

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Tuesday, May 13, 1997.

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.

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

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

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON, LL.B. (Hons.), (Leader
of the Opposition)

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B.

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

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

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

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.), LEC (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, B.Sc., Dip. Ed., (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)

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B., (Minister of State,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tourism and International
Transport)

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

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

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

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL, B.Sc. Econ. (Hons.), M.A.
Public Finance

Prayers were led by Rev. Father Ivan Harewood.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes for Tuesday, April 22,
1997.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to
move that the Minutes of the proceedings of the
Honourable, the House of Assembly for its meeting on
Tuesday, April 22, 1997 which Minutes have been
circulated be taken as read.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am to report that I am in receipt
from the Accountant General of the Accounts and
Statements for the month of January, 1997.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year 1996.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT FARMERS, ST. THOMAS

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of land at Farmers, St. Thomas for housing development. The land is located to the west of the Turners Hall Primary School and access to the area where the Highway 2A, the road linking to the junction at Blowers on the western side and to the eastern side where the access in the area where there is a junction from the Farmers Plantation on the road leading from Hillaby to Dunscombe.

Mr. Speaker, the particular area of land is marginal land, part of a larger area of Fanners Plantation. It is in a general area which together with lands forming Plum Tree Plantation was land which was mooted at one point in time for development as a golf course. As a matter of fact there has been an application to Town Planning with respect to the development of this same area and I am referring to the area of Plum Tree Plantation.

I speak subject to correction with respect to the application and the general area over on the other side which forms part of Apes Hill plantation, separated by a gully. This is the general area for which an application, I think, has been submitted to Town Planning.

Mr. Speaker, the area is an area which is very suitable for housing. As you know this particular area, as I had indicated earlier, is next to the Turners Hall Primary School. There was an amalgamation of 2 schools in 2 communities close to this particular area, namely the

Hillaby/White Hill area and the Airy Cot/Dunscombe area to the north. As a result it is an area which is very heavily used both on mornings and afternoons by parents taking their children to and from school and as a result is an area which is very well known to the communities in that particular area.

It is not a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the recent land slippage in the White Hill area has increased the demand for house lots in this particular area. It has put pressure on Government to find suitable sites for housing and in keeping with the policy of Government, as set out in our Manifesto to find suitable sites, marginal lands on the borders of existing villages for this purpose, this land has been the preferred site.

It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to resitals of those persons in White Hill whose lands have been affected by land slippage, that we would also be able to relocate persons in the area who have been affected by the amendments which were made, by the last administration, to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act.

There are a number of persons in that particular area who have been dislocated as a result of these amendments and as you know, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of Government, in accordance with the amending legislation, to compensate persons who have been so dislocated. It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to use these lands to relocate and resite persons, not only from the White Hill area but from the surrounding other areas in St. Joseph and St. Andrew like Belleplaine, Melvin's Hill and Isolation Road which have also been affected by the land slippage.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of land slippage in the White Hill area is indeed a very serious one and the problem is a lot more serious than one would like to think. I recall, a few months ago, being summoned to White Hill by a resident who had indicated that his house was affected by land slippage. And having looked at the house and looked at the surrounding location, it appeared to me that his problem was no more serious than other persons in the area and I indicated to him that when we were in a position to relocate all those residents which had been affected that we would make his case a priority case.

Mr. Speaker, I recall the next night, after speaking to him, I was watching the television news and there I saw an incident which I could not believe. Because shortly after speaking to him, just a few hours after speaking to him, his house actually collapsed and we had immediately to relocate, not only his house but 2 other houses in the immediate area.

Due to the shortage of house spots in this area and due to the fact that the last administration had not seen it possible at the time when the amendment to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act was made, and taking into consideration the problems which affect people in these areas, and seeing that they did not make adequate provision for available house spots, it is really necessary that we move swiftly in order to ensure that if there is a major catastrophe in the White Hill area and other areas in St Andrew and in St Joseph that are affected by land slippage that we would have the land available. 11.30 a.m.

We have been able, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate those exceptional cases in a few areas remaining in Apes Hill. We are somewhat surprised that land which in other areas had been acquired for housing purposes and would alleviate the type of shortage which I spoke to, Mr. Speaker, has been used for other purposes. The situation is indeed a very serious one. We have a case in the Apes Hill Development where land was actually acquired for the purposes of housing. Persons who have been affected not only by land slippage but by the type of disenfranchisement of which I spoke, and notwithstanding that one person who already had owned property elsewhere was allowed to purchase from the Government a substantial area, which would mean, Mr. Speaker, that when things like these happen that we are in a quandary as to where we could actually relocate persons who have been so affected.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that with this acquisition we would be able to resite most of the persons who have been affected by land slippage in that general area and most of the persons who have been disenfranchised as a result of the amendments made to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. It would not however be assumed, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to resite all the persons who have been affected in this one location and this is just one in a series of acquisitions which we will be bringing to Parliament to ensure that all persons who have been so affected can be relocated on safe ground.

Already we have been looking at lands at Lancaster, other lands at Apes Hill, lands at The Hope, and in general, marginal lands which are on the borders of existing villages.

It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to satisfy our manifesto pledge to ensure that suitable sites are found for persons who have been affected in these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St George North.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate to congratulate the Minister and to lend my support to this particular acquisition. I have gone, Mr. Speaker, to the White Hill area, and I have seen a number of households which were affected by land slippage.

Those of us who have gone there have recognised that land slippage and houses that are affected because of the sloping of land are indeed in a dangerous position. Where sometimes you go to sleep, Mr. Speaker, with your house intact and during the night you could wake up finding parts of your house down the gully or finding parts of your house all over the place.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, have complained that they have left their homes intact before going to work and come back finding the contents of their houses scattered all over the place. In today's society, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of hazardous things like earthquakes and all types of problems that are not man made and we have no control over these things.

I believe that people who are affected within the Scotland area should be properly protected and we, year after year, Mr. Speaker, have been speaking about these problems and we have not done anything about them. I am very happy that this Government has taken the initiative to do something for the people in the Scotland area and we have been at pains to point out that the Scotland area does not only refer to St. Andrew, St Petter, but those of us who know the area know -that it stretches from parts of St Philip right through St John and St Andrew.

But, more to the point these people who have been affected, Mr. Speaker, have been involved in agriculture all their lives. They have been involved in the rearing of sheep, cows, vegetables and fruits. Therefore, it is the intention of the Ministry to provide suitable accommodation so that these people would not be affected. Therefore, the decision was taken to provide an opportunity whereby the persons who were affected in the Scotland area, get enough land so that they could continue to grow their agriculture and get on with their task from day-to-day. Because, these people, as I have said before, rely to a large extent on agriculture as a means of support and this site, Mr. Speaker, will be used for this sort of thing.

I also want to make a few remarks on the use of land because I know that a number of us know that Members in here have been asking from time to time, about the use of land. I believe that the time has come for us to look at our policy as it refers to land use. We have to put land to its maximum potential.

Land is used for agriculture. Marginal land has been used all over the years for the rearing of sheep, cows and so on. But, today, we have a situation where a number of persons are not really involved in cattle rearing. There are many lands which are annexed to tenancies which we have to be looking at because it is of a marginal nature. We have to find homes for a number of people.

But, when you look at the Zone 1 area, Mr. Speaker, there are large areas around the water tanks and the wells which are used by the Barbados Water Authority and we consider that to be Zone 1. But there are lots of people who live in the Zone 1 area.

If you look at Zone 1 within the St. Michael's area you will find, for example, at the Belle and the Waterford areas, there are a number of people who have been living on the Zone 1 area for many years, perhaps even hundreds of years and they have not really affected the water supply because we have the purest water system in the world. 11.40a.m.

We have to resite a number of people in the Belle area and also in my constituency at Golden Ridge, Sweet Bottom and Ashbury. I am wondering if something cannot be done to protect those persons who cannot now obtain water. There are a number of people in the Belle area who cannot get water. There are a number of people in the Golden Ridge area who cannot get water. There are a number of people in Waterford area. There is a large tract of land at Waterford which is more suitable for housing but we cannot even dare to think to put any houses in the area.

Therefore, we have to study the implications of what we are going to do to help the persons who cannot obtain water and what system should be enforced. Because I believe that if a guy has been living on land for more than 5 years, at least, the Town Planning Department should say if you put in the correct system, the correct sewerage, either the filter bed system or special septic, tanks should be encouraged.

Here it is we have to remove in my constituency from the Zone 1 area more than 30 homes. These people were living there for more than 10 years but they cannot obtain water.

I am asking what can we do. I believe that the Town Planning Department, the Ministry of Agriculture and all the ministries that are involved in this process should carry out a study at this time. We need not only a study but we need to implement properly a system that will help.

All over the world, other countries use other systems. There are sewerage systems that are used in Jamaica that I am aware of. There are sewerage systems used in Canada and people live around these zones, Zone 1 or whatever.

I am calling for a system to be put in place where those persons who now live on the Zone 1 area would be asked to instal these systems and at the same time, bearing in mind that large tracts of land still exist in the Zone 1 which can be used for housing people, we have to study the use of this land.

In terms of housing, I believe the time has come for us to look at these settlements. I am talking specifically of Fanners. I do not think there is a playing field or recreational facility around Farmers but we have to insist that in all of these settlements that adequate recreational facilities should be put in place to help protect these settlements.

I want to support this Resolution and at the same time call for a land use policy to be in place and also for systems of study to be used and put in place for the Zone 1 area.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to start exactly where the Honourable Member for St. George North has ended. I want to point out first that Fanners happens to be a location where a playing field is situated at the present moment.

I want to warn this House once more about a dangerous trend that I am seeing developing in this country. I am seeing prime agricultural land being subdivided and all of a sudden prime agricultural land is marginal land. I want to know if this is the new policy of this Government and if so, I would like it to be put in Hansard today.

A couple weeks ago, Sir, we were at Constant. Today we are at Farmers. All that is happening in this country is that we are taking good agricultural land and we are dividing it up to sell off in house spots. The foolish belief that is given to this Assembly is that these lands are being divided up to sell to poor people.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that these house lots will get in the hands of poor people is if the Barbados Labour Party is prepared to adopt the policy I enunciated in this Assembly.

Let me repeat it again. I have said that if we are serious about giving land to poor people in this country what we need to do is take large land masses, put in roads, utilities and sell the poor people the lots at the cost of the land forgetting the essential services that you have put

into them. I will continue to repeat it in this Assembly and when they have decided to agree with me then I would accept that they have housing and land use policies. You cannot come in here every Tuesday and talk about dividing up good agricultural land and then talk about when we get an agricultural policy.

The agricultural policy should be in place.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member must be reminded that there are a number of persons who are affected because of the policy of a previous government. Hundreds of people are now put out and cannot find spots. We must find spots for people.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: I agree with the Honourable Member that a lot of people in this country have been affected because of the policy of the last government where they took away poor people's land and stopped poor people from renting their friend's land because of a policy that should have been done differently. If they could only listen for a while they would see that in 1981 when they passed that law they should really be doing exactly what they are calling for today and that is that Government should have taken up its own lands, put roads and utilities in it and those tenants who were affected should be transferred to the Government land.

I am opposed to any Government that is prepared to deprive poor people. Can you imagine, Sir, a poor woman in St. Lucy has a piece of land and she has 6 children. She allows 6 people to rent that land and then she is being told that she should sell that land to somebody else and her 6 children then have to go and look elsewhere to get a piece of land when Government has a lot of land elsewhere?

Sir, if Government is serious about giving poor people land, what it needs to do is to take its land, put in the necessary facilities that I am talking about and give it to poor people. Government should give away its own land, not the land of poor people because there is no way that they would go in Sandy Lane, Sunset Crest or any of those areas or on any lands that run next to the sea and divide it up as lots, but any piece of land that a poor person has and allows anybody to put their houses on, they feel that they have a right and some recourse to deprive those poor people.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that...

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am not interested in any Miss Lola. This is a serious debate and I am saying that the same way that rich people who own land on the coast, their land cannot be divided as lots for poor people, the

land situated in Checker Hall that belongs to an old lady who happens to be 94 and has 10 grandchildren, that land should not be taken away from her to give the Government.

When you are prepared to go to Sandy Lane to people there and Sunset Crest and Porters and Heron Bay and those areas... You know I have always spoken on behalf of the small man in this country. So don't believe that the First Lady is the first person that recognised that small people need to be represented. She has only come here and copied my style.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I was not here that time. I never heard you talk about the small man. I have never seen any Minutes where you have spoken about the small man.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that Farmers happens to be in St Thomas, Constant happens to be in St. George and now when will we be able to produce 75 000 tonnes of sugar as they were boasting about if we continue with this policy. 11.50a.m.

Constant will be destroyed for housing. I am glad, using your own terminology, the Honourable Member for St. George North said that land must have its maximum usage. I agree with you, yes. It is IADB talk and it is time we get back to Barbados and get policies that affect Barbados. All I am saying in here is that policies enunciated by the IADB and a whole group of you are following those policies without thinking about the small man in this country.

We get in here, Mr. Speaker, and talk about housing projects and how much money is being spent on housing in Barbados. You know what hurts, Sir? You pick up a newspaper and you hear there is growth in construction and it is the poor people who are suffering. When you drive through Barbados and you look at the houses that are being built, one house \$40 million, another \$20 million. All in Sandy Lane you can see construction but when I go into Rockfield, Checker Hall and those areas, I cannot see poor people building houses in this country and we are now a Government where we are only going to be looking after the interest of the rich. Am I to come in here every Tuesday and only hear about the rich, Mr. Speaker? Can I see any policy that could encourage me to support it on behalf of the small man? Am I to believe that we are only going to pay an interest in the small man now because the First Lady came down here and said that the interest of the small man should be looked after?

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You can talk about whoever is the First Lady but you tell the Press that then. If you are going to tell me that the First Lady happens to be Mrs. Arthur, tell the Press that. When they were writing that all over you did not question them. I am quoting from the newspaper.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to be serious in this country. If we are going to be speaking about housing and house lots we must be speaking about a policy where poor people feel they can approach their bank and can tell the bank: "Look, the true value of this land is \$40 000," but because the people whom we have supported over the years had a conscience - sometimes I wonder if this is what I see in this place - the people whom we have supported over the years realise there is hardship in this country and they have set a price on the value of the land that poor people can for once get land.

What we are having in this country, Sir, are large numbers of lots being subdivided and a small group of people buying these lots, then turning around and selling them all over again. The same people we are supposed to be protecting their interest are still out there going to National Housing every Thursday to be told to come back the following Thursday. If you are happy with that, Sir, I am not and I will continue to raise my voice in here against things like this because we cannot talk about how the reserves are up, how the total revenue of the country has increased, and at the same time the poor man in the street is suffering because in doing history I used to read about banana republics. If we continue in the trend we are going, Barbados will be the next. I state that today because I am seeing the evidence where "too few" are getting rich and the poor are suffering, let me tell you, more than ever.

I want to remind you, as a representative of the people in this country, you have a right to let your voice be heard. Do not mind the "too few" who feel they have received the last lot.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you referring to the Speaker?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Of course not. I know your heart is in the right place and you agree with every word I have said so far. But I know, Sir, you cannot speak in debates like this and you would like me to tell the Honourable Minister that it is time he implements my policy and make sure that the people in your constituency get their lots at only the price of the land and exclude the utilities.

Let me tell you why I have said this, Sir. I want to remind you of something. If we were to go into, let us say, the City and a decision was made to put in roads and utilities, *et cetera*, what people would say is you are doing these things for poor people. You hear that, Mr. Speaker? If we were to go into your constituency and there is a large lot "of land, and you have plenty poor people who needed house spots and they were to put in these facilities, somebody would argue that you have to sell the land at the same price with the utilities and everything involved as if you are going out there to sell it to some rich person.

What is wrong, Sir, with Government taking that large piece of land, putting in the necessary amenities and selling the people at only the cost of the land? They would have done it in the City. They would have done it in any other place. I am saying that instead of making people line up at National Housing every week and telling them come back next Thursday, to go into St George South, take up some good rab land and do not let anybody from St. George North trick you about marginal land because there is a plan afoot by the Barbados Labour Party to use marginal land to destroy Bulkeley. I have warned this Assembly already because when you start at Constant that is the beginning and the end for Bulkeley.

I have said already I have seen it happened at Warrens and now it is happening at Constant. Now they have gone to Farmers. I wonder, Sir, when they will come and tell me that Edgecumbe has marginal land and they need to give a piece for housing again. I am saying there is enough rab land in this country that we do not even have to touch marginal land for housing. We need to look at the rab land first, then we go to marginal and then we go to agricultural land.

What has happened in this country that we are now calling good agricultural land marginal land just because we want to serve certain purposes? I think, if I were allowed to say it, I would have to say it is a dishonest policy, but I am not allowed to say it, so I cannot say it, of any Government that can take good agriculture land and just because they want to implement a policy calling it marginal land.

Dealing with houses in a Zone 1 area, I have seen a situation where you have houses in a Zone 1 area and it is divided by a road and next to that is land that is not Zone 1. It is my opinion what Government should do to protect the water supply of this country and also to protect the people who are living in the Zone 1 areas is to allow Town and Country Planning Department the right to allow the sewage to pass under the road and go over to the other zones that are not in Zone 1 so that people can live on Zone 1 but their sewage would not necessarily affect the water system.

Let me give you an example. You cannot put a sewage plant every place. I know you would say put a sewage plant, but you cannot put one every place. At Porters in St. James where the sugar factory was, the owners had two portions of land. The factory was on Zone 1 and the other area was not Zone 1 but they could not run their sewage from one side to the other, and I am saying it is nonsense. The same way if the factory was on the other side they were able to do it, and the dividing factor was only a road, it should be done especially in areas where poor people are living because we need to make sure that poor people get the necessary facilities, like water.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, I agree because you were the Minister at that time but this is a different Government. They do not care about things like that. I am saying, Sir, we need to see those policies being put in place. It is time the same way it happened at St James Secondary School it can happen here again.

I am also saying, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to tackle the question of poverty in this country, the first thing we have to do is tackle the rights to land for poor people because that is one of the main problems.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, if you allow a poor man to get a house spot and he owns it, he has friends that will help him build a stone structure. 12.00 noon

I have already said in this Assembly that instead of taking up good agricultural land, there are many districts that can be expanded. You know what is cost saving about that, Sir. In many of these districts you have in water already and the telephone services; the roads are cut and all you need is to just extend these things. There is no need to go looking for new cost when all you have to do is add on the existing cost.

We find ourselves in a situation, where, every Tuesday we seem to be coming in here passing all sorts of resolutions, in the interest of people that we should not be representing. Those people know how to get you when they want you. It is true that my poor people in St Lucy need not fear because I carry a clear line and I answer my own phone, I do not hide from them but at the same time, I feel that if somebody can call Ministers to meetings, that the constituents should be able to call them to meetings and tell them look "We want some land and this is how we want it done and this is what time factor we want it done in".

Millionaires can brag about how they can have a project and how it takes them two and three months to get it through Town & Country Planning, when there are poor people in this country who are complaining that after six months they are still trying to get a plan through Town & Country Planning. I am not saying that Town & Country Planning does not have a lot of work but I am saying that these poor people need to have these same privileges.

We have to start paying attention to the poor in this country because the small man today will be somebody tomorrow and he will always be somebody because one thing he has intact is his integrity. I would say to this Assembly that if we pay more attention to the small man this country would go further but if we continue to build the banana republic that we are building, what we are going to have in this country is a group of people with all the money and as soon as we get a crisis like what we had in 1991, they will get on a plane and fly out of this country.

I am not knocking the rich because we have to find a way to tax their resources to get it down to the poor man but at the same time, all of our policies cannot be for the rich alone. We must look at the interest of the small man.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St James North.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, in his opening remarks, the Honourable Member for St Lucy was heard to indicate that it seems to be the policy of this Government to alienate land out of agriculture and in the process divert it to other purposes. In a heated contribution drawing deep from the intellectual wilderness which he calls his brain, the Honourable "Member for St. Lucy gave the impression that this so-called uncaring Government is more concerned with seeing agriculture perish at the expense of housing than anything else. Constantly repeating himself, he mentioned a place called Constant, in the fair parish of St George.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, this enlightened Government came to a conscious decision that there was a piece of diffused land at Constant, not productive, on which nothing happened for generations, which would have been ideal for the creation of house spots in the fair parish of St George.

The Honourable Member for St Lucy, who is given in the streets to informing the people of Barbados that this is a good Government but who in this House of Assembly, even when not joined by his colleagues, nor encouraged by them, comes in here to misrepresent the truth.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. One knows me well, Sir, the Honourable Member is

misleading the House and he knows that there is no way on any street that I would repeat anything like what he said, that this is a caring Government. I am consistent in everything I have said and if I said it on the street, I would say it in here and I have never said it in here.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did not get it right. I really wanted to say that the Honourable Member has two personalities. A personality on the street that commends him to be a full member of the human family and a personality on the Floor of this House which marks him out to be distinctly intellectually schizophrenic. This quiet young man from the parish of St. Lucy, whom I taught at Coleridge and Parry many years ago. The words 'to teach'¹ implies that the action was properly conveyed. The words to teach is very akin to aiming at and not necessarily succeeding in your aim. This Honourable Member whom I taught...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. What he really wants to tell the House is that the little knowledge that he has, was passed from my uncle to him.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, it is true that his uncle was a distinguished man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we proceed with the resolution, please.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I just want to let you know that in case what I say is to be commended to the record, that I was in fact taught by his uncle who was a distinguished teacher and from whom he learnt nothing.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, Sir. I do not know what is motivating the Honourable Member. He does not normally behave like that. I am really disappointed that the Honourable Member would even attempt to give the impression that he would disobey the Chair. The Honourable Member knows the rule, that when the Speaker is speaking that he is to keep quiet. I am giving him an opportunity by getting up on a point of order to calm down because he is not normally like that and I do not wish to see it.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, the particular portion of land that the Honourable Member for St. Andrew is asking this House to approve for purposes of housing development is an area with which I am entirely familiar.

Mr. Speaker, if you leave Portvale Factory and go 200 yards to the north, there is a road leading to the right called the Plum Tree Road for those of us who know it

very well. Up that road there used to be a gentleman called Mr. Gale, a former Newspaper Editor who used to live in the first house on the left hand, in a corner. The former leader of the D.L.P. used to have recreations there from time to time in that area as the Member for St. Michael South knows. Mr. Gale was Mr. Errol Barrow's close friend and Mr. Gale's family was extremely close to Mr. Barrow. Up that road, beyond Mr. Gale's house, Mr. Speaker, you come to a quarry, rocky and full of marl. Well, Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Member for St. Andrew is asking is for this Honourable House to allow land by the quarry, to be developed in housing, for poor people.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago, at die very Farmers, there was housing, and there were working class people living at Farmers as the Honourable Member for Christ Church West will tell you. Generations ago, the area had no light nor water and indeed people had to be moved from old Farmers and taken south to another place at Fanners immediately north of Dunscombe because they did not have the facilities.

As time would have it, the infrastructure around the area has developed. One of the first things that the Honourable Member for St. Andrew did was to place a beautiful road moving from Plum Tree right up to the Highway that leads across to Hurley. Indeed, a number of desirable inhabitants have moved close to that very area and the result is that the people recognise that the marginal land in the area has potential. Where this Government is trying to develop the housing project is below a new school that was built there and very close to where an original residential area was, which did not have any infrastructure, and where people had to move out from. 12.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting this Resolution but when one reflects, Mr. Speaker, on what words issued forth from the mouth of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in a debate in which his side has chosen so far to remain quiet and to remain humble, when one hears the Honourable Member for St Lucy try to castigate this Government on subdivision of land one wonders.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this country there is a placed called Rowans Park.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Again, Sir, the Honourable Member in his presentation I thought I heard him say in a debate in which his colleagues on the Other Side have remained silent.

Mr. Speaker, there was an opening speaker, there was a' seconder, then there was a speaker from this side. I think it would be casting an unfair aspersion to suggest that there was silence on this side.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, for the 2% years during which this administration has been in office there has been no wholesale, lock, stock and barrel policy of alienating sizeable chunks of land out of agriculture for non-agricultural purposes. There is no wholesale policy, Mr. Speaker, by which this Government is taking land out of agriculture and putting it in housing as the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is trying to say. The Honourable Member should tell this House if he is going to talk about the alienation of lands, which Government it was that took the lands at Rowans Park out of agriculture and what price did the purchaser of that land get that land for? Let the Honourable Member also tell us about who it was and which party that alienated Bagatelle Estate, Neils, Sandford, Frere Pilgrim, Norwoods, The Hope, Warrens and the Honourable Member will tell us that we are not alienating Sandy Lane. Recently a piece of agricultural land between Norwoods and Sandy Lane was the subject of an application for subdivision and the advice and the policy was that since it was distinctly agricultural it had no right being alienated out of agriculture.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy must choose the time and the occasion on which to make his speeches. There are Honourable Members on that side who decide when to speak, they usually speak some sense but the Honourable Member for St. Lucy more guided by enthusiasm and exuberance than by common sense jumps up and embarrasses the Honourable House, including his colleagues indicating that this Resolution is going to fundamentally undermine agriculture and giving the impression that we are, as a Government, refusing to be able to uphold agriculture...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir.

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

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading this House once more. He said, Sir, that I am embarrassing my comrades but when he spoke, Sir, about the development of Warrens, every head on the Front Bench went down because they knew it was the Barbados Labour Party that approved the commercial development at Warrens and the housing developing.

Mr. SPEAKER: How is that a point of order?

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Finally, Mr. Speaker, the position is this. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy abrogated to himself some role as being champion of the so-called poor saying that we, on this side, are doing little for the poor. If one looks at the Resolution itself before this House right now, these lots are intended for the poor. I cannot see the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, bearing in mind the policy which is influencing this decision to bring this Resolution here, Mr. Speaker, indicating that he is going to be acquiring land for the rich. This is going to be land for working class type people.

Mr. Speaker, the point has to be made. Mr. Speaker, I have a right to be heard in silence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! Please!

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: The Member for St. John who has a right to be able to get up and say what he wants to say should not be disturbing me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, Sir, finally the point is this. It must be said in this Honourable House.

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute, please. The Honourable Member for St. John, you will get your opportunity to speak.

Could you proceed please?

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is the hard fact of the situation. The National Housing Corporation can give information, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that they have in excess of 20 000 applications for low cost housing and for house spots, in a situation where Barbados is by its very size limited in land space, in a situation Mr. Speaker, where the high population of Barbados and the land space taken together will naturally put pressure on existing resources.

This Resolution has been brought out of the need, Mr. Speaker, to provide housing and house spots. Ask Honourable Members on that side how many house spots they provided between 1986 and 1994. Ask Honourable Members on that side how many NHC style houses they set up apart from the one at Church Village, St. Philip between 1986 and 1994. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy clearly was misleading the House in his contribution. He really wanted to make the point that he is interested in seeing poor people get through but made it very badly.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. James North were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, the point is this. I feel that in a situation where there is a prior need for housing, where there is a situation where there is a prior need for house spots, this Resolution is in order, it is to be commended and all of the red herrings that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy threw across the trail must be rejected. I have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in supporting it. Thank you very much.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a very brief intervention by way of warning. I have listened to the Honourable Member for St. George North on this issue of zoning in relation to housing. I want to say this, Sir, that it is important that this House clearly understands that a very fundamental aspect of any housing development must relate to the protection of the environment of Barbados, Barbados¹ water zoning has been determined by the most extensive geological and hydrological studies which have resulted in the present zones. 12.20 p.m.

Every once in a while, some maverick comes along with some abstruse new notions of hydrology and of water purification and advances some kind of theory which would allow housing on Zone 1 land. It is a very dangerous thesis. We have a coral filtration structure in Barbados and all it would take is for a significant earth tremor or a small earthquake to crack that coral and then Barbados can be faced with a major epidemic. It is something that must be guarded and it must be protected.

Now, Sir, we have seen sometime ago these kinds of theories advocated in this Honourable House and that resulted in a statutory instrument in 1983, being laid in this Parliament subject to negative resolution. And what was not noticed was that as a result of that statutory instrument large numbers of people were placed in Zone 1 land in the Belle area, and subsequent to that there were all sorts of problems arising in that area. I can only say that I would be guided by hydrological and geological studies. I am fully aware of the public health implications of violating the principles established by sound scientific analysis in relation to the use of Zone 1 land and this is something that cannot be violated either because of the pressures of housing, or because somebody comes up with some cockeyed theory as to how you can dispose of sewage with high density housing in Zone 1. Because I say that all it takes in Barbados and all it would take is an earth tremor of sufficient size to crack the coral under such a housing development and then all the sewage will be going down into the water that we will all be drinking the next day.

There are good scientific reasons, because of the nature of our water supply, nor can you compare this with other Caribbean territories. In Jamaica for example, most of the water supply comes from rivers and therefore you can have the kind of arrangement which the Honourable Member for St. George North talked about. In other countries it all depends on the source of your water, but in Barbados it is a special circumstance where our water comes from coral filtration going through and sitting under there. Coral that can be easily cracked simply by movements in the earth and it is limited only to one side of the island. But as you know Barbados is a country which is made up of two geological structures, coral on this side and over on the east coast is a completely different geological structure in the Scotland area.

So that let it be clear that this House must not be persuaded by arguments which are not rooted in scientific analysis and scientific study in relation to the use of Zone 1 land which in my judgement must remain protected if we are going to protect the health of future generations. It is the kind of activity that could easily undermine the economy of Barbados if our water supply should become contaminated as a result of unwise placement of housing in too large a density on Zone 1 land.

Sir, we have had this problem. There is still the risk in Barbados at the moment in relation to the Belle. That risk still exists. We have had the problem at Trents. If Members may recall that there was an error or something happened where there was a redefining of the boundaries of Zone 1 in the Trents area in St. James and although it was only one toilet bathroom that was sited from one school that was sited on Zone 1, the reality is that hundreds of children use those toilets every day.

I am not quite sure whether the toilets have been resiled or not but that was a problem that arose some-years ago and to get around that, some smart Alex went and redrew the line so that the toilets would appear to have been in Zone 2, but that is a very dangerous practice.

I do not wish to comment today on housing policy or agriculture policy and so on. I just want to focus on that 1 point and I will hope that the Minister of Housing would understand very clearly that there are serious dangers in the policies which he advocated in this House earlier today in relation to the use of Zone 1 land.

We do not get earthquakes every day, maybe every 50 years. We do not get large earth tremors every day, maybe every 50 years. But, it will happen and when it happens you have a problem.

If you go up in St George, Sir, in the area of Freehill, I know that area very well, just above

Woikmans where the pulverization plant was placed, I know that well because my great-grandfather owned the area. Now, if you look at the quarry next to the pulverization plant, you will see huge cracks in the coral. I could remember as a boy, when those cracks occurred. They occurred as a result of an earth tremor here in Barbados and the cracks just opened up. Luckily the way the land slopes at the pulverization plant, it is very likely that any leakage or slippage will go toward Middleton, the upper part of Woikmans rather than come across the area where the crack is. As a matter of fact Sir, my maiden speech in this Honourable House in June 1978 dealt with this particular issue and I have been disappointed over the years in seeing again and again these arguments surfacing in relation to the use of Zone 1. So I think that the policy must be the full protection of Zone 1 and look for other areas in which to put housing.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, but I believe that there were a couple of points raised in this debate which may merit our intervention.

The Honourable Member for St. Andrew is obviously caught between the very difficult position of being restrained in his introduction of matters of this sort on the one hand or being exuberant on the other.

If he were to go for exuberance, he would face precisely the problem which the Honourable Member for St. James faces in this debate and to some extent the Honourable Member for St. George North. I say that because one of the myths which has grown up in this society about the impact of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act was that it was one of the amendments which the Democratic Labour Party introduced which created problems. We on this side have already challenged the Barbados Labour Party Government to recognise and admit that in the first case it was the passage of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act which created a shift, particularly in attitude by landlords about renting their land to people. A crush then developed on the National Housing Corporation and, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is well known that throughout Barbados there were a large number of people who had lots of land, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and they would not allow new tenants. That is what I am talking about, not the 1965 Tenantry Control and Development Act.

I am familiar with the whole issue of the debate. That is why I do not have to get up sanctimoniously, like certain people in here and pretend that there was any major social

revolution occasion by allowing people to buy land which their ancestors had been living on for decades before them without giving them the opportunity to own any of the economic resources around that land. 12.30 p.m.

I make that point all the time. In every single tenantry in St. John, including Society Tenantry and the Honourable Member for Christ Church West who is in his seat mouthing off should know something about this because he owns more land in Society - and he was never a tenant - than any of the people who live in the tenantry. So they have lived for centuries through their families in a tenantry and have no relationship to the economic resource around them and somebody can come from outside and own more land than they have ever or will ever own.

I do not let all of that sanctimonious nonsense by the Barbados Labour Party stalwarts and Neanderthals, some of whom may still grace these portals, influence my view.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Sir, I cannot believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that there are Neanderthals in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you like to withdraw those words?

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I did not know that a Neanderthal in the Barbados Labour Party was supposed to be a criticism. I assume that we all have Neanderthals who grace...

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Sir, I think I may have to agree with the point being made by the Leader of the House.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South is not philosophically a Neanderthal but by age he claims to be the father of Parliament. So he has more seniority than the Neanderthals in the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. George North has to understand that the original crush and demand on Government came when the Act was first passed, and subsequently, when people refused to rent new house spots to tenants of the people who come to me in my constituency for house spots are people who cannot qualify.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the records in the Ministry of Housing reveal that since the 1990 Act which actually came into force in 1995, because there is a 5-year grace period, shows that 5 years after 1990 a number of landlords started to put a

number of tenants in court. The records show that a lot of them are now affected and people are now being thrown off their lots on a daily basis.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, that is not the only problem and nobody has denied that that is an issue. The Act places a responsibility on the Government to find those lots. In my constituency I have not yet come across one single constituent who has been affected by that because those tenancies are plantation tenancies and therefore they had already qualified.

What we had was a crush of people in those constituencies who needed to find lots to place new houses on them and they cannot find those lots in St. Michael and Christ Church and St. George in the smaller tenancies because the owners of those smaller tenancies from as far back as the 1980s made a conscious decision, sometimes because they could not understand the legislation but, in many cases, because they did not want to be affected by the legislation, not to make their land available to new tenants for housing. Accept that fact and move on from there!

The original problem was created by the 1980 Act. We did not solve that problem by making enough lots available to solve the crush which was placed on the National Housing Corporation to deal with those persons who now wanted to get house spots, the children of qualified tenants, the grandchildren of qualified tenants.

It is that second wave of persons who the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West has raised concerns about in relation to Government units. What is going to happen to the 4 or 5 children of a lady who has a Government unit in the Farm and die Pine and Colleton St. John? Where are those new opportunities being created?

The Barbados Labour Party is also having to solve the problem that it created in the 1980s by not understanding the impact of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. So I do not get carried away as I say by those who thump their chests with glee, having permitted persons who could not be moved anyway, because of legislation the Democratic Labour Party passed, to own land on which their ancestors had been living for 2 centuries or more in many cases with no other social engineering to create sufficient opportunities for their children or for them to have access to resources near to them.

The Honourable Members confusion is understandable.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I really want an explanation. I am a bit confused

because the 1980 Act says 2 constitute a tenantry. The amendment says 5. Once you are more than 2 you are thrown off the lot.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The point is that the Act stopped people from making new lots available. Large numbers of landlords said they are not renting out their land to anybody because they do not know what will happen.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Thank you. I am glad you say that is a fact. There are some people on that side who want to blind people with a lot of foolishness about social engineering and not seeing the implications of that policy.

I am going to go further. Anybody who takes up the Hansard and reads the debates in 1980 when the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act was passed would discover that the then Minister of Housing who is now a talk show host among other things - platform setter up, microphone tester, did not understand the impact of that Act. He limited his discussion of the Act to plantation tenancies and I got the impression reading the debate that there were many members in the Barbados Labour Party who did not grasp the full implications of the Act outside of the plantation tenancies. There are members of the Barbados Labour Party who admitted that they fully understood what impact that legislation would have had on small tenancies in the St. Michael suburbia, Christ Church and other areas, There may be some who said they understood it but a lot of them did not fully appreciate the impact of that legislation in their moments of honesty.

The Honourable Member for St. George North said he is a bit confused and I know he will remain confused since his vote of thanks the other night in which he thanked the Honourable Member for St Michael East for delivering the Grantley Adams lecture and when corrected he reiterated his thanks to the Honourable Member for St. Michael East for delivering the Barbados Labour Party's Grantley Adams lecture. 12.40 p.m.

The last point...

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: No, I could not go. You know I would have liked to have gone.

One very minor point, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for St James North waxed very warm on this issue of taking agricultural land out of agricultural production for housing purposes. Before demitting

office, the Democratic Labour Party Cabinet came to a very firm policy decision in relation to land use in Barbados. In fact, so inflexible was it that I was then battling with how one would have implemented that policy while, at the same time, agreeing to the IADB conditionalities in relation to land use policy. But the Cabinet agreed that land would be zoned in Barbados very clearly and that there would be no departure from the zoning. That is very necessary, Mr. Speaker, in the context of increasing the tonnage in the sugar industry and carrying out other aspects of Government's economic programme.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is only asking relevant questions and does not have to be met with that kind of odium and contempt which was heaped on him by the Honourable Member for St. James North.

Aside.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: But you called yourself a Neanderthal. You do not use the word but the way in which you speak we all know that is what you are. I only provide the word for you so you can now identify yourself more clearly.

The Honourable Member for St. James North was out of place because if the Minister does not adequately explain what the acquisition is about and the Honourable Member for St. Lucy merely gets up to get some explanations about the land, where it is located, what is the purpose of the acquisition *et cetera*, then those questions are fair. I am saying that Cabinet Ministers on that side who introduce Resolutions of this sort have a duty to answer those questions. We are not begging for anything.

The Honourable Member for St. James North did not do anybody in here any favour. I wish he could provide some sugar for the consumers in this country instead of getting all hot and sweaty over a matter as small and as uncomplicated as a land acquisition in St. Thomas. That is what I would like him to focus his boundless and unbridled energy on at this time instead of focussing his attention on the very legitimate and worthwhile questions which were put to him by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy acting in good faith on behalf of his constituents, on behalf of the poor people of Barbados and on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party. To be met with that kind of response, Mr. Speaker, was not befitting of the quality of the debate which we have become accustomed to from the Honourable Member for St. James North. We know there are weighty things on his mind. I hope he can pay some attention to them and move on from this point.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have reluctantly to intervene in this debate to answer some of the implications of the speech of the Honourable Member for St. John. He has the habit, Sir, of referring to people in pejorative terms and to Honourable Members in this House thinking that would immediately either knock them out of the debate or, indeed, provoke a response in similar terms.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. In case the Honourable Member for Christ Church West is upset, I suggest he gets a copy of the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary and looks up the meaning of the word "Neanderthal." He should not have any problem with that word. I have heard worst things said about him, and not by me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. You have made your point of order, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is the Honourable Member's point of order. It really surprised me that he obviously did not understand the proper use of the word "Neanderthal" because really it refers to somebody who is, if he were speaking figuratively, primitive, uncivilized, uncouth, reactionary, extremely conservative. Now, that is the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary.

When the Honourable Member for St. Michael South rose to his feet to deny that he was any of these things, I understood his position quite clearly. He is a modern study expert like myself. He had the good fortune to win a Barbados Scholarship in the knowledge of the English Language and English Literature so we would have expected the Honourable Member to have used his words more correctly and really to understand what he was talking about rather than using pejorative language that is a little bit beyond him. One has to understand this with him.

Sir, whenever we debate in here a land acquisition, we hear different interpretations of the history of land ownership, land tenure and particularly land tenure in so far as it relates to tenancies. I have had the good fortune of being in this House long enough to have seen almost all the relevant legislation, although, let me confess, that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South probably knows the history even better than I do because he was in here when events of the 60s forced us to bring legislation in the House to modify the Security of Tenure Act of 1955.

Now, Sir, the Democratic Labour Party was formed, I believe, about 1955 but at that time Sir Grantley Adams had already brought into the House the Security of Tenure Act, passed in 1955 to give some security of tenure

to people who had house spots and did not own the house lots and were being ejected. We tried to put into law to make it obligatory to give them a certain period of notice and there had to be reasons stated for removing those persons. For instance, that you did not pay your rent, or that you were subletting the house for a house without permission.

As early as 1955 we were dealing with the issue and we extended it further to agricultural tenancies because small owners found themselves growing canes and then particularly plantation owners were in the habit of giving them short notice without paying them adequate reparations for their crops and growing trees, *et cetera*. That is the way the legislation started.

That legislation, however, did not answer all the problems. New problems came on the scene particularly in urban tenancies. I recall particularly the tenancies at Eagle Hall, Bosvigo, one recalls that. People would wake up and find their house at the side of the road. Halls Road was another area. As a result the then Democratic Labour Party Government, led by the then Mr. Errol Barrow, and assisted by the Hon. Erskine Ward and Hilton Vaughan passed the Tenancies Control Act of 1965. That Act was brought into this House and the purpose was that if there were 5 or more lots it was a tenancy. Once the person was complying and paying the house rent and not breaching the terms you could not remove those persons at all. Under 5 or more, however, and less than 5, you could remove them, so that problem was not solved.

The reason why that problem was not solved was there was a feeling then that there were some small landowners who did not want to remove people because their children wanted house spots, the problem continued particularly in urban Barbados and suburban Barbados that those poor people now found themselves being at the side of the road. That is the history of the matter. I do not know why the Honourable Member talked about being sanctimonious. You either know the history or you do not.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and people must represent the facts correctly. The constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, which was then represented by Mr. George Fergusson - and the Honourable Member for St. Michael West has to listen to this too. He knows this, Sir, that constituency found itself with a large number of people being thrown off house spots, that was one of the areas of tremendous concern for some of us. 12.50 p.m.

Sir, I do not know about the Honourable Member, but when I came into the House in 1971, I was representing a constituency that is made up of a series of suburban

tenancies, some of which are 5 or more, many of which are 4 or less, joining the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Michael South and places like Lynch Gap, Kings Village, Dayrells Roads and going further up the hill up in Reece Road - we had those problems.

You see, Sir, these people that are not Neanderthal, who are later day green around their ears and lacking in their heads, do not understand these things. They believe that leadership arises today and they have not gone through the process of growing up properly before they find themselves in position and they come in here and tell you that you are sanctimonious. They must learn the history of the position.

Those of us who were in here like the Honourable Member who came in the Senate in 1967, found ourselves having to provide house spots for people who were still being thrown off their land. So the Government took an approach to do two things, one was to make sure that the plantation tenants whose foreparents had lived on the land for ever and ever had the right to purchase.

I do not think that any of us could quarrel about that legislation. A bit of legislation that was passed in 1980 that gave you the right to buy your land for 10 cents per square foot that you still by 1996, could buy it for 10 cents per square foot and that allowed so many of our citizens, deservingly, to improve their living condition, can on any objective analysis, be described as radical and proper social engineering.

If the Honourable Member seeks to lead the Democratic Labour Party and cannot analyse that legislation in that way, he deserves not to be leading the Labour Party at all, sorry, the Democratic Labour Party. He must understand that, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member needs to make it clear because he was talking so fast, he said that I had a desire to lead the Labour Party. It was you who had the desire to lead them and be successful and you failed. I have never had any desire to lead the Labour Party.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I mean the Democratic Labour Party. Not only has the Honourable Member failed but if he does not look out he soon will not be where he is. He knows that.

Anyway, let me take him back, I will take him back to the history of the tenancies in Barbados, Sir. Part of the difficulties we had was this. The difficulty with the 1965 legislation was that the landlord could not remove you and you could not buy the spot, so there was a stalemate.

People could not improve their living conditions by adding toilet and baths and improving their house and at the same time they could not be removed.

One of the things that the 1980 legislation sought to do was to answer that problem to give them the right to purchase. There was no difficulty in relation to the plantation tenancies. The difficulty in relation to the urban tenancy was that you could not put a price of 10 cents per square foot in the legislation without offending the Constitution. The idea was that the Government would bring down a credit housing scheme to make their facilities available. If the Honourable Member look at the debate at the time, we also recognised that where there were 4 or less, we thought there was nothing wrong in giving that person the option to purchase as well.

Sir, the Democratic Labour Party in the 1986 election held on to what they thought was a called-in programme reaction and opposed that sort of legislation and said that it would amend the Act and it did amend the Act. It amended the Act because they said there were less than 30 000 people affected and it gave the Government of the day five years to provide alternative spots for those people to come forward and seek compensation.

You have got to understand Barbadians, a lot of them never even bothered to give notice to the Ministry of Housing about their conditions. Some of them have not claimed compensation and one has to help these people because they hear that there is a piece of legislation there and they have not taken the opportunity to read it and in many cases, we the politicians have not gone around and helped them and the Government recognises its obligations to provide house spots for those persons.

I do not know about other Members but I still have a large number of people in my constituency who are waiting to get alternative spots under that legislation. They do not want the money, they want the alternative spot.

The problem is, Sir, that in areas like Christ Church, where I am, and in St. Michael South, there is no land to be acquired. We are very heavily populated so we have to go outside to find those house spots but in the meantime, it is a problem that we have to deal with. There is no point in talking about mistakes, we have to learn that as these problems come up we have to find solutions to them.

Sir, I have no difficulty with the Government acquiring marginal land, such as I am assured by the Minister that this land is, to provide those house spots for people like the people in White Hill and elsewhere who need this type of land. I am well satisfied that because of the problems in White Hill Tenantry one has to move those

people and I am well satisfied that Government will have to continue to find house spots for those suburban and urban tenants who cannot at the moment find those house spots.

Unfortunately, the Honourable Member in his exuberance mentioned Society Tenantry. Let me talk a bit about it. We have not seen the Honourable Member there recently. The only time that we see him is when he comes for pudding and souse on Saturday, that is what he wants me to put in the debate, so I put it in the debate for him, Sir.

The position is this, the Society Tenantry is owned by the Codrington Trust and I believe that the Honourable Member would know that we have been trying to convey those lots to the people as soon as they want to. It is in a Zone 1 area but the legislation allows those of us who are in the Zone 1 area to remain in Zone 1 area but not to extend further than we have. 1.00p.m.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Society Tenantry is in need urgently of proper road systems. I always say that the late Right Honourable Enrol Barrow is one of the luckiest people that has ever come into this House, because if you take his constituency when he died his constituency was one of the most undeveloped constituencies in terms of utilities. Even after he had been in this House for close to 30 years and Prime Minister for some 15 or 16 years. I want to repeat it, Sir. He is "one of the luckiest people because the parish of St John which voted consistently for him was one of the most undeveloped areas in terms of utilities and Society where I live, the village of Society is one of those examples.

I have no difficulty...

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He does not live in Society Village. Where he lives is a paved road from the main road straight into his house. It is the tenantry. That is why he does not see me. It is the tenantry which does not have Toads and proper utilities. The Honourable Member does not live in any tenantry. He lives in Society Plantation house overlooking the sea on the cliff on acres and acres of land. I am not allowing this foolishness to go on inside here.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not use the word, Sir. The member gets up with his sanctimonious lack

of knowledge and ignorance. He does not even know the border of where is Society. His statement only shows he does not understand. I wonder if he has ever taken up a plan of the area. He had a St. John Development Plan so he says. He has obviously left it out, Sir, because the Honourable Member should know the difference between the plantations and where they end. Firstly I do not live in a plantation house. For the Honourable Members benefit, Sir, I will teach him about his constituency. Society plantation house is next to Lodge School when you pass the gap going into Lodge School on the left that is Society plantation house. I do not own it. It is owned by the Church. You mean to say you do not even know your constituents. The Honourable Member obviously feels he has no chance of getting a vote in my house. He does not come down there, Sir, so I do not expect him to know.

Secondly, Sir, die Honourable Member should know that the last time the piece of road he talks about got repaired was when the former Lord Bishop, Drexel Gomez approached the then Government in order to fix the pot holes in the road that lead to Holy Cross Church, not to my house. I had to let him know that, Sir. It is now in a bad state of repair, Sir, and I am asking the member as one of his constituents to do something about it because I have seen no letter *from* him.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not fixing the church's road nor asking for it to be fixed until the people who have their toes stubbed and cannot get water mains in the tenancies, get a road first. The road which the Honourable Member is talking about is not Society tenantry road. There is a road running parallel to that which is the actual Society tenantry road. When that is fixed I will call for the church's road, the school's road and the Honourable Member's road to be fixed but not until the people living in the tenantry can get roads and proper facilities.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I will teU all of the tenants who live in that road, he does not understand that there are tenants in the road. He does not understand that there are small tenants in die road some of whom have not yet been able to convert their houses. I will tell them that he says he is doing nothing for diem. I will do it for them, Sir.

I want to finish the statement about Society's tenantry because the Honourable Member has written no letter on behalf of anybody in Society or Society tenantry in order to get die facilities up there fixed and I am appealing to him to do his job as die parliamentary representative for the area.

The Honourable Member says and I have to put diis because while I may not want to talk about myself in die

House, I have to reply to diis, that I own more land in Society dian die tenants own in Society. The Honourable Member should know that unlike other persons Society is in Zone 1 and whatever lands you own you can have one house on it and that is what I have on it. But in addition to that, without charge I make my facilities available for the use of the Society private school so that they can use the open area next to the school and to the church as a Christian person. I do not come in here like the Honourable Member in order to attack people about their personal achievements or lack of achievement. Christianity calls for him to be a little bit more humble and understanding. You cannot be a leader unless you learn humility and die Honourable Member displays the sort of behaviour that shows he has no humility. That is a quality I hope he will acquire as time goes on. On that note, Sir, I support this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Sir HAROLD St JOHN: I rise to establish my right to speak.

SUSPENSION

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move diat tiis sitting be suspended until 2.00 o'clock diis afternoon.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I beg to second diat.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 1.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. The Honourable Member for Christ Church South.

Sir HAROLD St JOHN: I just wish to place the record in proper perspective having regard to the speech made by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and I wish to continue from where the Honourable Member for Christ Church West finished. And I will say that as a result of die legislation passed in die early 1980s, with respect to the option granted to tenants to purchase the freehold, tiat we have seen a very tremendous increase in the quality of the housing among those people, who were the primary beneficiaries of that legislation. That is one of die reasons why I must express my disagreement with die conclusions of die Honourable Member for St John witii respect to the impact of diat legislation.

My latest information is that nearly 6 000 people in Barbados have acquired titles to their freehold lots. I want to repeat it, nearly 6 000 people.

One only has to look at tenantries over Barbados and see there are a large number of quite sizeable houses that have been erected. I myself not so long ago had the opportunity now that the canes have been cut to look at the housing in the tenantries in Brighton, in St. George and in the tenantries in the St. Judes, Todds area and one sees the large number of tenantries housing of a wall structural type.

So that whatever one may say about that legislation one has to conceive that a large number of people have had access to house lots at a reasonable price and they have taken advantage of the benefit of that legislation. I think it could also be recognised that there was another aspect to that legislation which related to tenantries as defined by five or more tenants but which were not tenantries which were scheduled to the Act. That covered all of the other tenantries in Barbados whether in the urban area or in the rural area.

Now, with respect to that legislation the right was granted to purchase the land but on different terms and conditions. That is a tenantry that remains a tenantry with the tenants having the right to purchase at a price which reflected the current market value at the time, less a deduction for facilities and amenities which had been paid for the public purchase.

There was another exception to that, that the Town Planner could certify a tenantry to be not fit for development as a tenantry and I want to say, Sir, that it was always the understanding that among the reasons that the Town Planner could issue such an order was that the tenantry was a small tenantry and the land was needed for the owner himself and his immediate family.

This is a point that has been argued in here on more than one occasion. Perhaps the legislation was defective in that it granted the power to the Town Planner and it should have granted the power to someone who was ministerially responsible. That part of the law also contemplated that a fund would have been created to facilitate access to capital by the tenants at reasonable rates of interest and that would have gone a long way to permit the true development of tenantries.

As we all know, Sir, if there is one area of neglect that we have in Barbados it is this area. For we have the most ignoramus situations in our country in which Banks prefer to give access by way of lending for people to borrow money from them for motor cars than to lend them long term money for housing.

It is a remarkable thing. I believe that recently I saw a statistic in which it is said that last year \$66 million was lent out on the purchase of cars and that certainly can never be matched by the amount that was lent out for the purchases of houses. I believe in our best years a maximum of \$30 million was lent out for the financing of housing and only after a determined effort was made by the Cabinet, by way of authority given to the Minister of Finance at that time to summon a meeting of all the Banks in Barbados at the Hilton Hotel in which they were told that we regard it as their fundamental duty to lend money for housing.

We had to have meetings after meetings in which we received nothing but obstruction from several lawyers too, who said that it was a waste of their time to do an investigation of title for a transaction which was only \$20 000 and the same time could have been spent for one that was \$1 000 000 and they would get a lot more fees.

All of that went along. That was systematic of the attitude in society towards dealing and tackling this important question of housing which needs a combination of efforts on the part of a number of institutions. It is not only making land available. You have to make money available on such terms and conditions that people very early in their lives can feel confident that they can undertake a mortgage over a reasonable period of time.

So that, Sir, it is a very, very important point that we have recognised that with the demand we have for housing in Barbados, we need to come up to a new policy in relation to it. I am one of those who believe that in the urban areas of Barbados it is impossible to satisfy all of the demands for everybody to have an individual house spot. I have seen that near the sea coast in my constituency. And however you try to tell people that we have to go up because there just is not enough land available and prices are now going in the vicinity of \$10.00, \$15.00 and \$20.00 a foot because there is a shortage of land, similarly in the urban areas.

I sympathize with the Honourable Member for St. Andrew. I have been around in politics for 30-odd years and I remember many debates in and out of this House of Assembly about the Scotland area. I remember, Sir Frank Walcott saying that if Barbados is not careful, the Scotland area is going to break the whole of Barbados because the demand for money to deal with the problems in the Scotland area is far beyond the resources of Barbados.

It is a fact of life that many times in our period of Cabinet the Scotland area was discussed and various views were expressed. Some of a most extreme nature and it was decided that the best thing to do was to migrate all

the people from there and put them somewhere else. Or, that you decide to carry out a careful analysis of particularly the flatter areas, down by Belleplaine, and you intensively develop that. Belleplaine, Shorey, and those areas like White Hill, Turners Hall and like Hillaby, that you remove some of those people. 2.15 p.m.

I remember also that this is not a new phenomenon. There was land slippage and whole villages had to be removed. There is a housing area just outside Bagatelle that was specifically developed during the time of Joy Edwards to facilitate the movement of these. It is a matter that we have to deal with and we cannot postpone it. It is happening all around.

That is why, Sir, I found it very strange that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy should have spoken in the vein in which he has spoken. Because it is not true to say, having regard to the record of the Labour Party, that the Barbados Labour Party has not made a conscious effort, which has been successful to a large extent, to improve the lot of working people as far as housing is concerned. It is not true. The record does not bear it out.

The last point that I would make is this question of land use. This has been the subject of tremendous debate in here for many years and naturally it will always be because Barbados only has 90 000 acres of land as far as I understand it. We have a lot of competing users and needs for that land.

In the present vein in Barbados people make no decisions, they only palm off decision making to the reports of consultants. I believe you will see in yesterday's paper that a series of meetings are going to take place now - no doubt chaired by consultants who have been appointed pursuant to some agreement to - and one of the topics that is going to be the subject of these meetings is the need for a new land use policy in Barbados.

I would really like to see that all Honourable Members in here have the opportunity of meeting with these people. I am not going to any Queen's Park Shed to give my views. I feel that this is of sufficient importance to Barbados that should this House be respected as an institution, we should have the opportunity in these Chambers to have a meeting so that we can express our views. Particularly if we had a committee system working we could summon them here and they would have to come because you have the power if they do not come to deal with it.

My position is that we would like to have a proper statistical base for some of our accounts. I believe that

more agricultural land was subdivided between 1966 and 1976 than at any time between 1976 and 1996. All of those years.

Secondly, I believe that the question of the water zone is something in which there should be no division. I have never heard anybody advocate that we should break the original rules that we are supposed to have that the Zone 1 rules should be rigorously applied. We have to recognise that that is a fundamental environmental decision that is for the benefit of all Barbadians not for the benefit of any political parties.

The last area, of course, with respect to land use is the area with respect to the impact, which is one I constantly mention, of the new highways in Barbados. It is not only the ABC and Highway 2A. It is also what is known as the cement road, the road from Greenland to Checker Hall.

I remember that when that road was built it was recognised that it would be providing access to hill side land which was poor agricultural land, particularly the Fairfield Estate. Mount Gay, I think, was at the corner. I remember then the head of the CDB saying very clearly that they felt happy to finance a part of that road because they were convinced from their own studies that land which was not of a marginal nature, indeed rock stone land, would be available for housing. So with the problems that you had with the slippages in the St. Andrew and St Joseph areas you would have reasonable alternative sites to put those people on which was accessible to the east coast.

We need to do an assessment of that because I am sure that there is land available there which would prevent a trespass taking place on the good agricultural land.

That is why I feel very confident that a proper review of our land use policy can take place without departing from some of the fundamental ideas that we have had and held sacrosanct for many years in this country.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate on this Resolution I would like to give Members of this House the assurance that this land is not located in the Zone 1 areas as has been insinuated by 1 or 2 members on the Other Side.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. Nobody on this side mentioned anything about this land being in a Zone 1 area. I would not like the record to show that members of this side said that this land is on Zone 1 area.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to state that it is not land which has been used for

sugar cane production. I know the land well and to my recollection no sugar cane has been planted in that particular area for over 15 years. Even if the land had been land which had been utilised for sugar production or other agricultural purposes one would still have to take into consideration the plight of those persons in White Hill who have been losing their houses for some time now as a result of land slippage in the area.

The type of houses that were built in White Hill a number of years ago when persons first moved in that area is not the same type of houses that you will find there now. In the earlier days you had houses with pit toilets. Today we have houses with water borne systems. We even have situations where people have certain different levels as a result of the terrain. This has certainly contributed to land slippage in the area. I do not think that one could legislate in a way which would stop people, rather one should not bring the type of legislation which would stop people from improving their houses.

As a result of this, Mr. Speaker, and also as a result of the fact that we have had the amendments to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act which has placed greater strain on the Government. No one is being critical of the Opposition for the amendments which they made to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, but it is because of those amendments and the compensation which must be paid by Government and the fact that persons waited until the last minute. They had 5 years to come forward. We now have a backlog of persons, a number of persons not only in St. Andrew who want to be relocated and they do not want to be relocated in St. Michael nor in St. George. They want to be relocated in any area close to where they presently live and this is the reason why we have to find land in the surrounding area.

The only other alternative, and the Honourable Member for St. Lucy talked about the small man, that we would have is to go around the area and identify the small parcels of land belonging to the same small people that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is talking about. In that way then the Government would not be accused of depriving the small man of his own land or we can leave the people in White Hill and allow the land to slip or we could allow persons who have been disenfranchised by the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act to bring certain actions against the Government as is their right.

In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is really necessary for us to bring this legislation and I would not guarantee that we would not in the future have to tread on agricultural land which is in sugar production because of the circumstances of which I speak.

All of this land cannot accommodate the persons who have been disenfranchised nor the persons who have been affected by land slippage. It would appear as though we will have to go to Lancaster Plantation in order to accommodate persons in that general area.

Lancaster is also an area, unlike this area, which is presently under sugar production. But if someone could come up with some other alternative they could let me know but we have to find alternative land in order to relocate these people in accordance with our social responsibility and in accordance with the legislation brought about by the amendments.

With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. 2.25 p.m.

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

ORDER NO. 5 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
VESTING IN THE BARBADOS TOURISM INVESTMENT
CORPORATION OF LAND AT CUMBERLAND STREET,
CHEAPSIDE, BAY STREET AND
WELLINGTON STREET,
ST. MICHAEL

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution to vest certain lands in the St. Michael area in the Tourism Investment Corporation. The Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Tourism will speak to this Resolution. The points which will be made with respect to this particular Resolution* are also relevant to Order No. 3 which will come after this Resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words in respect of this Resolution. These lands are proposed to be vested in the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation. In order for that Corporation to develop these properties, it is necessary for them to hold clear and indefeasible titles to the properties so that they may legally buy, sell, barter, lease, dispose in any way which seems best to the Corporation. The Government has sought to vest in this fashion many of the boundaries, titles. Some of them are lost in the midst of antiquity. That and other reasons caused the legislative route to be the way used.

Now Honourable Members would have heard me speak on several occasions now in this House in respect of the Tourism Development Programme which has within it a subprogramme which deals almost exclusively with urban development and redevelopment, Speightstown, Bridgetown and the St. Lawrence Gap. These properties are all falling within the proposal for the redevelopment and regeneration of Bridgetown as a capital city. The properties referred to here are the former Child Care Board headquarters house known as "The Savoy" on Bay Street, the Fish Market...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We are doing No. 5. There are several properties, more than one of which is on Bay Street. "The Savoy"¹¹ is on Bay Street. The Fish Market is on Bay Street. The lands at the corner of Bay Street and Wellington Street where the Government Electrical Engineering Department now is and the St. John Ambulance Brigade that is land leased over all the years from the Bethel Methodist Church.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No. This is over on the road from the other side of Wellington Street from Pondside, immediately opposite the Boatyard. They also speak to lands adjoining the old Town Hall and the old Town Hall property itself, in other words, the entire block going back from the old Lower Green to Temple Yard.

Mr. Speaker, there is a proposal that several of these properties which the Government owns, and the Government is the largest landowner in Bridgetown, followed only by the Barbados Shipping and Trading, are regarded as heritage properties. It is not the Government's intention, I think, to sell properties which are regarded as part of the patrimony of Barbados but several of the properties the Government own are properties which are eligible for sale, exchange, lease or however. The Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation might look for joint venturing with the private sector.

I can say, it is not a secret, Sir, that in respect of the old Town Hall, the Barbados Chamber of Commerce together with the Employers' Confederation have expressed an interest. They have gone so far as to have some outline drawing done on the old Town Hall. It is proposed that they would restore it to its former glory because they are aware that the Government has plans for greening of the old Lower Green which would be linked to the Jubilee Gardens.

We are seeking permission of the St. Mary's Church Council to take down the southern wall of the Church to replace it in large part with the beautiful old cast iron work

which was saved when the old Marine Hotel became derelict and unsafe for human habitation. When that was demolished, we saved that cast iron. We are offering to landscape the graves. There are beautiful old trees in St. Mary's Church yard, few of the good trees left in Bridgetown.

When most of us were children, we could remember when there were far more trees in Bridgetown in the middle of the capital than there are today. We lost wonderful evergreens out of the Lower Green and there will be massive replanting there as well. We hope the new Lower Green will be a place where artists, for instance, could come, maybe particularly at weekends, to put up their easels and paint, bring their sculptors and other expressions of art for exposure and sale to the community and where other cultural expressions might find a home and might take place. This development is starting at the Western end of Bridgetown. 2.35 p.m.

The rebuilding of the Cheapside Market is all part and parcel of that, Sir, and that building process is to start momentarily. If you come further up, in respect of these properties, there is the old spirit bond on the Wharf. The Small Business Association has shown an interest in this property and we hope that in due course they will begin to negotiate whatever particular interest they have in it with the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation.

The Empire Theatre, regarded as a heritage property, is already a property which the National Cultural Foundation has indicated its interest, in restoring the theatre to its former glory as a theatre. It was originally designed as a theatre and its sister theatre, the Ward Theatre, has long since been restored and is very much the home of culture in Kingston. We hope that the Empire Theatre will be able to re-find its glory and its function in the cultural life of Barbados in the early 21st century in the way that it did far more than a century ago.

Sir, included in these properties too are "The Savoy" and the Fish Market at Bay Street. There are many other properties but it was not possible to bring all before the House at one time. These are the ones to which we have given high priority because these are the ones in which they have been public expressions of interest. Even now the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation is preparing a package by way of which it can more properly describe to the public what kind of development it is envisaged will occur at the Cheapside end of Bridgetown and particularly along Bay Street.

The Phase 2 of the Pondside Housing Project, I am advised, is to start in June 1997. There is going to be massive road widening there. I believe that a number

of private owners of property on both the land and the sea side of Bay Street are already making enquiry as to the kind of development that would take place there and quite a few applications are coming before the Town Planning Office.

I think, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that what is going to happen is that over the next few years, Bridgetown is likely to begin to look like one giant building site and some of the work has already started. There is also infrastructural work that the Government has to embark upon, the north phase of the Careenage has to be shored up. Cavans Lane has suffered a collapse and that is being given priority by the Ministry of Public Works and they are doing remedial work there.

The plan for the regeneration of Bridgetown is so large, that Bridgetown of necessity, physically divides itself into sub-areas so to speak. There are proposals for the inner and outer basin of the Careenage. I know that Barbados Shipping & Trading has massive proposals for their lands in and around the Pierhead. They have shared these plans with us in the Ministry of Tourism by way of a demonstration.

There is a natural historic area within Bridgetown where work is already on the way. The completion of the restoration of the Jewish Synagogue and its environs is about to get a new impetus. The restoration of the burial ground of the church yard. The House at the corner of Synagogue Lane which used to be the Rabbi's house, all of that is just about to begin refurbishment.

The Central Police Station has undergone quite extensive repair and refurbishment in recent times. I believe works are going on at the old Town Hall. A lot of people do not know that what we now know as the Supreme Court of Barbados used to be a Town Hall. The Carnegie Library has had a face lift.

I am pleased that the British American Company saw fit to invest in a re-landscaping and a re-planting of the Montefiori Gardens. They have promised to maintain it and so far, it they have maintained. That is all part of a really quite extensive historic area.

I have described the Lower Green, and it is proposed that on Swan Street and Broad Street we would do quite extensive works. We are going to partially pedestrianise Broad Street, Swan Street is already pedestrianised to a larger extent and it is proposed to repair side walks to put nice lighting in and to pave some of these areas.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are hoping to have good signage not only for the use of the visitors but for locals alike.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is true, we have to make sure that those who prepare the signage know how to spell well. I take the point that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is making.

Even as I speak, Sir, application is being made to the Minister of Finance for Baxters Road, Tudor Street, Milk Market, Pinfold Street and Roebuck Street to be declared special development areas. Again, it is hoped for massive redevelopment to be taking place.

As we speak, Sir, there is a dig, an archeological dig going on in Suttle Street. I have been advised that they have been some magnificent finds in the ruins and in the foundations of very old houses which were recently excavated. People may not be aware that all of this is going on in Bridgetown, but it is.

It is important that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation which now has a new lease on life should have these properties vested so that they can be getting on with this redevelopment plan. One of those properties, in due course, will be the old Bridge and Harbour Police Station. I am pleased to say, Sir, that a local consortia has indicated an interest in that property.

Mr. Speaker, I have waited for a very long time for the process of vesting in the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation to get to where it is today and it really does give me the greatest pleasure to second this resolution. Now the work can proceed. 2.45 p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the Minister would have told this Assembly the large businesses that would be involved in these projects that she just mentioned to this Assembly. I want to know, Sir, if she is making provision for some large business in this country to do massive developments in Barbados and if this is the case it is exactly what I was complaining about earlier where every Tuesday...

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is putting up a straw man in order to put it down. The only business that I referred to was the Small Business Association which has shown an interest in the old Spirit Bond.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member also mentioned about some project that some large company in Bridgetown is about to start. I am wondering if the Honourable Member is speaking about a project that starts from the Careenage and it goes

right back to Bay Street I want to know, Sir, if this project interferes with the Careenage and it also interferes with Independence Square.

I also want to know, Sir, if this project would see hotel rooms coming to Bridgetown and a marina also coming to Bridgetown. So if we are doing this to accommodate this, Sir, I feel that we should say so in the open and do not give the impression that we are doing this...

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I cannot accept that I am giving any impressions. I know nothing of the project of which the Honourable Member speaks.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that we will have to ask the Hansard Reporter to bring the record, Sir, because the Honourable Member for the City has said already in this debate that that project is on stream and how it was discussed with their Government. You said it. She said that the project was discussed with their Government and I want to know if these vestings of land have any interest..

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I said no such thing. Mr.

SPEAKER: On what do you rise?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is inventive but not to the point where I am going to be made a liar. I said that the Barbados Shipping and Trading has plans for its properties in and around the Pierhead and it has shown me a demonstration. That is all that I know. It has nothing to do with the Careenage. It does not have anything to do with hotel rooms or anything of that kind. I never said anything like that. How could I?

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Am I to believe that the BS&Ts project has nothing to do with the Careenage or it has nothing to do with Independence Square, or it has nothing to do with hotel rooms? Am I to believe that, Sir? If the Honourable Minister is telling me so I have to be guided by her but when the opposite happens I would expect the necessary apology to this Assembly.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, I would not call for her to resign. I want her to apologise to the Speaker, because she would not be misleading me she would have been misleading the Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that this project also involves Temple Yard and I want to

know whether this is going to be a negative effect on Temple Yard or a positive one?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. There is no project. That is the first thing. Temple Yard is a part of the Cheapside Market and the Rastafarian crafts people there are going to be resited in a building whose design they participated in.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, you and I are hearing now that the Rastas in Temple Yard will be removed again and they will be resited in a building. I want to know, Sir, when that was published and I want to know whether it was discussed with them because, Sir, when we heard about the Town Hall and the Rastas the impression was never given in this Assembly that they would have been resited again. We are playing political football with the small man in this country and that is why I will continue to argue on his behalf. Every time that you put them somewhere and you believe that they are making progress they are moved once more.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is grandstanding. The Rastafarian crafts people at the Temple Yard have been consulted every single step of the way. They were offered location within the new market, they said it did not suit their way of doing business and a new location has been found and they have had a large say in the design of what will now rehouse them.

The Temple Yard is part of the market. It always has been and will continue to be so and they have been consulted every single step of the way. The Honourable Member for St Lucy is not speaking the truth when he says he is speaking for them because he does not know what is going on. If he was speaking for them he would know.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am saying to you that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South...

Aside.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: That is true. I will say what I like in here once it does not displease the Speaker. I will always respect him in here but the Honourable Member for Christ Church South moved them to Temple Yard and now you are uprooting them. And I am saying if you want some place good to put them, the Honourable Member for the City should reclaim land at Trevor's Way and give them right outside the Port. I am saying that the same way that rich people in this country who have property that leads into Bridgetown have got the first hand...

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order, order, please!

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: I do not care where they are being resiled. I am telling you in here where I want them resited because once we are representing the interest of the small man I will put his case. I am saying you should put them at Trevor's Way right outside the Port. They have a right to the first hand to the tourist industry in this country. They have a right and nobody who can't even speak to her own Cabinet Ministers can speak to me in this debate. Of course I cannot be speaking about you. You control the Cabinet

Mr. SPEAKER: Please! Please! Do not get to that. Move on, Sir.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the Rastas in Temple Yard, they have been able to identify with Temple Yard and we cannot every minute uproot them. They were uprooted in Broad Street and now we are doing the same thing again. If we are going to do that we should put them down Trevor's Way. I do not want to know where you are putting them I am telling you where I want them. I am not interested in where you are putting them.

Aside.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: The Judge Gap? A beautiful place. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Small Business Association, and I hope that when they get the building they use it for the Small Business Association and they do not allow people who have controlling interest to continue to control them. I believe they have a right to continue speaking on behalf of the Small Business Association in this country and they will get my support all the time. 2.55 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: You know what hurts me Mr. Speaker, whenever the Government has something to be given to the rich in this country it is talked about today and they were given yesterday, but whenever something is for the small man, you hear about it two years ago and three years after nothing has happened.

I am annoyed about this. And I am saying that the same way that they are saying that the Small Business Association will benefit from this resolution, we must see something tangible about it. We are tired about talk coming

from this side about the poor man, and what is strange all of a sudden two and a half years I have been talking about the small man and the only time they can talk about the small man is since Mrs. Clinton came here and mentioned about the small man. All of a sudden it is a catch word for them now.

Asides.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: I am small in sight and small in words, everything. You cannot dictate what I am.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, order. Proceed, Sir.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: I do not belong to the Supermarkets Association either. So, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that if this project is to accommodate the project in Bridgetown, I have no problem with it, but tell the House what you are accommodating.

It is obvious that you have to be accommodating something. It is not wrong to say that you are trying to develop the City. We have heard you for years saying that you want to develop the City. The same way that I talk about my small airport, if you have an idea like that there is nothing wrong with that

The same way that you want Baxters Road to be declared a special development area and I want an airport for St. Lucy. There is nothing wrong with that

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Mr. D. St E. KELLMAN: But, what I will tell you is that you need to tell the House about this.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to know how many small men would benefit from this land being vested. I want to know how many small men would be involved because one of the things I realise is that whenever you are dealing with the small men you are talking about the Small Business Association. When you are talking about die rich group, you are never talking about their organisation; They are individuals.

There are individual small people in this country that deserve recognition too. The same way you know when a large company wants something in this country, there are individuals out there who are small and they should be treated the same way. I am not telling you to ignore the Small Business Association.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Give away the port? Mr. Speaker, how we could give away the Port when it is still down there? What kind of nonsense is that? Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, all we have to make sure then is that if we gave away the Port that nobody can give away the Careenage or Independence Square. Because if they are ever given away in here, Sir, then you are going to hear about this debate going further.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to find out from the Honourable Member for the City how many marinas she has planned for the Bridgetown area. I would like to know, Sir, if any of these land acquisitions have provision for marinas. I want to know how many shopping plazas would be set up and if there will be a walkway across the Careenage, leading from the Helicopter Port straight across to Bay Street.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member said she would hope not. This means that one of her plans has gone through the eddoes again. I want to know also from her, Sir, that when Broad Street is closed off, which road you will use, Sir. Because it is okay to come in here and say you are going to close off Broad Street, Sir, but without giving alternative roads of usage?

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. No one said Broad Street will be closed off. This is an educated person in the Honourable Member for St. Lucy? I said that Broad Street will be partially pedestrianised. I said it a hundred times in here that instead of traffic running east-west on Broad Street, it would run north-south. At three points it would cut Broad Street.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for the Minister for now adding that new part. Because I want to know how she can say what she said before and now come and add a new part Mr. Speaker, if she said it if any times, Sir, I was not in here. I am talking about today when I am in here. If you are going to stop traffic from going into Broad Street, I want to know the alternative roads. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that your constituents have a right to know, Sir, when we are going to be blocking Broad Street. We just cannot come in there and talk about blocking Broad Street without putting up alternatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am saying, Sir, that if there are any massive projects to come to Bridgetown, my friend from Christ Church South would like to know. They would like to know about these projects that are coming. It is not

fair for me to come on the Floor in this House and talk about these things and he believes it is not true. When solutions come to this House, we need to know the long term effect of them. For too long we have been dealing with resolutions and then two and three months after, to hear that something else is happening. We need to be told everything up front, Sir.

I do not mind pedestrianising Broad Street. I do not mind the greening of Bridgetown but we need to know who will benefit in the long run. I am saying if the Small Business Association will benefit too, I have no problems with that, but we need to identify the locations where we can identify with certain people getting some of the benefits that they stand to gain on Broad Street.

Broad Street does not belong to any one particular group. Every single soul in Barbados has a right to benefit from Broad Street. And from a historical point of view, Sir, I am seeing a trend happening in Barbados that I am worried about. Our foreparents struggled hard in this country to bring this country where it is and now, Sir, this country is being without a people who never cut a cane in Barbados. And, people are expected to sit down and accept this. The people who cut the canes in this country and built Broad Street, they have a right to get part of Broad Street. And, no Government with a composition like this, have a right to put provisions in place where the people's grandchildren who worked hard in those fields to build Barbados have to watch and see other people who arrived there by various means.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. I just want to draw to your attention that pedestrianise according to the Shorter Oxford Dictionary says "close to vehicular traffic and make accessible only to pedestrians." I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, that the Honourable Member got up and said, "yes, I said pedestrianise," so therefore she said to close Broad Street.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. I repeat what I said earlier. The Government proposes to partially pedestrianise Broad Street. From the time I first spoke of this matter in this House over a year ago, I made the point that the traffic on Broad Street would run North-South instead of East-West and Broad Street would be cut at three points. That is what I said. 3.05 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank you. Honourable Member, could we have our focus now on this Resolution before the House? I have allowed a lot of latitude. Let us proceed, please.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I must correct something before I get into the meat of my debate. The impression

is that right now the traffic travels in 2 directions on Broad Street. I would like a clarification on that, Sir. You have ruled and I want to know if you are in agreement...

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not rule on Broad Street.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I want to know if it is coming in 2 directions now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we proceed with the Resolution please?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, Sir. I was saying that any vesting of land in Barbados that the people who work in the fields, their children and grandchildren, should have the first preference to get some of those benefits.

We are not seeing this in Barbados. What we are seeing now that Barbados has developed is that people feel that once you have money you can get anything you want and the poor people out there have to suffer. If Broad Street happens to be the main area in Barbados I believe people from our constituency, Sir, have a right to have a place on Broad Street.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The IADB policy stopped them where everything must be sold to the highest bidder. We have never signed an agreement in this country which states that everything must be sold to the highest bidder or better yet, to the maximum usage, copying a phrase from my friend from St. George North.

If we continue with that policy the poor man in this country would never get anything, and they feel proud about it. Everyone of them feel proud about it, every Honourable Member on that side. None of them have disagreed with that policy, even my friend from St. James North who represents a rural constituency with poor people has not defended me on this policy. I expected him, if no one else, to get up and support me in supporting poor people. Further than that, Sir, he has supported the interest of the rich people.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You have to say it on the Floor of the House. You cannot come and grandstand and he has been grandstanding. He gives the impression on the outside that he is for poor people and then he gets in here and supports the rich all the time, my friend from St. James North.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: On a point of order, Sir. In the interest of proper decorum and in the interest of upholding the rules, I would suggest and draw to your attention that that is in breach of the Rules. You cannot say that outside he supports poor people and in here he comes in and supports the rich.

I suggest that the clear indication of that statement is that the man is a hypocrite.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am sure that you and I know about walking to school and we would never be misled by people who have driven to school in cars from the time they were 5 years old. We are not part of the privileged few. We are humble people and we have always respected our positions, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is misleading the House. He has been doing it all through his speech. There is not a single member in this House who is in their seat at this time who was driven to school in a car from the time they were 5 years old and I would venture to say, who were driven to school at all.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: There are other members in here, Sir, who might have had special privileges to stand next to their door and the bus would have to come and pick them up.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: On a point of order. As a member of this Honourable House I am entitled to understand what the Honourable Member means. I want the Honourable Member to tell us whether he means personalised bus stops.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You see, Mr. Speaker, we are at a serious stage in our history where we have argued that we are going forward. But when one takes a critical analysis of what is going on in this country we cannot honestly claim that we are going forward in this country, even though the economy might be going forward and the other factors. The poor man is still suffering. What we need in here is a radical change where the emphasis of Government should be on protecting the interest of the poor in St. George South and in St. Lucy and not necessarily the too few who can control the capital, because if we allow this to continue we will always be politicians who will be dictated by the man with the largesse.

Thank you very much Sir.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

fion. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

ORDER NO. 3 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
VESTING OF LAND AT WHARF ROAD,
ST. MICHAEL IN THE BARBADOS
TOURISM INVESTMENT
CORPORATION

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of the previous Resolution I did indicate at the inception that all the comments pertaining to that Resolution would be relevant to this one. In those circumstances, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not participate in the last discussion. My honourable friend did a magnificent job and I do not intend to discuss the details of this particular vesting in the Tourism Investment Corporation.

What I would hope is that the Government soon will issue an indication of the policy change, if any, which is occurring with relation to the Tourism Investment Corporation. As Your Honour will recall, the Tourism Investment Corporation was established by an Act of Parliament and what it was supposed to do was very clearly articulated in the presentation to this Honourable Chamber at the time when the Tourism Investment Corporation was created.

I have noticed from utterances by the Government that they have been very subtly, very slowly, but quite certainly, changing the terms of reference of the Tourism Investment Corporation and we are now getting resolution after resolution vesting property into the Tourism Investment Corporation for it to be carried out.

I think that the methodology which the Government is using is faulty but I do not believe it is worthwhile to fight the Government on the issue because in the end they will proceed in the way they wish to go. But it seems to me that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South when he set up the Tourism Investment Corporation had a very clear indication as to what this Corporation would be responsible for and what it would do in relation to tourism development. It now seems to me that the nature and

content of the responsibility of the Tourism Investment Development Corporation has been changed or is changing.

Sir, while we are passing legislation to vest properties which are to be acquired in the Tourism Investment Corporation we are not hearing anything about those areas where it is supposed to be functioning. Furthermore, I have heard or read somewhere that, for example, the Hilton Hotel will now be managed by a separate company to be established. 3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, I am not going to allow that latitude. I think your discussion should relate to the Resolution before the House and not on the activities of the Tourism Investment Corporation, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. The Tourism Investment Corporation has responsibility under the Act that set it up for managing the Hilton Hotel and other hotel properties of the Government. I need your guidance but the Tourism Investment Corporation was established specifically to manage the hotel properties which the Government had. In order for me to discuss the policy of the Tourism Investment Corporation, I necessarily must discuss what it is not doing in relation to what it was set up for in this Parliament. Now, I await Your Honour's guidance on it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceed. I will monitor what you say.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thank you. I am making the point that when the Tourism Investment Corporation was established it was given a very clear mandate and now we are in the process of giving it what I choose to call a second diversionary mandate. It seems as though the Government is shifting the actual responsibility that had been articulated for the Tourism Investment Corporation to another entity. I am really seeking guidance from the Government as to when we might expect a policy statement so those of us who have come to expect a certain pattern in the affairs of State will know the Government has shifted that pattern all together.

If, in fact, it is true, and only the Ministers can confirm if it is true, Sir, that the Hilton Hotel will now be managed by a separate company to be established, one would wish to know what has occurred that has changed the original intent of the Tourism Investment Corporation to a position where it is now apparently involved in developing heritage properties. This seems to me, based on the Resolution that went before this and this present Resolution, as if the Tourism Investment Corporation is being perceived as a kind of holding company for heritage properties. I wish the Minister to tell me if, in fact, this is the case.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South is probably in a better position to tell us what is happening with the property which the Tourism Investment Corporation is supposed to manage at the Golf Course in Christ Church. That is one of the properties which falls within the ambit of the remit of the Tourism Investment Corporation but I have had no information. This House has been given no information about what is happening with those properties which it now manages.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: The Honourable Member whose responsibility it is to discuss the vesting is discussing the vesting apparently from his seat I have no doubt that when he gets up he will enlighten us. I do not have to answer him when he asks me questions from his seat, especially when they do not go through Your Honour.

The question I am raising is this. Is the Tourism Investment Corporation going to be used *far* an entirely different purpose from that for which it was created? If that is so, is there anybody over there who is going to tell us what that purpose is? Can we expect more acquisitions of this kind? Will there be other properties to be acquired? Will the Tourism Investment Corporation be involved in managing properties, as it was set up to do? Will it now be involved in developing properties as it appears it is now going to be required to do? If that is so, what is happening with the Golf Course? Why are we not getting any information about what the Tourism Investment Corporation is doing about the Golf Course in Christ Church but now it is being saddled with additional properties when it does not seem as if it has been able to do what it was set up to do, and when it seems as though you are divesting it of the property.

You will recall, Sir, that Almond Beach was part of the remit of the Tourism Investment Corporation. It had the responsibility for, on behalf of the Government of Barbados, managing the Almond Beach. When Almond Beach was sold to BS&T, it meant that the Tourism Investment Corporation was left only with the Hilton Hotel, the Golf Course at Christ Church, Sheibourne Centre and the Sir Garfield Sobers Complex. Those are no longer part of what it was supposed to do but we are now moving into a new area.

I have no quarrel with that, if that is the Government's intention. The Government of the day is entitled to make policy changes, policy switches but it has a duty to tell this House when those policy decisions have been made. It has a duty to let us know whom we should expect to call into account in relation to those properties.

I am unable at the moment, on the basis of this Resolution to raise any questions about the Hilton Hotel. I am unable to raise any questions about the Convention Centre at St. Lawrence Gap, the former Cable & Wireless building which forms part of the responsibility of the Tourism Investment Corporation. But the Minister of Tourism should be in a position to tell us if it is true that the Gems Project is now going to be absorbing another part of a property at St Lawrence Gap.

Will TIC, as it has been proposed by those who come to run the Gems Project, take over Mrs. Maitland's property? Will they take over Mrs. Maitland's property or is it the other way around that the Gems Project will take over Dover Convention Centre and the Tourism Investment Centre will be eased out of responsibility for tourism investment for the Dover Convention Centre?

Mr. Speaker, it is very important that all of us discuss these matters on a level playing field. We have to know what the facts are before we start taking positions. I prefer to have the facts before I take a position. I would only say that I hope the Government will not fall prey to some of the blandishments in words which are coming from those who are to do the so-called Gems Project. Because if the Government allows itself to shift the Tourism Investment Corporation to such matters as developing properties like this at the Wharf, and away from its major responsibility in relation to Dover Convention Centre, for example, then what we will have in the end is what the Honourable Member for St. Lucy was talking about

I do not think I would be permitted to expand on that, Sir, without infringing the rules but I hope the Minister and the Government understand that we expect information from them or there will be a major debate waged in this country about the Gems Project as it relates to the Tourism Investment Corporation.

The Gems Project as it relates to the Golf Course what is happening to the Golf Course? Why is the Golf Course not being developed along the lines which everybody agreed it should be developed along?

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: A Daniel has come to judgment What happened in the 8 years is immaterial. Once the gods and goddesses of this earth had taken over the Government, then it was your responsibility to do it So do not talk to me about what happened. You now have the responsibility. You can turn water into wine and walk on water therefore do not tell me about what happened before. I want to know what you are doing now. I am not interested in what we did. It was agreed that we did, according to the

history, nothing. We were rejected and thrown out so do not come and talk about us. I want to hear about you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just continue to address the Chair, please, and let us proceed orderly, please.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: I always address the Chair, Sir. When I say "you," Sir, it is clear I could not mean Your Honour, so when I say "you," I am addressing those through you who attempt through you to address me.

Mr. Speaker, I know you have allowed some latitude in this debate and I will not tempt Your Honour but the Honourable Member must be aware. The Minister responsible for the Tourism Investment Corporation must be aware that we are also aware of the manoeuvrings which are going on and we wish to know.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South has been consistent in trying to get people to understand a simple fact about the Golf Course under the TIC in Christ Church. When I was the Minister the Honourable Member was trying. Since I stop being a Minister the Honourable Member is still trying and it seems to be difficult for ordinary people to understand that what you have to do is to put the thing out to work. That is all that has to be done. We are talking about all kinds of development I heard the Honourable Member painting a picture of the glorious development we are going to have in Bridgetown. Sir, I hope it happens in your lifetime. Sir, I have been in here long enough to know that everybody has dreams. 3.25 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: I could give you chapter and verse about the number of times when you put your hand to the plough and it stuck to the ground but this House does not permit me to speak of those matters at all.

I am making the simple point that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation has been given simple task and it cannot be said that they performed them. I have heard nothing in relation to the golf course. I have heard nothing recently about the Hilton Hotel, I have only read that they intend to have a separate company to run that I do not know why you would need a separate company to run that There had property at St. Peter which was sold so the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation is not overburdened with work in relation to its commitment Now it is going to be given development duties with the acquisition of these properties.

I want the Government, not in this debate, and I have to state it because I am speaking to people who do not listen well, who do not hear at all and who are stubborn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please, I am hearing you.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: Mr. Speaker, if you were in the Government, do you have any idea how many things you would get done, Sir. If Your Honour was in the Government I would not have to be making this speech. I would never describe anyone as stubborn if I knew that your hand was there to help.

Mr. SPEAKER: In spite of that, you have to get back to the resolution.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: Your Honour, I am working my way round to that but quite seriously I hope that we will get a policy statement not long from now.

I do not expect the Minister who getting up after me and who is piloting this resolution to make a policy statement about this or anything. I do not expect him to make a policy statement I would like to signal the Government that it is important for those who take an interest in the development of this country to have a clear policy position on what the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation is intending to do and whether you are going to get new agencies to do what it was doing before, otherwise we are going to continue to be in a relative fog of confusion.

I am not impressed when you come to this House to acquire properties and say that you are going to vest it in the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation unless you are able to say to me what it is proposed that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation will be doing for the next two years. Are we are going to have a new agency or a separate agency to look after what they were looking after? Then Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us will be in a better position to contribute one way or another to the development of this country. That is the point I wanted to make. I am grateful to you.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Just one point, Sir, that I have an abiding interest in, Sir, that is the Durants area.

The Honourable Member will recall that for many years I was of the view that we should have a municipal type of golf course in Barbados so that everybody who was interested in playing golf should not be forced into the position where they have to fork out exorbitant sums to have access to golf.

My understanding of the position is, Sir, that Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation has been mandated to pursue the development of the golf course at Durants along the same lines that the consultant's report in 1985/86 had recommended. That it would be a co-operative scheme between the Government through the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation, the householders who were interested, the hotels on the south coast, the golfers in Barbados and that an entity would be created in which the various shareholding interests would be those parties.

The position as it is today is that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation had vested in a new company called Southern Golf and that the land and the development of the course would be pursued along the lines that was recommended in 1985/86. The hotels of the South Coast from the Hilton Hotel right up to Sam Lords have been invited to participate, and they have agreed. The householders around, who have kept a fair part of the course clean, because of environmental necessity, they have also agreed. The Golf Association of Barbados* they have also agreed.

Notwithstanding the fact that all of this has been agreed, the first act of the new board of directors, you would not believe it, Mr. Speaker, was to appoint another firm of consultants to advise them. It is a fact, a positive fact I repeat, the first act of the new board of directors which are the representatives of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation was to appoint another firm of consultants to reinvent the wheel. One of these days we will realise that a large part of the revenue of Government is spent on consultancy.

The fundamental plan, however, is exactly the same, that we must have that development for the whole of Barbados.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: We are developing a strange trend in this Parliament, Sir. For years, when Government is buying land or disposing of land, the Ministry of Housing through National Housing has been dealing with it. All of a sudden, Sir, there is a strange diversion, and we need to know why, Sir. That is all I want to say at this moment in time.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have more than that to say at this moment in time. I hear Honourable Members in here mouthing off. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West really quite extraordinarily misrepresented the reality and the real truth about the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was called an Investment Corporation but my submission to you is that in all the

years, it has never, never acted as an Investment Corporation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that I did an extraordinary misrepresentation. I was careful to point out the Terms of Reference of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation when it was created in here. The fact that it was called Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation, what it was supposed to do was articulated, I believe, by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, when the legislation came here. That is what I said. How could I misrepresent it, when all I did was to refer to the terms that were set out for it. The Honourable Member cannot do that.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it started out with what was Heywoods and what is now Almond Beach and the Hilton Hotel which were the tourism related hotels owned by Government at the time.

Over time the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation has been treated like a rat bag. They pelted the Durants Golf course in it when it came to grieve, they chucked in two air-conditioned coaches when they could not find anywhere else to put them, they chucked in Dover Convention Centre and latterly Sherbourne Centre. When the Dover Convention Centre, Mr. Speaker, Sir, could not make an occupancy rate about 18%, I repeat, when the Dover Convention Centre could not make an occupancy rate over many years better than 18%, the then Democratic Labour Party Government built Sherbourne and called it a conference centre and chucked that too into the bag of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is misleading this House in the history which she is reciting which is completely inaccurate and furthermore, Sir, the Honourable Member is indicating information that is simply not true. 3.35 p.m.

If one looks at the Estimates, the Estimates for this year says this sub-program provides for a grant to the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation whose function is to market services and the facilities vested in the Corporation.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: He is getting up and reading out of a book. He is worse than Errol Barrow reading off a plain page. There is no grant to the BTIC. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point I am making is that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation was not allowed...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, the Minister must have taken leave of her senses. These are the Estimates, Sir. It says here \$1.6 million and she says there is no grant. We voted for this.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point I am making is that the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation has never been allowed properly to operate as an investment corporation. Over the years in recent times it has even been suggested that it ought to be allowed to die off.

When we came into Government, Sir, we saw fit to give it a remit for the first time to get into the business of investment tourism development and that is what the vesting of these properties is partly about.

We have heard the Honourable Member for Christ Church South speak to what is the position in respect of the Durant's Golf Course. Between 1986 and 1994 it ran high in bush, growing almost at the height of canes with all kind of vermin making life for the surrounding residents at Durants uncomfortable.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South made the life of the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation very difficult, Sir, because he had a plan and a proposal which is more than the Democratic Labour Party Government ever had in the 8 years preceding.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church South had his own consultants.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir, I hate to interrupt the Honourable Member but the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The plan which the Honourable Member is referring to was approved in 1986 by the Government.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heard the Honourable Member for St. George South, many years ago say in here and I repeat it all the time, I will never forget it - "It is alright to talk about you have a plan..." They were talking about what is now the Grantley Adams International Airport and the people who were in the Opposition then are in the Opposition now and were beating their breast and shouting out that it was their idea and the Honourable Member for St. George South said, you cannot land an airplane on an idea. Durants was in bush.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as we have heard from the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, the BTIC is

engaged with a proposal from a group of south coast hotels for the future use of the Durants Golf Course and it is totally correct that they should ask to have certain studies done. The consortium did it to their satisfaction and so should the BTIC and I stand foursquare behind them in their decision.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No, they cannot operate only on the basis of the consultants of the hoteliers, they have to take their own independent advice.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. She is giving the impression that the Honourable Member being a hotelier, consultants were just there for the hoteliers and they were chosen specifically because certain people had influence over the hotels and it is not fair.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Only your tortured mind could arrive at that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in respect of Dover. Dover is prime beach front property and the GEMS project are wishful, as I understand it, of negotiating with the BTIC in respect of the property at Dover.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Who said I was giving it to anybody? I cannot give anybody anything. Give it? They would have to buy it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the occupancy rate at Dover when it is added to the occupancy rate at Sherbourne, still cannot make 50%. Sherbourne was designed for a particular purpose. It is not the first time that we had a President visiting Barbados. President Reagan came here when there was no Sherbourne. I am saying, do not let us overstate the case about it.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I am saying is that for the first time the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation is going to be afforded the opportunity to truly carry out its function as an investment corporation.

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Do not let us talk about directors, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West must not spit up in the air, Sir. The last Chairman of the BTIC has got a lot to account for to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point I am making is that these properties and many others beside that would be tourism related and will allow the Barbados Tourism Investment Corporation to be one of the main driving forces behind increased and improved and enhanced tourism development in this country in the years to come. And in the circumstances, Sir, it pleases me very greatly to support this Resolution.

In respect of this particular one and we are talking here about the Spirit Bond on the Wharf Road, this is a building which has been derelict for many, many years. In fact many Barbadians do not even know what I am talking about or where I am talking about when I talk about the Spirit Bond. It is a prime property which has been allowed to fall into dereliction like so many others were allowed to do in the City of Bridgetown. But as I have said earlier in here today, Sir, the Small Business Association has expressed an interest and I hope that now that the vesting

is taking place, that negotiations between themselves and the BTIC will now come to good resolution, and the restoration of this property would get on the way at an early date. 3.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am obliged to you.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House be adjourned to Tuesday, 27th day of May, 1997 at 11.00 in the morning.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, May 27, 1997, at 11.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 3.50 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER
1

Confirmation of Minutes of Tuesday,
April 22, 1997.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR
THE SPEAKER

The Accounts and Statements for the month
of January, 1997.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER _____

The Annual Report; of the Public Utilities
Board for the year 1996.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER.....

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND AT FARMERS, ST. THOMAS

Hon. G. W. Payne, 2, 18; Mr. G. A. Clarke,
3; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 4; Hon. R. C.
Eastmond, 7; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 11;
Hon. H. deB. Forde, 13; Sir Harold St. John,
16.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF
CROWN LANDS IN THE BARBADOS
TOURISM INVESTMENT CORPORATION
OF SEVERAL PIECES OF LAND AT
CUMBERLAND STREET AND
CHEAPSIDE, ST. MICHAEL 19

Hon. G. W. Payne, 19; Hon. Miss B. A.
Miller, 20; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 21.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING OF
CROWN LANDS IN THE BARBADOS
TOURISM INVESTMENT CORPORATION
OF SEVERAL PIECES OF LAND AT
WHARF ROAD, ST. MICHAEL 26

Hon. G. W. Payne, 26; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 26;
Sir Harold St. John, 28; Hon. Miss B. A.
Miller, 29.

SUSPENSION..... 16

ADJOURNMENT 31

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 31.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

CLARKE, Mr. G. A. (St George North)
EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St James North)
FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West)
KELLMAN, Mr. D. St E. (St Lucy) MILLER,
Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown) PAYNE,
Hon. G. W. (St Andrew) St JOHN, Sir Harold
(Christ Church South) TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St
Michael We«O THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St
John)