possibly some of the islands in Malaysia, there is no comparable area like the Caribbean in which you have islands of close proximity which lends itself to daily cruising. The Greek Islands have it but the Mediterranean is polluted. That is a fact that the Mediterranean is polluted. So we have an advantage and I am very glad to see that at long last the Caribbean is beginning to see that this is an area in which collaborative action is the best means of insuring that each individual island is not used by the cruise ship operators as a means of dividing the Caribbean for their advantage. That is important. The late Sir Arthur Lewis warned the Caribbean long ago that when it came to economic opportunities because of our smallness that we constantly had to remember that we were so small that people would try to divide us in order to exploit us. So that I am very glad to see that efforts are being made to present a common front in this area.

Sir, there is no doubt about it that the cruise ships when they come to the Caribbean do have the effect of causing the port operators to have to incur expenditure. The question of waste disposal of cruise ship waste is an important point. Somebody has to deal with it and also, Sir, what really galls me and I hope that it is not true, and I am hoping later on when I see the actual agreement that I hear that part of the taxation generated to pay for these things has been hijacked - I can only call it that - as a result of this joint venture agreement as part of the revenue of this that has monopolistic points. It is a very serious thing. It is a question of principle. I do not care who the individuals are. I believe that is a question of principle. I do not believe that anybody would have had the gall to go to any airport in the world where the services are provided by the airport authority and tell them that in return for providing services they must have a percentage of any taxes levied. No, Sir.

Now I want to see, Sir, that in this new area that we are dealing with that maximum benefit is derived from this area. I just wish to reiterate that once we are guided by the principles of opportunity being given to everyone to exploit the potential, then I think we can get great revenue down there. But the Port Authority must understand that, if the Port Authority is not above the law of Barbados, it certainly is accountable for Parliament for its decisions whether it is this Administration or any other Administration that makes them, Sir. 5.30 p.m.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South has spoken in the vein in which he spoke. I had planned and I do still plan to speak in an even franker mould on certain iireas in which I have grave concern when I see certain developments in Barbados.

The Harbour was once a major infrastructural focus of economic development in this country. With the changing economy in the 1970s, there was some diminution in its contribution to the economy of Barbados. With the changes in the economy, Sir, it has become once again a pre-eminent infrastructure in terms of the economic development of Barbados.

There are some very unfortunate developments that have taken place there which have been a source of bother to me. There can be no question that if you look at the share of revenue from the Harbour that now goes to the workers, both in terms of actual take home pay and in terms of numbers of people employed, there has been a considerable diminution in that area.

The second point Sir, that I wish to make is that we have to be very careful in this country not to allow the political process of Barbados, the process that has the political power, to be used by other people for their financial gain at the expense of the broad masses of people of Barbados and at the expense of small people.

I am very concerned, for example, over what has happened in the Pelican Village area and I am concerned about what has happened to a lot of small people who made their living in relation to the Harbour. I recognise, Sir, that a very fundamental change is coming over this country which needs to be dealt with and has to be dealt with at the very fundamental level of economic control of Barbados. Whether you like to face it or not, I am prepared to face it because what is happening here is that those people who traditionally control the commercial and the agricultural sectors of Barbados have all of a sudden decided to latch on at a very late stage of the tourism earnings in this country and particularly because it is a major area of foreign exchange earnings.

Whereas we may be desperate in terms of giving priority to the earning of foreign exchange to this country, we have to be very careful whether in that process, we are not using the State and the resource of the State in order to promote the interests of a very small group of people. I think that these questions have to be answered because we will be failing in our duty if we do not address these kinds of concerns.

If you look very carefully - and the Harbour, I think, is a kind of microcosm of what is taking place in Barbados

- over the years and you see what has been the input by the State and the input by others and you see today who are the beneficiaries, who are making fortunes... I understand that the return on capital down there is somewhere in the region of 30% to 40% per year. That has been handed on a platter to certain individuals who would not put one cent in the tourism industry of this country over the past 25 years. I go further and say that, in instances where they owned hotels, they got out of the tourism industry in the late 1960s and 70s and now today are coming to tell us that they have a prior claim on the earnings from the tourism industry of this country at the expense of a whole lot of small people like the Honourable Member. The Honourable Attorney General owned a small piece of land in Christ Church, put up a hotel and spent 30 years probably trying to pay for it, a whole lot of money.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Nothing personal. I am just giving an example. It is a positive example. That is what has happened to a whole lot of us. Either we inherited a piece of land or you put some money in a piece of land and went and borrowed a whole lot of money from the Development Bank or from the commercial banks. You could never own the hotel. You have spent money bringing people to Barbados and when they came to Barbados you, as a small man, have carried the debt on your hotel whilst others made a profit out of selling goods and services to them. Now they are going a step further. This has to be looked at. Make no mistake about it.

Whilst we are thinking of expanding infrastructure in all kinds of directions we have to make sure that the small man in Barbados participates in this maximally.

Asides.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The time will come when I will talk direct.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Let us hear the Honourable Member.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I will give an example, Sir. What we are doing here today is basically taking State land, leasing it to a State authority at a very concessionary rate for a long time in order to promote an aspect of tourism. Now the point I am making is that this kind of state intervention has been going on for a long time in Barbados. There is nothing wrong with this in principle but we have to make sure that at the end of the day that we do not end up in a situation where the broad masses of our people are not owners of these leases, where they continue in the same kind of relationship which has existed down the years in relation to sugar and things like that.

It is going on right now. Look carefully and see what are the changes taking place in this area and look and see who is reaping the sweets. Look and see who has made the sacrifices over the years. I feel very bitter about this because I know that over the years successive governments have made approaches to these people to get them involved even in building a hotel in Barbados and they refused to build one because they said it is too risky. That's a fact. It is a risky area of investment. Those who own hotels got out of the hotel business and gradually have crept in at the services end and now want to make the fullest use of public capital. That is what they are trying to do now for their particular advantage.

You see the Honourable Member for Christ Church South is scared to speak with the same kind of frankness that I would speak. When the time comes to call names, I will call names. This is not the time. We will warm up to the time when we have to call names and it might embarrass some people too. 5.40 p.m.

Sir, I think there is a mistake here in the Second Schedule. When the Minister introduced this matter he said the period was 36 years and I see 35 years here. That rent seems to me to be a little low, \$100 a year. I do not know when the other lease was signed but there is no good reason why you should pay the same amount now that you paid on the previous lease. I believe that the time has come when we have to try to get a higher yield from Government land. Let me put it this way, Sir. If I own a piece of land I certainly would not be leasing it to anybody at \$100 a year. I am quite sure that you would not do a thing like that because it would be quite wrong.

Sir, the Barbados Hotel Association and the Board of Tourism. I want to take issue with a statement by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, and in this regard. I think one has to be careful whether we are not entering into the area of persecution of an individual. I say this because it would appear to me that the Chief Executive Officer, as referred to by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, was as much a victim of all that has gone on as anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I am asking that you stick to this Resolution before the House. Just relate what you have to say to this Resolution.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir. That is why I just wanted to make that point. If you permit me, Sir, I will not refer to that individual again but what I would say is this. There are people who recognise that the Tourist Board has \$30 million plus available to it and they want to control that too. Apart from the party politicking over certain

matters relating to the Tourist Board at the political level, there is an under-current there that has to be addressed and the Government of the day has to stand up and say, this is taxpayers' money. If you want to spend it, go and face the electorate. The point is this, and this is very important. The whole American Revolution was based on the principle of no taxation without representation and we have a situation developing in this country where people want to spend taxpayers' money without representing them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I take it that you will relate all of this to the Resolution before the House.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: I am sorry, Sir, that I did not establish the proper basis in your view for the statement that I made there, as the Deputy Prime Minister said that the Tourist Board will have a responsibility to monitor what is going on in this area when it is used for the purposes which she explained to the House. She did explain to the House that the Bajan Queen, the Jolly Roger and some other cruise ship will be making use of it and that would come under the surveillance of the Tourist Board. It is in that regard that I am dealing with this particular issue.

I am dealing with a more fundamental issue where I think there is a new kind of gall in this country where they are not only satisfied to be benefitting from Government's capital outlay in all kinds of regard, but now on top of that they want to determine how the taxpayers' money is spent. When it is badly spent you all will have to answer inside here. Those people need to be told in no uncertain terms that they will not take decisions on how Government money is spent. If they want to, go and face the electorate. There are some very deep issues involved in this whole tourism thing at the moment. Any changes one considers at the Tourist Board or anywhere else in the tourism area be fully aware of the forces that are at work. They are not at work in the interest of the broad masses in Barbados.

I believe, Sir, that I have said enough that those members of this House who wish to look at this matter with some seriousness fully understand what I am saying and I do not have to get into the area of name calling. All I would hope is that in the future we want to see opportunities for as many poor black Barbadians as possible to get an opportunity to benefit through small investments or otherwise in the Port that is owned by the people of Barbados and any further developments down there should be predicated primarily on giving an opportunity to the small man in the harbour. Give the opportunity to some of the small hoteliers that owe the Barbados Development Bank \$1 million or \$2 million and have brought 100 000 people to Barbados over the past 20 years and will lose their properties. Give them

an opportunity to have a little shop in the Harbour. They have no opportunity to expand or develop on their own investment that they have made in the interest of Barbados.

Let me tell you something. I can talk. I lost a lot of money in a small hotel. My heart really goes out to these people. When I see these small hotels and know the struggles that those people have gone through, now the opportunity has come along they are not being given a chance in this country. They are the people who need public assistance or opportunities provided by the State more than anybody else. I want to see a policy enunciated by the Government of Barbados that in these developments in the tourism area where the infrastructure has been put in place by the tax dollar of this country, that the priority in the future is going to be to give small people the opportunity.

Let me tell you something. It does not take any genius to run a duty-free shop. You do not have to go to university for 5 years to run a duty-free shop. Even I can run a duty-free shop and I am a big joker, as he said.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. Do you relate this also to this Resolution?

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Yes, Sir, because one of the aspects of this development is to have some overlying duty-free shops. I can envisage this land being fully utilised where you have a walk-over of duty-free shops over there. Give some shops to some poor people. Give them a chance. These are things we need to deal with in this Parliament.

I am going to wind up and say this. Unless these matters are dealt with in the life of this Parliament, unless these matters are addressed between now and the turn of this century, it is going to be another century before the trends that are developing now can be reversed. Do you hear what I say? People in this country have no idea of the extent of capital accumulation and the redirection of capital accumulation in Barbados in recent times. A lot of them do not have any idea as to what is going on. 5.50 p.m.

Look at that whole financial sector, Sir, and see what is happening. We have to take those decisions now. The decisions that this Parliament has to take in the next few years are as monumental as the Parliaments in the early fifties and sixties in this country had to take. They were monumental as well. We have to put the brakes on. We have to get some kind of reversal of the present trends. Otherwise, our children and our grandchildren will not have

the kind of opportunities which we had 30 years ago in this country. The doors are closing. All the fancy talk that you are hearing out there about participation and this and that. They are closing the doors to opportunity of our children and our grandchildren.

We have the power in this Parliament to do something about it. Let us do something about it. That is perhaps the major issue facing a Parliament of this kind in the closing years of the century.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the Honourable Member please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate has developed so far into one of the most profound debates which we have had in this House for quite some time. I wish to say that I appreciated the way in which the Honourable Member for Christ Church South and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central spoke with regard to this Resolution.

I believe that some perspective - the Minister is not in his chair - should be brought in relation to the reality of this piece of land because the truth is that the facilities have already been developed to a certain point. If you look at the Addendum to this Resolution the penultimate line says:

"Described in the First Schedule of this Resolution for the development of a coastal food facility and for facilities for fishermen of the Sandpit community."

When the Honourable Member for the City spoke she obviously did not remember, although this Resolution is coming to the House at this time some 2 years later, the issue of the sand pit community was determined about 2 years ago and it is in that context that in appreciating what the 2 Honourable Members have said that I am concerned and would invite the Minister himself to put some conditionalities on this lease. The conditionalities would relate, for example, to the so-called facilities for the fishermen of the sand pit community.

I recall that in my capacity as the Representative of St. Michael West in which this falls and where a number of the persons who were being uprooted from the sand pit reside and, as a community, along with a gentleman called Mr. Evan Forde with persons from St. Michael South who were also going to be suffering as a result, that a tremendous battle had to be fought to get the Port Authority to agree even to that facility which is there now which is the replacement for the shack and

surrounding sandpit where these fishermen, who incidentally come from all over the island, the fishermen who go to the sand pit come from St. Philip, they come from St. Peter, they come from all over the island. We had a tremendous battle to get even that small facility which is already established. In other words, the land was owned by the Government.

The Port Authority was responsible for laying out the programme of how the land would be used and now I see that we are moving to lease it to the Port Authority. At that time the Port Authority did not show any particular propensity for accommodating the sandpit community and in that context I do not believe that they will show any greater propensity given the benefits, to which the Honourable Member referred, that will accrue from the facilities here to treat the members of the sand pit community any differently. One of the conditionalities which I should like to know that the Government is insisting on in the body of the lease, is that the sand pit community will have continuing and perennial rights because this was the issue on which they invested much of their time, effort and energy and they were assured, they were given the assurance by the Government that they would, in perpetuity, have what they believe to be prescriptive rights to access to that area of this land that they had traditionally used through the late George Fergusson's backyard.

I am saying therefore, Sir, that the Government should see to it that the Port or any private persons who subsequently sublease from the Port do not within a year or two or five or ten uproot these poor people from the current, let us call them facilities, which they now enjoy and those facilities add up to no more than a relatively small building which allows the fishermen when they are getting their boats repaired to have some recreation and to have, generally speaking, a reasonably good facility where they can spend time.

Mr. Speaker, already in this issue over the last couple of years attempts have been made to raise the fees for those fishermen for mooring their small vessels in that Shallow Draft. Already attempts have been made to root them out. I wish to say that I have been involved with them for a very long time. The law does not permit them to sell fish within a radius of 2 miles from - the Port. We built - and I am not complaining that we did - a fishing port around the other side. It was pointed out that there was some difficulty for those fishermen who lived in Westbury Road and surrounding areas to bring their catch to the fishing port which although it is a relatively short distance away is culturally a chasm. They still were able to bring the fish out and operate and operate within the neighbourhood.

If you pass there, as I do practically every morning, there is a 12 foot fence which now surrounds the entire area and the fishermen now have to enter the Port through a prescribed entrance. I have no quarrel with that because the reason given was security and it is a fact that dope was being moved through this particular area of the Port and the Port Authority and the security people felt that they had to improve and increase the security. Whenever you have progress on one side of an equation there is usually somebody on the other side of the equation who has some burden. There are benefits on one side, burdens on the other.

The fishermen have accepted that they have to conform with what is necessary for the security of the country. But that conforming must not mean that as the fishermen exercise what they believe to be their God given and time honoured rights going through the new gates, find themselves after this lease in a position where they are being told at what time they can pass through, where they can pass and perhaps having to get some kind of arrangement so that they can go to and from their small vessels. The fishermen are concerned because they have no reason to trust anybody in relation to decision-making in that area. 6.00 p.m.

They rely on the Government because they believe that the politicians and the Government are accountable and however else people might write, those of us who sit in this House know very, very well and very, very clearly how accountable we are when the time comes. And so the fishermen believe that we are accountable and they will take a chance with the Government. When however this lease occurs those who will have jurisdiction over the area will no longer be the Government. It will in fact be the Port and the Port will no doubt have companies that will have jurisdiction over areas.

Mr. Speaker, there has been over time been a concerted though subtle attempt to have those fishermen removed entirely from this area and so I want to say to the Minister that as he says "for facilities for fishermen of the Sandpit Community", that the Sandpit Community has to be defined in any lease. Some instrument has to identify the rights which the Sandpit Community fought for.

Anybody who has been following the newspapers know that this was an ongoing running battle and it embodies the issues raised by the two honourable gentlemen who just sat down because those issues are fundamental to the kind of country we are going to have in the Twenty-first century. Those issues relate to the feeling that if one works in a particular way one has a chance at * owning some stake in this community. They have made the record. Except to say I concur with the basic

point they are making I do not wish to repeat what they have said. But as you observe what has been happening in this country you cannot help but relate to what happened in Britain.

Thatcherism was introduced into the United Kingdom and there is a small cadre of persons in the United Kingdom...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member knows that there comes a time in every man's life when he has to speak first and check the consequences later. He has done it and will do it again because he has the same antecedents. Thatcherism in the United Kingdom, Sir, has resulted in a small cadre of persons becoming super rich - filthy rich - at the expense of millions of persons who are now part of the vulnerable society. Thatcherism and Reaganism...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, his heart was in the right place. The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central's position within the Democratic Labour Party, his heart was in the right place and I am not now going to allow the fact that he and I are now in two separate political organisations to dim my recollection of where we were at a given point on these issues.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I have no difficulty with that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I well recall when I became Minister of Tourism in 1986 and the Honourable Member as Minister of Finance said to me, "Whatever funds you need for tourism you can get." I remember saying to the Honourable Member at the time, "Let me first see what we are doing with the funds that we now get." The Honourable Member will tell you that we were able to turn around tourism without injecting the millions which were being called for by a number of people who, as the Honourable Member said, wished to have political power without going through the political process.

It is always instructive when you come face to face with these types who are able to draw upon certain philosophical utterances, not the philosophy but the utterances. It is very well done in Barbados. You can take up almost any one of the newspapers in this country and you can see a number of words which purport to expound a particular theory of development. If you do not go under those words and behind them you will not understand that that is a facade for business as usual. And those who dare to question business as usual are taken care of in one way or the other.

We, in this House, as Honourable Members have said, have a responsibility and especially those persons who are now coming to the House have a responsibility to ensure that the issues which were fought 25 years ago and which on the surface may appear to have dissipated but which in fact are recurring in sharper focus for those who have the ability to perceive them, those issues are still as urgent, still as important as they were then except that the consequences of failure are much more calamitous in their scope than we could have anticipated 25 years ago.

There are numbers of people in this country who feel that they are part of the vulnerable group even though they may have done everything they were told they should do. They were told, if you go to Sunday School, if you are a good person, if you get your 5 O'levels, if you go through the community and you be nice to everybody a place for you is assured.

Many of them are coming to feel that that is a myth. But the collective energies of all of those persons in this country let loose against people who fail to recognise their dilemma which, let us face it, could, may, and if we are not careful will, include those of us in this Honourable House because we are their hope. We have told them either implicitly or explicitly that if they trust in us, either when we are over there or over here that a path will be open for them.

Your Honour is fully seized of my position on this over a long period of time because quietly, without fanfare, these matters we have been dealing with at a different level. So I speak here not merely for the sake of speaking but to endorse the concern which is expressed in the statements made so far in this debate. I ask only that the Minister does not treat this as just another lease by the Government. I ask that the Minister, apart from examining the fundamental legal aspects of this lease, that he examines certain other aspects of the lease.

The Minister in the Addendum and in his presentation indicated generally what the lease is for. But since it is our land we can put conditionalities on the lease, ^he Government is in a position to examine and if necessary re-examine positions that have already been taken even if it means repudiating decisions taken by the Democratic Labour Party Government. If that is what it calls for, then examine them and repudiate them. As long as such repudiation is not done out of a sense of pure politics - I am trying very hard not to contaminate the debate - then that is what the Government is for. Because the Democratic Labour Party itself has examined decisions that it has made during its tenure as the Government. It is the process of Government, good governance, to examine decisions that have been made. 6.10 p.m.

I heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church South making a statement about legislation which was passed in here during my time. I shall wait until that amendment that is promised comes to the House before I speak on it. But I think that the basic principle has to be addressed and examined. Proper political power is the people who exercise it and they are answerable to the people over whom it is exercised. No matter who writes about corruption with a large or small "C", the fact remains that the country gets the government that it votes for if there is a democracy. When it has that government, the Government may or may not make mistakes but it is the Government. That is to be divorced from the back-room boys or the Bay Street boys or some other kinds of boys who do not have the courage to go into the old ladies' rooms and smell them. They do not have the courage to beg people for a vote but who want to wait...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You do not understand this. I do not expect you to understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT:...until after the votes are counted and then through subtle methodology take part in the sharing of the power. Sometimes even they decide how the power should be shared out.

Mr. Speaker, I have made the point. I agree with this Resolution because in some ways it is coming *ex post facto*. This is not an initiative that is being taken, nor am I seeking to suggest that there is anything wrong with continuing where it is necessary to continue. I am saying however that there is scope for re-examination and to see whether there is some way in which any errors that were made in the past are not repeated. But more particularly from my point of view as a representative of people in St. Michael West who earn their living and whose parents earn their living and whose children who will earn their living from plying the waters around Barbados and who operate out of this facility, I wish the Government to insure beyond any shadow of doubt that such rights as they believe with good reason they have are not frittered away and that we do not leave even an aperture for some to come subsequently and remove those rights. If the Minister can assure me of this particular approach, I would be even happier than I am at this moment to support this Resolution.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I will be very short and I had not intended to enter into this debate were it not for the intervention of the Honourable Member

for the City who sought to draw me into it unnecessarily. However, there are two very important points that I want to make.

The first relates to the question which was asked by the Honourable Member for St. Michael East about the disposition of the land which is vested or controlled by a company known as Land Reclaimers Limited. This was a company established, I believe, by a previous Barbados Labour Party administration and of which the Director of Finance is the Chairman. It relates to land that is within that area of the Port or very near to the area of which we are speaking. Presently on the site is the Flour Mill, I believe a fish ice plant, and some other activities. I have never as Minister of Finance, and there are now 4 former Ministers of Finance and one present Minister of Finance in this House, seen a report from the Board of Directors of Land Reclaimers Limited. It is a board that has full autonomy because it was established as a private company for which Government is a shareholder and the board seems to feel that that autonomy is to be exercised that they have not sought policy inputs, to the best of my knowledge, on any of the activities that have taken place on that site from those who are responsible for policy. Something needs to be done about that land which has essentially wasted away for a long time under successive administrations. I am not blaming any particular individual. I am saying that the way that that company, Land Reclaimers Limited, functions is outside of the realm of policy.

Therefore, decisions could be made for the disposition of that land for which the Minister may have absolutely no knowledge and this has happened time and time again. Contrary to the kinds of asides that I hear in this House from time to time, a report has never been given to me by the Directors of Land Reclaimers Limited about any activities taking place down at the harbour which have ranged from Soca Village, Coney Island, and all kinds of things. There has been no policy input whatsoever because the Minister has no power.

As I have said, it is a private company and the Directors act within their discretion and they are accountable to the shareholder, which is at the end of the day the Government of Barbados. But they certainly have not taken any action inconsistent with their remit as Directors. What I am saying however is that perhaps they have taken no important decisions at all about the disposition of that land and I think that it is about time that we determine that. If it is going to be problematic from the point of view of industrial use because of its proximity to the coast or whatever, then it may be a prime or good site or part of it for tourism related or even cruise ship related activities whether it is a small water park or something like that. Because it was only last Crop-Over that some of

the people who had bands established tents on the northern site of that land and I went in the vicinity of those rocks, and saw the Honourable Member for Christ Church South in that area too, that I realized how beautiful a spot it is.

I always believed that it was for industrial purposes, I had never actually been in the area and realized that it could be used for other related activities, whether it is for the beach use for cruise ship passengers or whatever. All I am saying is that perhaps the present Minister of Finance could intervene to pull the company, Land Reclaimers Limited, back on track and let us have some policy input which would help that land to be used in a useful way. It is obviously very valuable land. I have no criticism of its disposition because nobody has ever consulted me.

The second point relates to the Port development and the cruise ship passenger terminal. I am not afraid to give my mind on that matter and I have done it in this House already. So the Honourable Member for Christ Church South must not feel that I am in retreat on this issue. There was a better way for the shares in that cruise ship passenger terminal to be offered to the public of Barbados and to encourage more citizens of this country to be involved in that investment. That was not pursued and I believe that nearly everybody who sits on this side and who is present and within ear-shot believes also that there was a better way for those shares to become available to the public. Regrettably, the Port Authority did not at that time pursue that particular method and entered into an arrangement which only allocated about 20 per cent of those shares to the public of Barbados. When the share offer was made, there were several applications. There were even more applications than they could process according to the way in which the shares were being offered and therefore what they did was to divide the shares available by the number of people who made applications, which is a perfectly legitimate thing. 6.20 p.m.

In my view, immediately that happened, some consideration should have been given to this interest by Barbadians. Now we have to understand the context in which this is happening. Shares in the Pine Hill Dairy had been made available to the public but, regrettably, were not absorbed in the way that we had hoped. We are still in the tentative stages in Barbados of encouraging people to take up those kinds of investments. I was very happy to see that so many people took up the shares in CIBC West Indies Holdings Limited when they became available. It is clear that Barbadians are ready for those kinds of investments and all I am saying to the Government is do not ascribe blame. You cannot look at Heywoods Hotel alone, assuming that is what some people may be doing in here, and say that because Government sold Heywoods Hotel to a local Barbadian company as distinct from let's say, a

foreign investor or a consortium of foreign investors or joint ventures with Government.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well, there was only one Barbadian company making a bid so they say a less conservative. There was nothing stopping... What the Honourable Member for Christ Church South called for in respect to any new arrangement at the Port obtained with respect to Heywoods. It was put out by way of advertisement throughout the world and in Barbados. The Honourable Member for St. Peter constantly raised it in this House. It was in the newspapers week after week and we kept the offers open until the last minute. Some gentleman in the Other Place who apparently was an attorney-at-law for some bogus group out of London said he had a last minute offer of some... Anyway, I would not even dignify you with saying who it is because he is...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. John.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I wouldn't go that way. But at the time when the decision was made there was only one Barbadian company which at that time had made a bid for Heywoods. The best that we could do in the circumstances was to insist that that company, and I hope I am saying this to the Honourable Prime Minister in earnest, because I don't give advice and therefore I am making a request of him that he would ensure that they make those shares available to Barbadians. It was supposed to be within 18 months of the opening of the hotel and I expect 10% in BS&T Resorts Limited to be made available to the citizens of Barbados in accordance with the terms of the arrangement which we had with Barbados Shipping and Trading Resorts Limited on the purchase of Heywoods.

When we are going into any cruise ship or any other kinds of investments... There have not been any major divestments which the Government had in the foreign exchange earning sectors that have been mortgaged away or sold. But I believe that we are all committed to seeing this kind of change. I appreciate the points made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central and the point made by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, except for the hyperbole which may give the impression that a Democratic Labour Party Government may have divested assets in critical areas to people who should not in 1994, or for that matter since 1838, be entitled to have access to them. That is not really so.

Now we are dealing with the coastal cruise facility. In respect to the new airport shops which may come pursuant to the consultancy study, it is clear that we are going to have to increase the availability of shops at the airport. With respect to any other initiative - Pelican is another area - there are Barbadians who are interested in

investing either jointly with Government or, if they can raise their own finance and we on the Democratic Labour Party will give 100% support to any initiative in that area which is geared to put Barbadians, not only in ownership of those physical structures, but also in ownership of the shops and the ancillary services servicing those entities.

You will have our full support - I say that to the Honourable Member - Prime Minister - without any hesitation - as long as the offers are open and transparent and as long as you follow the precepts you said we should follow with respect to the privatisation programme and it is a fair and transparent process. The time for economic democracy for Barbadians is here. I am not speaking about shibboleths. I am saying that there must be an attempt in this country to force successful private companies to go public and it is not going to be done by these piece-meal concessions through personal income tax. It has to be done by forcing them through suasion and other incentives to convert their companies into public companies.

There is a prominent writer in the Sunday newspaper - I would not ascribe to him his political persuasion because that is not necessary - who actually wrote a whole article to say why his company should not be a public company but that black people in this country can go in the stores and buy corned beef, English potatoes and all kinds of products which his company can import and can invest and give him patronage and that successive governments of the Barbados Labour Party and to a very lesser extent the Democratic Labour Party had extended patronage to him to be a supplier, whether it is at the Hospital, the School Meals Department or whatever and that he can have the temerity in 1994 to suggest, in what he considers to be a learned opinion, that it would be disadvantageous for a Barbadian to invest in a public company; if he turned his company into a public company. That it would be more advantageous for him to assist them in setting up small businesses which will forever be tied to purchasing from him. I hope, thank Goodness, that the Barbados Development Bank will not be again used in this country to those ends, a tribute to the Honourable Prime Minister for having the foresight to keep his hands out of that pot. But now he is in the sugar industry pot. You have to watch that too. I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

So the point is that we need to have that serious response. And economic democracy does not mean privatisation. It does not mean the sale of Government assets. That is part of the process. It means that credit unions must stop taking their money and depositing it on Broad Street because they are taking poor people's money in this country, depositing it in the large banks and those same large banks are -not lending poor people in this country money to develop businesses and so on. They must find new means, and government must be a facilitator of

this, of having those funds circulating among the people whose interests are best served by those investments.

I will give the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance my fullest support with any initiatives. I don't expect them to be major because I know the battles that he fights within and without. Those major initiatives would only have come from the Democratic Labour Party on that point. I expect, nevertheless, that something will be done and we will support even the first tentative step. I think Barbadians are ready. Government must be a facilitator. That facilitation does not mean the sale of Government assets only. It means that where there are joint ventures and Government is involved that demands must be made of the other private sector partners and Government itself must be committed to meeting the process of economic democracy; that private companies which are successful in this country which depend on and are built on patronage must at some stage make opportunities available to Barbadians to invest in them; that the credit unions and so on must be mobilised in a way to divert those funds from Broad Street somewhere else. I can't say where at this point. I have to leave that to the Government in the execution of its policy.

Finally, the process of economic democracy in Barbados needs to extend to... The Government has just had a public sector retreat. I read the comments which the Honourable Prime Minister made about promotions in the Public Service but Government is not as bad as many of those private companies in Barbados and the policies which they have such that young black Barbadians who have had opportunities to study outside of this country come back home and are more disadvantaged very often by going into the private sector and being pushed and pulled around when people of lesser intelligence, but who have family connections and other... 6.30 p.m.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But I am saying that. I am saying that Government's policies are way in advance of the private sector in that regard.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member I am afraid you are a little too far off from the debate.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, Sir. I apologise. What I am saying is that those people who are going to invest in the coastal cruise facility, assuming that they will be the large public companies in Barbados themselves, must have this process of economic democracy moving into the board rooms, and that senior people who have ability and who have committed themselves to the companies must not only be able to purchase shares in those corporations but must also move into major positions of

decision making; that economic democracy is not just an initiative of Government; that an enlightened private sector in any part of the world - it is only because Barbadians are very retiring, sometimes placid people - that we have not had the kind of pressure applied to the Barbadian private sector which has benefitted from the patronage of political parties over the years in the ways that I have mentioned and it has nothing to do with what they have in their head or their ability. It is just that very often they pull the strings best. It has been so with successive administrations. Well, if they have been pulling those strings best, we need to pull back some strings and say "You have built your empire on this. That empire now must be spread among more of the citizens of this country whose parents have had to be locked into these economic arrangements which have supported your wealth." Any initiatives in that regard will be given the full support of the Democratic Labour Party.

The process is reversible. We are not that far gone. In that respect I disagree with the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central. It is entirely reversible but it has to be a commitment by everybody and you will receive the full support of the Democratic Labour Party and, based on what I understand from other political parties, their support too. Let us commit ourselves to that and make sure that this country becomes a developed country in the year 2000, not just because of the quality of life of its citizens, but that in the process of empowering them we ensure that each of them have a better stake in economic decision-making and the ownership of economic wealth in this country.

That is the philosophy of the Democratic Labour Party on that subject, not best put by me because I know there are others who could put it better but that is what we are committed to and what we want to see as the major advance as we move into the year 2000.

Thank you.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, this debate has generated some very important and useful contributions. I think I should begin by saying that I hope that some day soon the Democratic Labour Party spokesmen will find it possible to say what these three said, that a lot of the recent policy that the Democratic Labour Party has accepted under structural adjustment strictures is not typical Democratic Labour Party policy. A whole economic fog would be lifted if, in discussing recent economic events and discussing the very things that people want to criticize now which were put in place by the Democratic Labour Party, people would be honest enough to say that they did it, but left to themselves these are not the things that the Democratic Labour Party would have done. We are now hearing Members of the other side who put these very things in place speaking with a sense of criticism about their own handy work. That is what we are here dealing with.

What has happened at the Port did not arise by some magic or the waving of some wand. It was done by a Democratic Labour Party Cabinet operating within a particular economic philosophy of the day. It was an economic philosophy which said that this country had to be run in accordance with particular dictates and that the private sector had to exercise an over-wielding influence.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, on a point of order. The Honourable Member has accused Members of the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet of making certain decisions. The kinds of decisions which the Cabinet would have made in relation to the development at the Port would not have descended into the kind of detail which has emerged in this particular debate. There were broad parameters put to the Cabinet and those broad parameters were agreed to. But the Port Authority established a private company and went into an arrangement with the private sector for the construction of a facility at the Port. Essentially the broad outline of that is what the Cabinet was made aware of and that is all.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, that having been said I want to give this House the assurance that this Barbados Labour Party Cabinet will not abdicate its responsibility on something as important as the question of the application of facilities constructed at the public's expense, and public property, in the manner that would obviously seem to have been done by the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member may be unwittingly misleading the House. The public's expense in relation to the construction of that cruise facility was minimal. The whole purpose of entering into the joint venture with the private sector was simply because the public sector did not have access to those resources. There are other things that could have been done. We accept that - a development bond. There could be other ways to do the shares but the Honourable Member for St. Peter knows that.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I have to date made one statement. I do not speak a lot but I have made one statement because the question, for example, of the issue of TV licences has arisen. I have made a point that I believe that whenever the State has to issue commercial licences from which people should profit, it should insist that the company should be a public company and that the capital should be denominated in the form of shares and in such a way as to ensure that the broad masses of the people of the country should own those shares. I feel so in relation to the issue of licences. Therefore, it should be abundantly clear that if one were dealing with an even more fundamental matter on the question as to

how facilities that were initially developed by the investment of taxpayers' funds had to be utilised, I would ensure that the Cabinet of which I was a part would have to be on the ball and insist that the capital would have to be denominated in shares and be so distributed that the broad masses of the people would have to contribute.

Sir, there has been a time in the recent past in this country where certain private sector elements in Barbados had a disproportionate share in the formulation, conception and execution of economic policy. That is a matter of fact. Part and parcel of the way forward, part and parcel of the way of addressing some of the issues raised by the Honourable Member for St Michael South Central, is our putting in place structures that can capture inputs into policies that are broader than those that informed policy in recent times.

I make that point to stress the issue that very often those who have the most direct input into policy formulation come to influence the structure and the shape of policy in manners that are not necessarily in the public interest. 6.40 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. John raised a number of issues which I should like to respond to directly. There are a large number of obscure enterprises and funds and so on that fall within the public domain that are important but do not ever report properly and their proceeds are never properly accounted for. One such is the Land Reclaimers Ltd. and I have asked for proper Reports to be brought on that, including the Report on the transactions in relation to the soca village. Also recently the proceeds from the disposal of shares from Government enterprises were put in the fund. I have read the Act very carefully. When it was brought to the House I was very concerned then that the civil servants and the Accountant-General were put in charge of it. The Minister had no power.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: He did not put it in.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I read the Act up to yesterday. That fund was supposed to be giving this House quarterly reports. Not one Report has ever been submitted to this House by that enterprise fund.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not know what the final arrangement was but I know that the House intervened at the Committee stage

with respect to the public enterprise investment fund and at that point we agreed that the Minister would direct the Accountant-General in respect of the allocation of those funds and pursuant to that power the then Minister of Finance established a Committee comprising private sector trade union and Government representatives to advise him on how to direct the Accountant-General on those investments. I hope that error has not been made because my recollection is that that section was amended to reflect that power in the Minister.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, I would just like to wait until those reports come to the House and they must come quarterly. Because when we set up these enterprises outside the control of Ministers they have a responsibility to report here as the Accountant-General does every month.

I have asked for a full report and that the reports must be done quarterly. I am to tell the House that as of yesterday when I got a progress report from that fund there were some \$19 million in it. It is still awaiting the final proceeds from the sale of Heywoods. I think there is another US\$5 million outstanding from the sale of Heywoods. There will be some funds therefore obviously to be drawn upon for budgetary purposes.

There are other funds which have been established by the state long ago. For example in 1985 a fund was established at the Barbados National Bank to repair historic buildings, not a penny of those funds have been utilized. I have asked for a report of them and I intend shortly to get those funds moving. The TECHVOC funds again a mistake by the Democratic Labour Party. The same mistake that was made in relation to the Barbados Tourism Authority was made in relation to TECHVOC, in my view, that when you set up these institutions and you strip Ministers of power you are creating a problem because we are answerable to the people. A lot of the problems that have occurred in tourism have occurred precisely because people have come to feel that persons who have not asked the public for power should be given rights and privileges to allocate the public funds.

Changes might also have to be made to the TECHVOC Council which commands the use of the Training Levy.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The Act has to be amended because the Training Levy has to be allocated by the TECHVOC Council but the Minister has no authority to say who should be on the TECHVOC Council, although we are responsible to the public for the disbursement of public funds. All of those things were done by the Democratic Labour Party Administration that constrained the rights

and capacity of the state to utilize public funds in a manner that was in the best interest of the public.

Sir, as I said Hey woods was raised in this debate and the Minister said that he hoped that provision would be made for shares to be taken up by the public. I was not myself seized of these facts. I am grateful to him for bringing it to my attention. I want to enter this debate to say this, Sir, that in every instance where conditionalities were entered into surrounding the sale of public property to private interest and those conditionalities involved those private interests putting some of the shares available to the public of this country, I give this House the assurance that this Administration will be assiduous in carrying out its responsibility to make sure that those shares are issued.

Aside.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I was not myself seized of the fact that within 18 months Hey woods had to put 10% of its shares on the market but I will follow it up as carefully as possible.

In relation to the development of cruise facility in Barbados, I am pleased with the development that is taking place in Bridgetown. But I also must tell the House that I strongly feel that there should be a cruise facility in Speightstown as well, and that the Speightstown Development Task Force has been in contact with the Florida Cruise Ship Association discussing the prospects of the putting of jetties and facilities in Speightstown that would also enable the cruise ships to come to Speightstown. I feel that we have to see this as an area of development for the country that must be decentralized. The Government speaks of its success in increasing cruise ship numbers but with the increase in the numbers have also come some problems. One of those problems is access to the beaches and other facilities of land based tourism. I think that in addition to their putting up these cruise ship facilities, we also have across Barbados to put...

Asides.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Speightstown is coming. As I said, I have just announced - you were talking to the other Members - that the Speightstown Development Committee is in contact with the Florida Cruise Ship Association about bringing smaller cruise ships to Speightstown, and putting in jetty facilities in that town for that purpose.

But I was making the point that across Barbados we are going to have to put investments in a land based facility in order to accommodate the needs of the cruise ship passengers. Conflicts are arising between cruise ships and hoteliers in relation to cruise ship passengers coming and using the facilities that should be for their guests. That

would be a cost to Government which will be brought to the House in some course.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there are any other issues that were raised on the other side that warrants...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR:...any more direct response by the Government. As I said Land Reclaimers Ltd. will have to put up, to Government, a plan for the development of the property that goes beyond its being used occasionally as a source of entertainment and cultural activity.

I share the view that it is a piece of land which can realize a very high rate of economic return to the country if the optimal use can be made for it. I enter this debate just simply to say that it goes just beyond our getting a report from them but our having from them a plan for the development of that facility which is strategically based.

I lend my support to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I join this debate and I support this Resolution. But I want to point out that there is a dangerous trend developing in Barbados and that trend is that it seems to me that there is a group of people who feel that certain facilities are only good for them. And there is another group of people who, once their are involved in a project, another group of people cannot get involved in that project.

We have a situation at the sand pit where the owners of the cabin cruisers and yachts believe that they have a God-given right to that facility. The poor fishermen down there do not have a right. As a representative of a rural constituency I cannot be party to that, Sir. 6.50 p.m.

I also want to inform the Honourable Member for St. Peter that at the Naval Base Facility there is an on-going project just like Speightstown for land based facilities. Something has already been done about it and we want that to continue because we cannot invite cruise ships or visitors to come to Barbados when we have facilities in St. Lucy that are available and are already prepared and we deprive the tourist from using those facilities.

Sir, we must utilize the facilities that we have and we must also expand them. I have no problem with the facilities in St. Peter being developed but we have some

at North Point and also at the Naval Base already and we must utilize these facilities.

Sir, I mentioned already that there is a group of people who feel that they have a right to every thing. We had it in the Port, we had it in the Sandpit and now we have it in tourism. There is a group of people who feel that they have a God-given right to all of the foreign exchange in Barbados and they feel they have this right to take the foreign exchange and keep it overseas. That is why they are pushing all inclusive tourism which will bankrupt Barbados and cause us to devalue our dollar if we do not do something about it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy I would like you to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, Sir, I am sticking to the Resolution because if we do not get the foreign exchange we cannot build the facilities at the Sandpit. Sir, that is very important. We must have foreign exchange in order to build the facilities down at the Sandpit. Sir, if certain people in tourism feel that they have a God-given right to all the foreign exchange, people like you and me must do something to stop this. We must speak out against it, Sir.

What did you say, Sir? That is why I hope that you would not stop me, Sir.

So, Sir, we have to be serious about this. It started with the beach vendors and that is sea-based not land-based and everybody joined the hoteliers against those poor beach vendors who promoted Barbados. Let me tell you something, Sir, we spend a lot of money promoting Barbados, and we do not pay the beach vendors a cent. We should be compensating them because they are the ones who promote tourism in Barbados on a daily basis and all they get is insult. That is why I represent them in here.

I am saying to you, Sir, that the same thing that happened to the beach vendors is happening to the small business people now. It is all happening through a concept called all inclusive, Sir, where a small group of people feel they have a right to deprive a large group of people in Barbados from earning a living.

It is a free country, I agree and that is why this House cannot afford to encourage these policies.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, the cruise ship facility has part to do with the all inclusive.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Not quite but it has something. Admit it. It is part of the all inclusive.

You see, Sir, even the other side wants me to talk all inclusive because they have admitted that cruise ships are all, all inclusive.

Mr. SPEAKER: And they want you to link it to the Resolution.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Let us be serious, Sir. In this House of Assembly we must be seen as the ones who are protecting the rights of the minority and when I say the minority I mean minority in wealth, not in numbers. Because in this country we are seeing a dangerous trend which we have to protect ourselves from and our people from or not you will have a situation where you are going to find it is not the beach vendors against the hoteliers it is the small business people, the beach vendors, everybody against the hoteliers and the hotels will become the enemy of Barbados. We cannot get ourselves in a situation where we have something that we must depend on and we find that it is in conflict. Then we would have no tourist industry. If this House allows it to continue, then we will be guilty of everything that has happened.

Sir, the fishermen at the Sandpit must be protected and we must do everything and once we have done it from in here, then the message will go out that the House and all of its Members are protecting the interest of the poor and working-class people of Barbados. So I am hoping, Sir, that you will encourage your comrades to support me on this issue. Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the concerns of Members have been very well dealt with by Honourable Members on this side and in particular the Honourable Member for St. Peter in dealing with the discriminatory concessions at the Port, which the Honourable Member for St. John would know more about being part of the last administration. But dealing specifically with the Resolution I would like to assure the Honourable Member for St. Michael West that with respect to the lease, I am satisfied that the terms and conditions, I know he did raise those concerns, have been carefully negotiated and it would not be wise at this stage to make any major fundamental changes.

I would just like to make one correction. It was alluded to by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central in that the unexpired term of the lease should be 35 years rather than 36 years. Subject to that correction, Mr. Speaker, I now move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT
BRYAN'S ROAD, WELCHMAN HALL, ST.
THOMAS FOR THE PRESERVATION OF
ECOLOGICAL AND AESTHETIC
VALUE OF HARRISON'S CAVE

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Bryan's Road, Welchman Hall, St. Thomas for the preservation of ecological and aesthetical value of Harrison's cave.

Mr. Speaker, a report on Harrison's Cave prepared by the energy division of the Ministry of Finance focussed attention on the damage being done to Harrison's Cave and its environs by the operation of livestock farmers, mainly pig farmers operating in the Welchman Hall area.

According to the report, bacteria has been identified in the sample water from the cave. This is directly related to the human activities in the areas above the cave which ties into the stream water-flow regime through the cave. 7.00 p.m.

Of particular concern is the pig farm operation carried out on the property, the estate of Mr. Mervin Dalrymple at Bryan's Road, Welchman Hall. This operation, the report states, is perched on the top of the coral limestone close to the vertical face of the gully. A trail of waste from this operation was observed along the side of the coral cliff and ponding in a dampy clay area in the bottom of the gully. This area was directly above where the tunnel of the Cave crosses the gully. The thickness of the coral in this area averages about 50 feet. This makes it critical that waste should not be accumulated in this area. This thickness of coral might permit effluent from the farm to enter into the underground stream that flows through the cave in an undecomposed state.

The effect of the seepage of waste from this particular pig farm is an unpleasant smell which pollutes the air above ground adversely effecting the ambiance of the scenic walk which was developed as a major external attraction to the Cave. The odour even permeates into the cave itself where its impact is very damaging. Finally, the fecal matter pollutes the otherwise crystal clear waters of the Cave. It is a situation which requires urgent attention and the relevant notices under the Land Acquisition Act, Sections 3 and 4 have already been published. The property has been surveyed and is known to measure 536.3 square metres with a residence and out-buildings which serve as pig pens and chicken pens. The survey plan is available to Honourable Members on that side.

The passage of this Resolution would put the Government in a position to vest this property in itself and eliminate the problems which currently effect the Cave. Officials from the Ministry of Housing have already visited the area and we are close to a settlement of this matter. It is very important that we move swiftly to avoid any further damage to the Cave itself. I would also like to say that there are a number of pens in the immediate area that are posing a similar problem and we are currently carrying out some tests and similar acquisitions will be coming to the House very shortly.

With these remarks, I beg that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I should not be long on this Resolution but I think it is important that first of all we indicate our support for the acquisition. As a matter of fact if it were not difficult, I would ask the Minister if he could enlighten me as to whether certain recommended steps by the then Minister of Health concerning failure on the part of certain officials to take action with regard to this particular piece of land resulted in any action. I do not wish to be difficult but, Sir, this land had all kinds of violations of the Health Services Act. I do not now say that he was the owner of the land, but a public official who is involved in environmental health and part of whose responsibility is to enforce the Health Services Act was in fact the occupier, as I understand it, of this property. Other officers who would visit this property would constantly fail to find him and fail to issue notices. I wrote on the file that the matter should be reported to the Public Service Commission and I have never had any indication whether it was done. But politicians carry a lot of blame for all kinds of things and this was in my tenure as a Minister the worst example I have seen of that kind of thing. This Minister is probably not in a position to answer and I do not need to detain the House. But I hope that the Minister will follow this up, because here you have a public officer who deliberately breaks the health law. I mean this is not something where he went around the corner without a bicycle light or something and you have other senior officers who visited the place specifically to examine this and who never reported this particular individual.

Sir, I want to put it on the record because I felt very strongly. This is one of those situations where the Minister can issue instructions until he turns blue, unless somebody is going to carry them out, the public sector is going to get away with it. Therefore, I am saying that I support and, in fact, it was decided that we should acquire this property when we were still the Government because acquisition of this property was the only solution to this very serious problem which was dogging the caves. I wanted to put it in the record, Sir.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Sir, I originally had planned not to say anything today because my voice really is not the best and I know that it is also getting late. But I rise to commend the Minister for moving as swiftly as he said that he has in this particular matter. Because it is a matter of grave concern and it is an ecological and environmental matter where Harrison's Cave is concerned. This is our prime tourist attraction and we just cannot have a situation where this particular state of affairs is allowed to exist with pig farms on top of the Cave. One matter which was not mentioned in the report but which was conveyed to me is that the formations in the Cave, the real attractions inside of the Cave of the stalagmites and stalactites, are becoming discoloured because of the brownish water that seeps through the roof of the Cave onto the actual formations. I would hate to think that we have reached the stage where we may have to spray paint on white those formations. Sir, I do agree with the Honourable Minister that we have to move quickly to avert this. I said that I would hate for it to reach that stage.

I have also been informed, Sir, that there were occasions when that Cave had to be closed down because of the smell that permeates the Cave in particular when rain falls and so on. That obviously, Sir, means a loss in revenue. 7.10 p.m.

I recall, Sir - and I move on to another point related as well to the matter - about some three years ago I read an article in one of the local papers where there was a complaint about the operations at the Cave. The main thing complained of then, Sir, was the fact that the guides who would accompany the coach in the Cave just spoke the English language. I want to say Sir, it is my belief that the time has come when we have to behave like people in the 20th century and that we cannot have a situation where we have a group of Spanish people or a group of French people visiting the Cave and all the information given to the group is in English.

Sir, we have taxi drivers in Barbados who have seen it fit to do crash programmes in German, Spanish and in French because they believe that if they do it that way they would attract more customers. I believe, Sir, that it is only right that in this day and age we do something about the guides at the Cave to ensure that they converse in more languages than the English language. It would speak a lot better for Barbados. I believe that if they go back home and they say that they went to Barbados and the information on the Cave is such and such because it was spoken to them in their language, that it would at least bring one or two extra people to this Island. I don't think the point can be more emphasised.

I believe too, Sir, that since it is our prime tourist spot, at the Airport itself we could have something that

tells the people as they arrive in Barbados about the Cave. It is unfortunate that people come to Barbados and leave without ever hearing about the Cave. It is sad. There should be something there. We have to advertise ourselves. We cannot expect people to do it for us. I believe that the new Administration will look into these matters and give Harrison's Cave the kind of thrust that has been sadly lacking for so many years.

I have two other points, but my voice is running out, Sir. I think I am going to close on this.

Asides.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: You said about the trams? The trams which were being used in the Cave are outdated. They were badly outdated and from what I understand, Sir, about three weeks ago a team went up to Miami to bring the new set of trams down. That is my information on the trams, but I am not responsible for them. I was not responsible for ordering the outdated ones either. That is my contribution.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be brief on the matter of Harrison's Cave. Harrison's Cave as I know it is one of the main attractions in Barbados for tourists. Most people selling Barbados as a tourist destination invite tourists to visit Harrison's Cave. It is one of our treasures. I, therefore find it very distressing that this cave should be desecrated in this manner. I believe that enough consideration was not given to the whole preservation of the Cave otherwise it would not be in the stage it is at.

I am worried, Sir, that we have not in the past paid enough attention to our human resources. My concern is that we do not have a repetition of this to any of our natural resources, especially one that is as precious as the Harrison's Cave.

Sir, I am thinking what repairs we have to do to ensure that Harrison's Cave is preserved as a premier tourist facility. I believe something has to be done. Whatever has to be done to preserve it must be done. „ Simply acquiring the land will not be enough. I believe some repair has to be done so that the Cave can be preserved. I am not an expert in this but I am appealing that whatever needs to be sorted out to repair that damage will be done as a matter of priority.

My experience, Sir, being in tourism, is that Harrison's Cave is perhaps the number one tourist attraction for Barbados. I am not taking the matter lightly. I recall having been asked to have some land made available for the people at Bryan's Road and I immediately recommended that the land be made available because I saw it a matter of priority that all attempts should be

made to have that land cleared so that the seepage into Harrison's Cave could be immediately addressed.

I therefore have no reservation with this Resolution here today. I am going beyond the Resolution as it stands and I am appealing that something be done about the stench. Something can be done about the seepage in the Cave. Otherwise, tourists will be turned away from what I consider and what is in fact a major tourist attraction.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Two very quick and brief points. First of all, I would like to assure the Honourable Minister that it has not gone unnoticed that his more recent introductions on Resolutions of Parliament have been longer and more thorough and as a result has led to less controversy and less debate. The Minister is obviously a very quick learner and I think that some of his colleagues could follow his example in listening to words of wisdom coming from this side. It would help them in their parliamentary performance. If the Press was not here I might have been minded to congratulate the Minister on making a very thorough and concise presentation.

Aside.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: The case was well and succinctly presented and that is the way a Minister should present a matter of this nature.

The second point I want to make, Sir, is whether the Minister can give the House any indication of the terms of this acquisition and whether it takes into account that there may be a viable business that is being dislocated as well. I don't know whether the business was legal or otherwise and perhaps he can let us know the kind of thinking in terms of the acquisition.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, dealing first with a question which was raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, I am not aware of the problem to which he alluded although I must say that I am somewhat surprised. There is nothing on file which would explain the delay in the Government of the day bringing the acquisition, especially seeing that the problem was identified since 1992. This is what I would consider a very urgent matter. I don't know what happened in between then. There may be some explanation to that.

With respect to the point which was raised by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, I must say that I have had meetings with the part owner of the land and I must say that I was very impressed with the operation she has there on a very small parcel of land, notwithstanding the damage that is being done to the Cave. I think that if you were to see this operation you would only be impressed with the type of operation that she has.

It is a very small parcel of land. She has a number of pig pens and a number of chicken pens. I have never seen anybody carry on so much business on such a small parcel of land. She is willing to move. The problem we have is that even though the land has been identified, as the Honourable Member for Christ Church East who is also the Chairman of the Barbados Agricultural Development Marketing Corporation mentioned, she is willing to move on lands owned by that Corporation. We are in the process of doing a valuation of the pens on the land and the business that she has on the spot. The valuation, without calling numbers, I would say it would be fairly substantial. We are hoping rather than having to go and build the pens which would take a longer time that we could quite quickly actually pay her and she would then be in a position to go ahead and fix the pens to facilitate speed in this matter. 7.20p.m.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House be adjourned until Tuesday, January 24, 1995 at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Now, speaking on the adjournment, Sir, when this Honourable Chamber last met on December 20, 1994, there was under the Head of "Private Members' Business" a Resolution of No-Confidence brought by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. On December 20 last year I offered to him January 18 as the earliest suitable date for debate of this Resolution. There is a custom in this Chamber in respect of No-Confidence motions that they be treated with great urgency and that they would be debated at the next sitting day, or the next future date after that sitting day and that in respect of all other matters these Resolutions take precedence.

Now, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has another Resolution of an earlier date on the Order Paper, but it is my intention that the Resolution of No-Confidence should, as is the custom with such Resolutions, take precedence. I offered again to him tomorrow January 18, 1995 and he said he was not ready to proceed on tomorrow's date. Now, I am adjourning this House until January 24. I, for the second time, offer to the Leader of the Opposition January 25 for the debating of this motion.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion for the adjournment of the House. When the House last met, my recollection is that on moving

the adjournment, without any prior consultation with me, either in writing, behind the Speaker's Chair, or in any other place, the Leader of the House, quite uncharacteristic of Leaders of the House, and out of consonance with the same customs to which we are accustomed in this Chamber, got up to adjourn the House and the Honourable Leader of the House said she was offering me a date to debate the Resolution.

I was quite willing at that time to debate the Resolution, even earlier than that. However, not in the intervening period but very close to that time, the Government took a course of action in relation to another Private Members' Resolution which I had on the Order Paper and I deem it - I am not taking any cue from anybody on this on the basis of custom or anything else - desirable, after consultation with my own parliamentary group, that that particular Resolution should take precedence. I have not asked anybody to offer me anything unless they are willing to offer me according to the normal dictates and customs of this Chamber.

I spoke earlier today to the Leader of the House and I said I would not be proceeding with the Resolution tomorrow. The Honourable Leader of the House indicated to me that the House would be adjourned until January 24. I pointed out to her, which she has not done in the comments which she made, and she is under no obligation to do that, even though other Leaders of the House would have done it, that I would much prefer, because of the course of action that has been taken with respect to the Commission on Casino Gambling, to at least commence and have our position put in respect of that matter prior to dealing with the No-Confidence motion.

I say once again to the Honourable Leader of the House that she can feel free to offer anything. On January 21 I will then let the Leader of the House know what my disposition is in respect of that matter.

I want to make it very clear that I am not breaching any customs but that I will not be treated as any backyard operative who comes to this Chamber, nor will anybody's secretary be calling at my office asking me whether I am proceeding with anything. I will indicate that to the Leader of the House as well that if I am in discussion with the Leader of the House it must be a discussion between myself and the Leader of the House. I am not discussing anything with any secretary, even though I extended the courtesy to the Honourable Leader's secretary on the last occasion. Either there is a way that this is going to be done in which we accord certain courtesies and respect to each other, or forget it. I am not asking for any quarter or for any special dispensation or benefits. If customs are being followed, let us follow all the customs and do not put any secretary to call me to ask me if I am proceeding with

anything, or any officer in any Ministry to have any discussion with me as Leader of the Opposition on whether I am proceeding with something.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I was asked to return a call to an officer, not to you. If only you had the courtesy of coming on the telephone and indicating what the position was. I am not getting into any trivial debate on this exercise. I am ready to debate the first Item in respect of Private Members' Business.

As a precaution, I am going to write to the Leader of the House and indicate that that is my position. I do not have to do that but as a matter of courtesy I am proposing to do so and whenever Private Members' Businesses called that is the Resolution that I will be debating.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
7.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Prime Minister.

Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, speaking on the motion for the Adjournment, I just want to say to the House that for the last 2 sittings of Parliament I have walked with the files of the Foreign Exchange Committee and the files of the Ruby Park Development in the hope that we could have had a debate on Casino Gambling and all of the full facts on various people's position on casino gambling could have been aired because they have to be aired and it would make very interesting discussion. I am very anxious for that debate to take place.

But in relation to the No-Confidence motion a No-Confidence Motion against a Minister of the Crown is a serious matter. It cannot be a matter brought to the House lightly. It hangs over the Minister's head for the duration that it is on the Order Paper. For that reason when I was in a different context in this House, I resisted the urge to bring a No-Confidence Motion unless it was for the various reasons. We cannot allow a No-Confidence Motion to be left hanging over a Member's head for a long time.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central I remember his complaining in here that he brought a No-Confidence Motion against a Minister of Finance and the Government of the day refused to deal with it. One of the reasons why I was reluctant to bring a No-Confidence Motion, if you recall, in February last year was that I felt that the Government of the day was not going to deal with it, Sir. Therefore, we are being very consistent in our position that the gravity of a No-Confidence Motion is such that once it goes on the Order paper it should be dealt with despatch. The position informed us then, it informs us now.

We are ready, Sir. I have all the files here waiting for the debate on Casino Gambling including what happened with the DLP Cabinet decision and what happened afterwards. I am waiting for the debate. I am anxious for it too.

I think, in fairness to the Minister, that the No-Confidence Motion should be dealt with because a No-Confidence Motion is a charge against a Minister is nothing to trifle with.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir,...

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I listened with much interest to the contribution by the Prime Minister in which he, following the Leader of the House, suggested that there is something that drove them, some I do not even know if it is an ephemeral position which the Barbados Labour Party would have taken with regard to Motions of No-Confidence. I do not know. It may very well be that I am not remembering well.

First of all I recall that the Leader of the Opposition who was Leader of the Barbados Labour Party Opposition before that position was huffed by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, had a Motion of No-Confidence hanging over the head of the then Prime Minister for some considerable time, after which it was withdrawn.

Then I recall that there was one for the Honourable Member for St. Michael West which had been announced even before it came to the House and then remained for some considerable time as the newspapers and commentators were able, with the introduction of almost every news item, to say that a Vote of No-Confidence was going to be taken against the particular Minister.

I am really very surprised to see that the Prime Minister is able to say that they believe passionately that a No-Confidence Motion against a Minister should be engaged upon with the greatest despatch.

But I go further. I recall that in the pre debate before the debate on one occasion when your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, established that No-Confidence Motions against the Government were to be distinguished from No-Confidence Motions against the Minister and that the Motion...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The House then decided that the Motion against the Government was the one that is to be

accorded this urgency which May's Parliamentary Procedure refers to, that No-Confidence Motions against Ministers could come any old time.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It does not suit me at all because I am the one who had to suffer under it.

I recall that I was ready for the No-Confidence Motion the moment it was put on the Order Paper. But I was strung over a fairly long period. I understand how the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East must be feeling because to have a No-Confidence Motion hanging over your head... For the people who do not know what it means, they perceive that if there is a No-Confidence Motion against you that you are just one foot out of prison.

For some considerable time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who had been proffered in opposition to me in the constituency spent some time telling the constituents that after the No-Confidence Motion they would have to visit me in Glendairy. I really do not know what they are talking about now. This new found wisdom that they have now obviously is not related.

There is clearly not a link that is perceptible except in the eyes of the distinguished Prime Minister. I understand these matters but it cannot be a precedent.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for the City.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I lead Government Business in this House and as long as I do that, in no wise will the Opposition ever be able to dictate the Government's programme.

I made no reference to words, that I gave my word to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition earlier that he could proceed with the Resolution on Casino Gambling next Tuesday. He is entitled to proceed. Nobody is stopping him. But what I am saying is that the other Resolution in respect of the No-Confidence Motion must take some precedence, I am not disposed to permit it to languish on the Order Paper. If it turns out that after 2 or 3 offerings to debate this No-Confidence Motion that it is not debated and the Leader of the Opposition does not take up my offer, I will treat it as a frivolous and vexatious Resolution and move to have it struck from the Order Paper. I would move to have it struck from the Order Paper...

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: ...which I know is what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants. Having

put it on the Order Paper he does not know now how to take it off without a debate.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this kind of behaviour, in my view, Mr. Speaker, coming from a Leader of the House constitutes one of the gravest indictments on the appointment which was made. What foolishness am I hearing? You are going to deem something that I do frivolous and vexatious. Who do you think you are? You did not come in here with any privileges that I do not have.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am not going to stand for that.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: There is no frivolous and vexatious statement by me. I have brought a Resolution and it will be debated when I determine it will be debated.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You are not going to have any say over any Resolution which I bring inside here.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Who do you think you are? You have no more say in here than me. You will not be dictating my pace.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER stood.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Members let us continue. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us hear the Honourable Member, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West.

Mr. L. A. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Standing Orders are clear in respect of PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS and I think without even having any consultation provision is made for PRIVATE

MEMBERS' BUSINESS to be discussed at a particular time of the day. The only thing that supercedes everything is GOVERNMENT BUSINESS. If Government suspends the Standing Orders which also in effect suspends that particular Order which prohibits that particular motion from being discussed then they have that right.

But on the question of any Standing Order it must proceed along the correct path. There is no way that a Private Members' Business can be enforced in a way if the Member is not ready to do it - whether no-confidence or otherwise. A No-Confidence Motion is just another Standing Order. It has no special preference over any of the other Standing Order. What I have always said and this Chamber has established it, is that a No-Confidence Motion in the Government is not the same thing as a No-Confidence Motion in a Member. It has been established here that a No-Confidence Motion in a Minister is not necessarily a No-Confidence Motion in the Government and the No-Confidence Motion in the Government is the Motion that always takes precedence. If you read May's you will see that. That is where the priority is given because it is considered a very serious matter against a Government. 7.40 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, we are dealing with Standing Orders which equal in weight. It has no law attached to it as some of us have been misled to think. Therefore, Sir, all Standing Orders must be given the right priority and the priority is, Sir, if you are not going to do it under the provision made under the Standing Order for Private Members' Business then it is fair that the Member who decides to debate that motion should have the decision as to the time he wants to debate it. I do not see any question as to whether it must be debated immediately or otherwise. We have established that already, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I move the question for the adjournment, I would like to suggest that there be consultation between the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House. We must at all times maintain the dignity and decorum of this House and I believe that before we meet again I would advise, and this is just my advice, that there be some consultation so we could this problem solved.

The question that the House be adjourned until Tuesday, 24th January at 11.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 7.44 p.m.

CONTENTS

The Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

MINUTES**Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 499**

Confirmation of Minutes of Tuesday,
December 20, 1994.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER**Mr. SPEAKER..... 450**

1. The Accounts and Statements for the month of October, 1994 as prepared by the Accountant General.

{

2. The Auditor General's Report for 1994.

PAPERS**Hon. O. S. ARTHUR.....450**

1. Report of the Accountant General for the Financial Year 1993-94.
2. The International Business Companies (Iroquois Capital Limited) (Rate of Tax) Order, 1994.
3. Annual Report of the National Insurance Board for the year 1993.
4. Airport Service Charge (Exemption) Order, 1994.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 450

Annual Reports of the National Cultural Foundation for the years 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES**Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER..... 450**

1. The Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1995.
2. The Juries (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

FIRST READING OF BILLS**Hon. O. S. Arthur 450**

Hon. D. A. C. Simmons 450

The Juries (Amendment) Bill, 1995.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 450

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ORDER NO. 7 - SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1994-95, NO. 5 _____ . _____ 450

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 450,451,452,453, 456, 463; Mr.- B. M. Taitt, 451, 455, 456, 459, 460, 469; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 451, 452; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 455, 465; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 459, 460, 461, 471; Mr. L. A. Weekes, 456; Mr. J. O. Tudor, 462; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 468,470; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 470; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 471.

PRIVILEGE

Dr. R. C. Haynes, 472, 476; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 472; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 471, 473, 476, 480; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 473; Hon. D. A. C. Simmons, 475; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 476; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 477; Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 478; Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 480; Rt. Hon. L. E. Sandiford, 481.

**ORDER NO. 1 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE EXCHANGE BY NORMA CLARKE-
ADAMSON OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT
WANSTEAD, CAVE HILL, ST. MICHAEL
AND ST. JAMES 483**

Hon. G. W. Payne, 483.

**ORDER NO. 2 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE LEASE TO THE BARBADOS PORT
AUTHORITY OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT
THE BRIDGETOWN HARBOUR, ST.
MICHAEL 484**

Hon. G. W. Payne, 484, 500; Mr. J. O. Tudor, 484; Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 486; Hon. Sir Harold St. John, 487; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 489; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 491; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 494; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 497; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 499.

ORDER NO. 3 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION BY THE
CROWN OF A PARCEL OF LAND AT
BRYAN'S ROAD, WELCHMAN HALL, ST.
THOMAS 501

Hon. G. W. Payne, 501; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 501;
Hon. R. N. Greenidge, 502; Mr. W. C. C.
Callender, 502; Dr. R. C. Haynes, 503.

SUSPENSIONS..... 464, 471

ADJOURNMENT 503

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 503; Mr. D. J. H.
Thompson, 503; Hon. O. S. Arthur, 504; Mr.
B. M. Taitt, 505; Mr. L. A. Weekes, 506.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

**ARTHUR, Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) CALLENDER, Mr.
W. C. C. (Christ Church East) GREENIDGE, Hon. R.
N. (St. Philip North) HAYNES, Dr. R. C. (St. Michael
South Central) KELLMAN, Mr. D. StE. (St. Lucy)
MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East)
PAYNE, Hon. G. W. (St. Andrew) SANDIFORD, Rt.
Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South) SIMMONS, Hon. D. A.
C. (St. Thomas) ST. JOHN, Hon. Sir Harold (Christ
Church South) TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St. Michael West)
THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) THOMPSON,
Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South) TUDOR, Mr. J. O.
(St. Michael East) WEEKES, Mr. L. A. (St. Michael
North West)**