

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 14, 1997

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Tuesday, October 14, 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.)

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, M.Sc. (Econ.), (Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs and Minister for the Civil Service)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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. EDGHELL

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

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER, J.P., B.A., Dip. Ed., B.Sc.

Mr. H. F. LASHLEY

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)

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 Monday, September 29, 1997.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes of proceedings of the Honourable the House of Assembly for its meeting of Monday, September 29, 1997, which Minutes have been circulated, I beg to move, Sir, that they be taken as read.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

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

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am commanded to lay the following:

1. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 16) Order, 1997.

2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 17) Order, 1997.
3. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 18) Ord6r, 1997.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

1. The Annual Report of the National Assistance Board for the year 1994-95.
2. The Annual Reports of the Department of Labour for the years 1992 and 1993.

FIRST READING OF BILL

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR, the following Bill was read a first time:

1. Bill to amend the Shipping, Oil Pollution Act, Cap. 296A.

OBITUARY NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, even before we last met in this Chamber, regretfully we found that a former Deputy Speaker of this Honourable Chamber, a man who was, relatively speaking, still very much a young man, a man who was a member of the legal profession, and so in that sense a colleague of all of us who are members of that profession on both sides of the House here, a relative of the Honourable Member for St. Andrew had passed away. Mr. Speaker, I speak of the late Joseph Josiah Payne who was a Deputy Speaker in this Chamber between the years 1986 and 1991.

Mr. Payne came from a family well known...

Aside.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: A clan, indeed. I thank the Right Honourable Prime Minister, from the northern sector of Barbados. Indeed, he may well have been a member of what is sometimes known in this House of the "northern cabal." Those Honourable Members who were born, schooled and grew up and later came to represent the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. James - St. Thomas like to think that it belongs to the northern cabal. St. Andrew is a member and sometimes St. Joseph likes to masquerade as a member of that clan.

The late Joe Payne, as we knew him, and I knew him professionally - in the years when he was a Deputy Speaker, I was having a sojourn in another place - but I

have to say I always found him to be the most courteous of persons, a quiet, almost unassuming personality. I am advised and from what I know of my own knowledge, that he executed his duty as Deputy Speaker with a certain aplomb in this Chamber. He took it very seriously. I know, certainly, in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association with which he was also associated, that his passing will not, I can say with some certainty, go unremarked. I believe he was a good member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association as well.

In this Chamber he was one who lent a certain dignity. I think he understood his duty not only as a Member and his duty to his constituents but, as an officer of the House, he understood his duty and carried it out well in a way that we could be proud of.

I had some little contact with him, indeed, in his capacity as a Deputy Speaker, that I can speak to of my own knowledge. Within the ranks of the legal profession from time to time, I would have to do business with him and again always his unfailing courtesy, I think, is perhaps the quality that would have endeared him most. He was a person that you could not help but like, soft spoken, ready to help.

It distressed me very greatly, Mr. Speaker, that a few weeks ago he called me one afternoon. I had gone back to my office 'after a Cabinet meeting, indeed a Cabinet meeting at which we spoke with concern about his medical condition. I thought it almost pathetic that as soon as I got back to my office he called and said to me that he was in distress, that he needed help and somehow he thought I would be able to help him. I tried to do what I could.

I spoke to the Right Honourable Prime Minister. I spoke to the then acting Minister of Health and everything that could have been done to assist him was done. He called me back, and this was the nature of the man, to say: "Thank you" and I told him, "Do not thank me, just go quickly and I wish you the very best. We will pray for you."

It was a shocking disclosure. The news was brought to me, in fact, by the Honourable Member for St. Michael East. We were all together at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting and he brought the sad news to us.

He is going to be missed in the legal profession. I believe that even though he was not at the time of his passing a member of this Chamber he was still then a person who would have been part of the group of people that from time to time would have been consulted by Honourable Members on the Other Side. He may still have remained as a member of the wider parliamentary party on the Other Side.

I would wish, Mr. Speaker, to offer my own sympathies and the sympathies of this side to first of all the Honourable Member for St. Andrew who was a cousin within that great clan, and to Honourable Members on the Other Side and to the family, relatives and close friends of the late Joseph Josiah Payne.

Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move that the usual Resolution would pass this House and that a copy of it would be communicated to the immediate family of our late lamented former Deputy Speaker.

Thank you, Sir.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, the last occasion when the Democratic Labour Party family gathered in large numbers would have seen Joseph Josiah Payne was on the first Sunday of our Annual Conference when, despite his failing strength and all of the other great challenges that he would have faced in the past few years as a result of his illness, he nevertheless made a great effort to come to sit in the General Council and participate as fully in the activities of the party as his health would permit. 11.30a.m.

Considering the disability that he faced, I would like to add that Joe Payne made a greater contribution than some people who were in the finest of health. Joe was one of those persons who made it a point of coming up to you and touching you on the shoulder and calling you by some familiar name, familiar to him. He was one of those people who call me "Dave", which is not one of the nicknames for which I am normally known but he would tap me on the shoulder and say "Dave, how are things going?" and he was exceedingly respectful, a characteristic which the Honourable Member for St. Andrew indicated is a phenomenon in his family with which, but for a few aberrations from time to time, I would concur. The Honourable Member for St. Andrew knows that I have known the Paynes for a long time, having grown up in St. James, catching the bus to school and getting a lift sometimes from the Honourable Member for St. Andrew or getting a lift with Joe. The Honourable Member for St. Andrew used to drive, I think, a maroon 120Y, he may not remember all of that, you see. He dropped me to Bank Hall Cross Road on several occasions and we remain good friends.

Joe and I were close because in 1981, he was the baby of the Democratic Labour Party team and was viewed by the older fellows as the kind of politician who needed the assistance of those persons around who generally helped and I was asked to go to St. James North along with a group of other persons and we worked with Joe. We worked with Joe from his house. He had just finished

building it. He had recently been married and Joe welcomed us into that environment as people assisting him and with great enthusiasm he opened the doors of his home to the kind of activity that most politicians would probably like not to associate with the home environment, but Joe took all of that in his stride.

He was not successful on that occasion but he persevered and in 1986 was elected to the House of Assembly as part of the 24 members who were elected and the House so highly regarded him even at that young age, he could not have been 35 or maybe he had just turned 35, but he was so highly regarded that he was selected as Deputy Speaker and I believe those of us present here, actually there are only two, the Honourable Member for St. Peter and myself would be the only two who would have been in here when Joe was Deputy Speaker. Again with his big stride he would come into the Chamber and take his seat at the back and was unfailingly courteous to everybody, always interested in a point that you were making which he did not understand and never reticent to come to you and say "I heard you make a point, I am not sure if I understand it completely, explain it to me". That was the Joe Payne that I knew.

Whenever the Democratic Labour Party faced financial trouble and Joe Payne heard about it, he would come and offer his support and up to the time of his passing, had been one of those courageous persons who had pledged, as many others do, to assist in clearing those financial obligations. I am certain that he would want to pass that responsibility on to his very loving cousin the Honourable Member for St. Andrew.

Joe Payne and the Payne name generally is well known in the North and they bear some distinction between the North the way the constituency was divided up in 1981. In fact, it characterizes the difference between the southern part of the constituency which has been recently populated and the northern part from which the Paynes would obviously have played their more significant role. In fact, in modern times, you cannot easily single out other than a few families in the Paynes Bay area, the Fitts Village area and Holders Hill. It is difficult to identify those families who had remained in that southern part of St. James to carry on their legacy but the Paynes have remained in the northern part of St. James and have been able to find accommodation for their views and their aspirations in both political parties and, as I have said, Joe was a person who held the convictions despite great challenges and worked tirelessly on behalf of not only the people that he represented but particularly on behalf of the disadvantaged.

Many of us marvel at the fact that Joe was able to organise the very successful Rock Dundo Festival in the 1980s. He did a lot of work in the community in St. James North and it was always a great challenge because, based on voting patterns, that is an area that had not

traditionally supported the Democratic Labour Party so that with his work he was able to make a major but not impossible breakthrough in that constituency. He did not see it just as an opportunity to be amongst a list of candidates, Joe worked very hard as a Member of Parliament and faced the same frustrations as a backbencher and the same challenges as a Deputy Speaker and as a presiding officer as all of those who preceded him would have faced from time to time.

At the Bar, he was meticulous, quiet, again unassuming but never one of those lawyers from whom one would have expected anything less than the greatest of courtesy and integrity and a commitment to fairness. Joe was not one of those adversarial practitioners who felt that in the smallest of matters, in the smallest of claims he had to take time consuming and unnecessary and irritable points simply for the sake of demonstrating that he had received legal training.

There was something about Joe Payne the individual that calmed people down in moments of intensity and in moments of aggression. Joe was always interested in finding the aperture for consensus or the aperture for more sober reflection. He was not an adversarial person and to cast him in that mould would not be a correct characterisation of the Joe Payne that I knew. He was the seventh of eleven children, all of whom spoke very highly of him. His brother delivered the tribute at the service held in St. Peter which was attended by a large number of Barbadians from all parts of the island. It was a fulsome one in which he spoke about Joe's youthfulness in a family of eleven children and the role that he played in that position.

Perhaps I should add that the Democratic Labour Party has always had room in the selection of its candidates and, in propelling persons to the forefront in leadership positions and so on, a concern with individuals who have very strong community connection would come to the fore. 11.40a.m.

I believe it was based on Joe's activities in social and cultural organisations in his community that would have prepared him so admirably for politics.

Perhaps one of the biggest criticisms that some people have of a lot of younger potential politicians is not the question of paying dues in political parties but the fact that they have not had very strong community contact, that they have not been involved in any major social or political movements and that they have not been able even in the areas in which they live to make a major impression on the lives of the people far less those whom they wish to represent. Fortunately this House has not had that experience but we should be looking to draw on more

people like Joe Payne who would have been members of youth and community organisations and who would have served at that level and learnt tolerance working with others, putting the interest of your friends and persons who live around you first. Those were some of the fine qualities that Joe possessed.

To his wife Patricia who is equally as meticulous, quiet and unassuming as he was, as well as his two young sons both of whom obviously must have been faced with great challenges at the time of Joe's death as he was a young man, we extend our heartfelt sympathy and I speak on behalf of the entire family of the Democratic Labour Party.

I also extend to the entire Payne family and in particular the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, our sympathy for any loss and any pain which must have been suffered during the very difficult time and the abruptness with which Joe must have left them. The only consolation that I can say is that we were fortunate in the Democratic Labour Party to have been having our annual conference and that Joe would have had a chance to, in some small way, make contact with hundreds of supporters of the Democratic Labour Party with whom he had worked and on whose behalf he had worked throughout the years of his public service. So we extend our sympathy to the extended Payne family and to his immediate family for this loss and hope that the memory of Joe Payne will long last and create some impression on future members and presiding officers of this House. Thank you.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks on both sides of the House and since public duties required that I had to be out of the island at the time of his thanksgiving service, I wish to take this opportunity to put on record my sense of loss at his departure and to express my great sympathies to his wife and his relatives and family.

Mr. Speaker, I knew of Joe Payne before I met him. All of us who went to Coleridge and Parry School in the sixties would have heard of the great northern clan called the Paynes one of whom owned an abundance of land in the vicinity of Coleridge and Parry School and the fruits, Mr. Speaker, produced by Mr. Joe Payne's father was a source of great sustenance and support to a lot of people. But Joe Payne came to Coleridge and Parry school during its august years. There was a period in the 1960s when Coleridge and Parry was excelling at athletics. It won the school championships on two occasions and there was an attempt to perpetuate this tradition of athletic excellence. Joe Payne was known to all of us as a champion athlete. In fact he was brought to Coleridge and Parry School to help us to perpetuate a tradition which sadly, Sir, has gone by the way and has now been assumed by Combermere.

Joe Payne came to Coleridge and Parry School in the image of an athletic hero and in fact, I think, I am correct in saying that he not only perpetuated that image but that he still holds the national shotput championship. At Coleridge and Parry he not only sought to excel at athletics but he used the opportunity that was afforded to him by the school's games master to build an academic career that enabled him in later life to assume the position of an attorney-at-law.

I not only knew but was very friendly with Joe Payne at school and it is a friendship that I have maintained throughout our respective careers. I watched, Sir, his development as an attorney with great pleasure and I must say, Sir, that the Leader of the House is absolutely correct that Joe Payne was an outstanding officer of this Parliament. He had a marvelous sense of humour that he used to enrich and to enliven parliamentary debates when he spoke from his seat as the Honourable Member for St. James North but, as a presiding officer, Mr. Joe Payne brought an elegant sense of humour that could very often defuse a heated debate and also very often, Sir, put members in their place. I should just say, Sir, when we were three, we looked forward with a secret sense of delight to the occasions when Joe Payne had to take the Chair, not disrespectful of the functions of the substantive Speaker but that he did bring his own quiet, humorous, but dignified touch to the management of the affairs of the Parliament.

He was well liked as a result on all sides and I do believe, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that it can properly be said of him that this was a man who was popular throughout the society. He was popular because of his manner, because of his character, but because in a special sense, Sir, he represented a triumph over adversity, a triumph over humble conditions and he was in many respects a model representative of the northern aspiration to rise and to make something of one's life. He was therefore a natural for the Democratic Labour Party in trying to win a seat in St. James North terrain that has not always been friendly to the Democratic Labour Party. Perhaps if one had to capture his full initial acumen and contribution, Sir, it may be said of him that he perhaps was the only Dem who could win a seat in St. James North. It says something, Sir, for his personality and his community touch that he was able to go into a constituency like St. James North and prevail.

Mr. Speaker, his loss has been a tragic loss because great athletes dying at a young age conveys a sense of tragedy and I will miss his friendship. I will miss, Mr. Speaker, Sir, also the cut and thrust of our political contest which is always only conducted in the most congenial and proper spirit and therefore on this sad occasion, Mr. Speaker, I want to place on record my sadness at the loss of a friend, my acknowledgment of the loss of a patriot and

a good man who did his duty as his training and his conscience showed him the way, Sir. I thank you.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the words that have been spoken in this Assembly this morning. I start, Sir, by saying I knew 6 Joe Paynes, that is Joe the school boy, Joe the athlete, Joe the lawyer, Joe the community worker, Joe the M.P., and Joe the businessman and no one can question his ability for functioning in these 6 roles. Because, if one knew Joe Payne one would know that Joe knew all of those roles and he handled them well. 11.50a.m.

I want to say that as a young school boy at Coleridge and Parry, Sir, I was very much impressed with Joe Payne especially when he was at the Northern end of the playing field. I remember it well, Sir, that day when he stood up with a shotput in his hand and he threw it at a distance that made everyone on the field marvel. No one believed that anyone could have thrown a shotput that far. I remember there were some big, strapping men and if you know Joe in his early stage, Sir, he was very big. But, there were some bigger than he and he made them look as if they were small and weak. Joe was strong and he did well for Coleridge and Parry. He put them on the map which is true, Sir, but he did not stop there. As I said, he continued to be a lawyer, then to be a community worker and from then on to MP. But last and not least, he was also a businessman. In all those roles, I had contact with the man Joe and I found him to be a decent young man, always prepared to give you some advice. That is rather interesting because in life when people achieve a lot they tend to shy away from where they have their roots and that cannot be said about Joe Payne.

He was always ready to give you some advice and this is something that a lot of people in Barbados today can take as an example. I believe that if you have to look at the statistics within the St. James area you will see that Joe did something positive to help solve some of the crimes that were associated with the St. James area in his time. I say, Sir, that if a lot of us will make his life an example, related to what I have said before, we would have achieved a lot in life.

To his wife, I will say to her, keep strong and continue to fight. A lot of people might not recognise this, but in many of his roles, his wife was there with him, helping him and I think in life that when you have a situation like that, one should be very grateful.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe if Joe had been here and I did not get up to speak I could almost hear him asking, "why not." As your Honour has heard

and most of us, who would have known him, know he was an extremely mischievous character who spent a lot of his time making his friends feel good. I am able to say with impunity that Joe Payne was my friend.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I spent some of his last hours with him and I know, for example, that if he could he would have wanted to say to the Honourable Member for the City, "thank you" because he asked me to say that to her for reasons which she knows and which do not bear repetition here, except to say that when the time came for him to go to London and it would have been his second time, Sir, he had some doubts as to how it would be perceived by the Government and he went to the Honourable Member who immediately understood and dealt with the issue along with her colleagues. Joe was very grateful for that and I think the records should so show, because he spent time discussing with me the totality of all the possibilities as he was leaving for London.

I do not think that he would have died being sad, because even as he was going forth to a very massive undertaking, he had advice from all quarters and knew what the risks were. He also was a man who shared God and understood the way God works and therefore had no compunction about doing what he considered to be the right thing. But even as you remember Joe Payne in his death, one cannot help but have a sense of joy at having known him.

There were things about him that were absolutely unique. He has been properly lauded and I do not think that it is necessary to repeat all of the good things that have been said about him, but there are glimpses of the kindness of the man which I will always have. I recall for example, how he would patiently wait on the father of the Clerk, the late Sir Theodore Brancker. Joe Payne had almost an infinite patience. Sir Theodore in his later years would come to the odd General Council Meeting at Party Headquarters and as everyone knows he could not see toward the end of his days, but he could hear very well and he could hear almost anything said by anybody anywhere and he had this capacity to retain the exact words that had been spoken. Joe Payne would be taking him home after a long session and he would get to the point of entering the car and then remember that he was supposed to respond to somebody who was back in the hall and would retrace his steps with Joe leading him to this person so he could respond and then proceed to the car again.

It is not unknown for that to have happened once, or twice or three times in the same evening and Joe Payne had that patience which allowed him to walk with Sir Theodore, up and down anywhere he was going and always made sure that Sir Theodore did not miss the General Council meetings. Between them they chose which meeting

Sir Theodore would attend after consultation. Sir Theodore would check very meticulously about the agenda, who was likely to be there and what levels of contributions were likely to be made from the floor and whether it was worthwhile to go and sit for two hours to hear it. So when Sir Theodore turned up, one felt that whichever meeting was on was going to be a good meeting. There is more to that, Sir, but the records of the House ought not to carry every secret there is about every political party's activities.

I was also very struck with the forthrightness with which his brother, who did the eulogy at his service, was able to speak both at the service and subsequently and before about aspects of Joe's life which must have been delightful for his brothers and sisters in adulthood, but have been quite annoying when they were young. Joe Payne remembered those things with a certain twinkle in the eye and you cannot help thinking that, wherever he has gone, he is going to continue in the same way, teasing people in the full knowledge that he is teasing them and getting a pristine joy out of their reaction.

Another thing that one cannot help remembering about Joe Payne is his tremendous generosity. Joe had a capacity to understand people at a level that is written about but very seldom witnessed. I recall a constituent of mine that lived in Lands End, who is now departed, a very difficult human being and he for some reason latched on to Joe Payne as a lawyer about 20 years earlier. He had continued with Joe spasmodically over the 20-year period. When he became ill and I asked him if he had a lawyer of record, which your Honour knows that is what we do if they ask us for help. He said he has a lawyer of record and his name is Joe Payne. I asked when you say a lawyer of record, he said, "well for the last 20 years he has been doing a lot of work for me but I have not paid him yet." When I got in touch with Joe, he said "Oh, yes, he is my friend from Lands End." We discussed it until finally Joe had to go the hospital to do what they call a bedside will for the gentleman who sought at that point to recompense his lawyer for all the work he had done. 12.00 noon

I recall very vividly Joe saying to me that there is no way he would allow any such thing to occur because he had met this man and this man had done a kindness for him when he first opened his office as a lawyer and he felt duty bound over the years to demonstrate his own reaction to the kindness which this man had done.

Mr. Speaker, I have had to put it in those terms to protect both of the parties, but it was for me a clear indication that among the high qualities Joe Payne had, generosity was in the first level of his operations as a person.

He also had a tremendous care for his children and, as one of the eulogists indicated, we hope that the children will not suffer unduly the difficulties which come as they lose a parent at this crucial point in their lives.

One takes note of the broad bosom of the Payne family in St. James. One takes note that throughout all the difficulties of political opposition, there *has* never been any doubt in anybody's mind who has seen the Payne family at work that the family ties superseded all others and all else. It is a great joy to know that Barbados, a small country like this, can produce families, and more particularly black families, who can establish what I choose to call a "dynasty" in an area starting from almost zero and progressing to the point where they can be observed with admiration on both sides of the political divide.

So, to the entire Payne family, and especially the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, and the more immediate family of the late Joe Payne, I would, from this Floor, for the record extend the condolences of the people of St. Michael West, and my own family, on this very sad occasion.

For me personally I have had a lot of tragedy in my life but Joe Payne is someone whom I shall miss dearly because conversations with Joe Payne were the essence of honesty and decency. It is a very difficult quality to find in humans in this time of our life. It is an extremely rare quality that one finds where honesty is the major bulwark of the person's character. That I shall miss dearly and I hope that he will find eternal rest with his Maker whom I am sure he understood and who I am sure understood him.

I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Mr. Speaker, I have known Joe Payne as a gentleman, a very quiet, very unassuming personality and, indeed, unoffensive. I worked with him in the law courts. I worked against him in the law courts and even at the end of a case where, perhaps, tempers might have flared, Joe remained calm, composed and clearly he was never antagonistic.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people seem to think that there is something devious or dishonest about the politicians but I would like to say that Joe Payne gave the lie to that perception. He was one of those politicians who came through as being very popular, very upright and very easy to deal with.

In the area of sports and culture, he took a very avid interest. Many a Monday morning Joe Payne would discuss with me "how my boys did" and by that he meant how St. Catherine's performed. He could tell me how he thought they would do against Spartan, against Empire and that really and truly he was a St. Catherine's man at heart.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the time that he broke the Interschool shotput record. The favourite then was a chap from St. Philip by the name of Davy Mason, very tough, almost twice the size of Joe Payne, and no one even thought that Mason could have been beaten, but Joe Payne managed to throw the shot almost time and a half to what Mason did. It is a record which, I think, remains even to this day.

I personally believe, Mr. Speaker, that if Joe Payne was exposed to proper training and proper coaching, he might have been an international shotputter because he seemed to have the flair and technique for that particular discipline.

He also, as has been said, had a very great sense of humour. I recall one night seeing him leave what he said was his favourite tent, the Untouchables tent. I wondered why he was leaving that early. He replied to me: "the best thing for me to do is to leave" because at that time Barbados' most popular MC was singing a song called "No Bajan" which was a tongue in cheek song about the politicians who had non-Barbadian wives. Joe said: "I am leaving because if he knows that my wife is no Bajan he will add me onto the song."

Clearly, this was a man who carried an ailment for many a year and did it virtually without protest because he was strong both physically and mentally.

In losing Joe Payne, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I have lost a friend. My condolences go to his wife and family.

Thank you.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be remiss of me if I did not make a comment on my dear friend, one whom I held in very high regard and one who always said to me that he was a Joseph. He said I should try to let them use my proper name instead of saying that I am the other Johnny in Parliament. 12.10 p.m.

I think that Barbados has lost a tremendous young person who really from a very early age was fixed in his mind about providing service to other people. He had a strange fixation about delivering service to other people and I wondered in the early 1980s why such a young man would have had such a passion to represent people at such an early age when he could have been engaging himself in developing his own personal life but at that stage he felt that the priority was to serve and to contribute to nation building as a whole. A wonderful personality! When you think that this young man took on a challenge in a traditional stronghold of the Barbados Labour Party and worked his way into the hearts of the people of

St. James North, I think that achievement in itself is a tremendous testimony of the kind of quality that young man possessed at that time.

Joe Payne was not restricted, Mr. Speaker, to St. James or St. James North or to St. Peter or to St. Lucy or to that particular area in the North. In St. Michael East, the constituency that I have the pleasure to represent, Joe Payne was very well known and very well loved. He had the ability to embrace many people from all walks of life but in St. Michael East, he always attended every single function that we had and in addition to that he would attend weddings, christenings, birthdays and would remember a number of persons in that particular area in the Ivy and Government Hill. I am sure that many of them who went to pay their respects to him would want me to say that they would certainly miss him tremendously as we moan his death.

The Honourable Member for the City did indicate that I learnt of his death while I was travelling on my way to Mauritius to attend the CPA conference and I telephoned home from the aircraft and I heard that he had died when I was 30 000 feet in the air, so I was able to relate the news when I actually got to Mauritius. I had been talking to Joe the week before he left to go to England and I was very disturbed. That was the last conversation that I had with him and I sensed that he was in deep trouble because his breathing was obviously affected and you could tell that he had a serious problem but all through that conversation, his focus was still on delivering service to people. He raised with me the question of representation for St. James North and I do not think he raised it in a pejorative context. He suggested that he still had an interest in trying to serve the people even though he knew that he was probably not in the best of health, yet he had a burning desire still to be a representative and still to serve the people of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, that had a tremendous impact on me because many politicians are viewed with contempt in this country and we speak glowingly about each other in times of death and it is unfortunate that we cannot speak in these terms when we are in a political arena where we can discuss issues without being personal. Certainly I hope that the day will come or maybe by his own death, we will learn a lesson that we can speak glowingly of him today and that we should have been saying these things about him when he was alive so that he would still have been the representative of St. James North to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I really must indicate as well that Joe had a tremendous love for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. During 1989 when the 350th anniversary of our Parliament was celebrated and we had the honour of hosting the annual CPA conference, Joe Payne was able to address the plenary session of that

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference and he was always very proud of the fact that he had the opportunity to speak and to deliver an address at that conference. It was one of the highlights of his parliamentary life. It was co-incidental that when the news broke through the Chairman here from Barbados, the Honourable Billie Miller, when the news was announced in Mauritius, the Honourable Member for the City will attest to the many comments of people who said that they knew Joe Payne and that they will certainly miss him and appreciated the association that they would have had with him. It struck me that so far away there were so many people who still knew the former Deputy Speaker of our Barbados Parliament. I would not say that they knew him because of his contribution or the speech that he made during that conference but he had a way of associating himself and being a friend of many people from all walks of life and from many, many countries.

I certainly will recall his generosity where he was always willing to give and as a comrade, as the Member of Parliament for St. Michael West said during the appreciation that he delivered, during his latter days he still found it possible to make a contribution and at his own expense to ensure that the Democratic Labour Party, a party that he deeply loved and respected was able to get through the annual conference this year. I am glad that he had the opportunity to at least have that final moment with us as we gathered in a Democratic Labour Party family to plan our activities for the future development of the lives of our Barbadian people.

I will miss him, I loved and respected him during his lifetime. He was a decent person, a person who freely served and gave of himself to others, a tremendous character in a person wanting to be a Parliamentarian who was prepared to put people and development before himself, was not annoyed when rejected and still continued and that is a tremendous personality.

I think the message in all of this is that to serve is more important than to be accepted. I think we would want to, certainly from my family we would want to say: We will miss you Joe, we certainly loved you during your lifetime and we hope that your life will be an example for many young Barbadians to follow and that they should seek to prioritise service and fellowship with their fellow Barbadians that would remain a hallmark to the outstanding short life of Joseph Josiah Payne.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I am obliged to you.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to associate this Honourable Chair with all the sentiments expressed. My family and I join with all Honourable Members in expressing our sincerest condolences to the family of the late Joe Payne.

This House with acclaim, accepts the Resolution of sympathy and so instructs that the appropriate Resolution be sent to the grieving family.

As a mark of respect to the passing of the late Honourable former Member, I now would invite all Honourable Members to join with me in observing one minute's silence.

A one minute silence was observed by the House.
12.20 p.m.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, still on the matter of obituaries, the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central lost his father some short while ago. We move from North to South. I cannot claim to have known the late Mr. Edghill but I can claim to have heard much of him. His reputation always went before him. In fact he would have been regarded as one of the great patriarchs of Christ Church.

A number of us attended the funeral at the Christ Church Parish Church with an interesting cross section of Barbadian business life, social life, political life, a number of the members of the immediate family. The brothers and the sisters of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central were there and it was clear evidence to us all that this was a large closely-knit, warm family closing ranks in its hour of grief and sorrow.

The reality is, Sir, that many of us in this Honourable Chamber are at that stage in our lives when we are indeed losing our parents, fathers and mothers, even some of our siblings. As I always say on these occasions it is for me, someone who lost a parent at a very early age, still an impressive occasion that you celebrate the life of a parent that one has had for a long time well into one's forties and fifties and in some cases even into one's sixties. It is a privilege with which some of us are visited. But the wonderful and loving and warm manner in which the eulogy was delivered by a brother of the Honourable Member and son of their deceased father told us a lot, not only about the late patriarch of the family but about a certain quality of life in a certain quarter of Christ Church during a certain period of the 20th century.

People say that Barbados is a tiny place, a minuscule place and in 166 square miles non-Barbadians find it very difficult to believe that there can be different nuances of speech. Traditionally it is accepted that the people in St. Lucy speak with an accent that is peculiar to St. Lucy. Indeed the people of St. Philip who call themselves Philippians speak with a decidedly Philippian accent. I once had a legal secretary from there so I am fairly familiar with it, in fact the people of "St. Philop" as she would put it. But in Christ Church this has been written now in poetry, in novels. Austin "Tom" Clarke in one of his novels, I

think, portrayed a very realistic and genuine portrait of life in that part of Christ Church in which the Edghills grew up. So that even as this great patriot and patriarch was taking his leave of us he was showing to, certainly my generation, and I believe, I hope, the generation coming after me because some of his grandchildren were there, he was showing to us, even as he took his leave, an aspect of life in Barbados.

This was clearly one of those strong dominant fathers who led his family, who supported his family, who brought them from one social stratum to another. We saw children, men and women now, who were of the professions which dominated in the 1950s and 1960s. The Honourable Member we know is a noted pharmacist so it spoke of an era in Barbados where parents sacrificed much and were firm in the way they conducted family affairs so that many of us in Barbados and certainly in this Chamber have become the men and women that we are today, men and women with a sense of civic responsibility, men and women with a sense of community commitment and men and women who are not afraid to give back to the communities that nurtured us.

I think that is what I learnt about this man right there at the funeral service, that he was one who would have given back, not only through his own effort and his own labour, but through his children by the way in which he nurtured them and the way in which he taught them, had given back, particularly to the communities in Christ Church and naturally by extension to Barbados a great gift.

It is this Barbadian psyche, it is this Barbadian personality which is looked upon with some degree of envy, Mr. Speaker, Sir, in other parts of the Caribbean and even beyond the Caribbean where there are Barbadian communities abroad. These are the characteristics which mark us out as Bajans and I understood on that occasion that this was the kind of person the late Mr. Edghill was.

I am sorry that I was not one of those Christ Church people who would have known him but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer on my own behalf and on behalf of the Members on this side, to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and his brothers and sisters and his mother and the extended family our sympathy on the passing of their great father. 12.30 p.m.

Hon. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to second this Resolution on behalf of the Members on this side and the family of the Democratic Labour Party and to extend our sympathy to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central on the passing of his father.

I do not claim to have any knowledge of his father other than reading the obituary and that is probably one of the best ways that one can make connection

between people whom you meet on a daily basis and the deceased. I was able to paint a sketchy picture of the contribution which his father must have made to Barbados through the lives of his children and his in-laws, many of whom have had associations with this Parliament, in areas of the business community and now with politics itself.

I hope that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central is able to draw on the strength of the lessons which his father passed on to him and that he will enjoy many happy memories of his father's life and contribution in whatever way to Barbados.

Regrettably I was not able to attend the funeral myself, but I know the Democratic Labour Party was represented and I reiterate that despite my absence, the Party's feelings of sympathy and condolence are extended to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central and to his extended family.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had the privilege of knowing the Honourable Member's father for a very long period of time even before I entered politics in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

He lived in the Maxwell, St. Lawrence area, an area that I frequented on a daily basis, because in those days the bus that served Christ Church stopped at what was then the house of the late John Beckles and anyone living to the East of that area had to walk from there to Oistins and around. When one walked that distance, one came into contact with the business of the late Mr. Edghill.

He was a man of profound character. That is illustrated by the fact that despite his living under the shadow of Graeme Hall Heights which was dominated in those days by a different political party, he as a shop keeper was never afraid to let it be known that he was a Member of the Grantley Adams' Party, as he would call it, and that he was in favour of all the values that that political party proposed.

When I joined the Barbados Labour Party in 1966, his shop was then at the entrance to what is now the Roman Catholic Church. It is there that on a daily basis, and particularly on weekends, I went to speak with him and others to purchase the Beacon newspaper, for he was the distributor of the Beacon newspaper in the Christ Church area. That in itself was also an exhibition of his courage. It took a brave man to decide that he would distribute the Beacon in those days in that area of Christ Church.

But he used to hold court there and Alexander Hoyos, the late Gordon Bell and any of the other people in Christ Church who supported the Barbados Labour Party and the progressive movement would meet at his shop. A man of

quiet disposition, but of great authority. Occasionally, when we had the opportunity to meet with him at his home, one could not fail to recognise the great respect which he commanded in his household. From his beloved wife to all of his children, he was a father figure whose authority was respected. So too was that authority recognised among people in the immediate and surrounding areas. He was truly a stalwart in the parish of Christ Church. He was one of those Barbadians, as the Honourable Leader of the House has said, who was privileged to witness a tremendous change in the fortune of himself and the members of his family during the course of his lifetime.

No doubt as a young man he struggled in the context of the then economic circumstances, but he was privileged to have been able to educate his children, to witness them rising, socially, academically and economically in the world and he was very proud of them and they, in turn, were very proud of him. As time went on and he became older and suffered disability - I believe he was diabetic: he lost one of his legs - notwithstanding that, he was still able periodically to communicate with his friends and with others and particularly those whom he regarded as his brothers in politics, namely people who supported the same political cause as he did.

The Barbados Labour Party has lost a true friend and one of our stalwarts, one of those who has done a tremendous amount to ensure that the fortunes of the Barbados Labour Party in that part of Barbados changed. It is generally known that until 1966, except for a short period of time when the then Honourable Member for Christ Church proclaimed that he was a member of the Barbados Labour Party, the Barbados Labour Party was never able to win the seats in Christ Church. But it was through the efforts of people like the late Mr. Edghill in that part of Christ Church that we were able to gain enough support to combine with our support in the traditional areas of St. Patricks and the East of Christ Church to win a seat. I was a primary beneficiary of his activity and I am deeply grateful for all of the unrewarded help that he gave the Barbados Labour Party and myself in particular.

I join with others, Sir, in extending my sympathy to the members of his family and all of his friends in Christ Church. I know that he lived a long and useful life and I am sure that all of them are proud, as I am, of the contribution that he made in Barbados. 12.40 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express the deepest condolence of my family and myself to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West Central, the whole of the Edghill family, both the immediate family and the extended family, the husbands and wives of their children and to Mrs. Edghill on the passing of Mr. Edghill.

I have known him since I was a young boy growing up in the Christ Church area. He was a man who gave service. Sometimes persons who give service at the level at which he gave service are not adequately recognised in our community. But he had the same characteristics as the lady who adopted me and whose influence I hope, will remain with me all my life. Those are the real people of Barbados. They do not often come to national prominence but they undertake national performance.

Mr. Edghill helped the poor from his own meagre resources. He gave freely to children in need and he assisted families who sometimes had no means of supporting themselves. His business thrived but people do not recognise that he showed thrift to make his business thrive, and people do not often recall that when there were many people in the community, customers of his, some not customers, without food, Mr. Edghill would extend credit to them, sometimes credit that was never repaid.

His has been a fascinating life in some respects, Sir. He travelled abroad when he was a young man. He gave service at the technical level of carpentry. He was an outstanding fisherman. He did social work in St. Lawrence, Bath Village and in Maxwell. He challenged the conservatism of the time and the aristocracy in his quiet way, and was able to show that what mattered was a social democratic society in which equality was important and that each one who had an opportunity should be able to use the opportunity for a better quality of life.

It was also within his near family that his influence was very strongly felt. From a very humble beginning and scarce resources he was able to nurture a family that has been closely knit and has imbibed the qualities which he himself exhibited. I believe, Sir, that such people are truly the great of Barbados.

He made an outstanding contribution as my friend the Honourable Member for Christ Church South has said, to the political life, not only of Christ Church but of wider Barbados. He was one of the forerunners who charted the way for those of us who have come later to carry on the beacon of a great party and a great political movement, and I salute him as such.

I express my heartfelt sorrow at his passing. I knew him both in a professional and in a social context, and it was an experience from which I have profited.

Thank you.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: Mr. Speaker, the late Adesta Whitfield Edghill was one of those persons in the Christ Church area who will long be remembered. He was a shining light for the people of Christ Church. He was one of those people who represented the proud,

independent spirit of many of the good people of the Christ Church area.

Mr. Speaker, he engaged in many of the activities which people with discipline, people who want to engage in hard work and people who believe that success comes through hard work have engaged in, having tried fishing, vending, having tried a skill such as carpentry and also himself having been deeply involved in the Church.

Sir, he had a spirit of selflessness, a charitable spirit, one which commended him to many people because he was the kind of person who would give to others who did not have even though he did not have much. Sir, I know many of his children and I see them manifesting this same spirit, quiet in demeanour but yet deep in spirit, having a sense of commitment to their community, a sense of giving and fair play.

I therefore feel proud to be associated with this family, as I have been for years. I think that the children of the late Adesta Whitfield Edghill will long live to represent the spirit of this gentleman.

I believe, Sir, that, perhaps, if they have sins their sins are perhaps those of being too charitable, being too giving. They would give, perhaps, their last shirt and walk naked. This is the kind of spirit that this country needs to have especially at this time.

I therefore want to give my sympathy to all the family members. Some are my constituents too. I want to give my condolences openly now in Parliament to the family of the late Adesta Whitfield Edghill, and I now support this Resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to associate this Honourable Chair with the sentiments expressed. My family and I join with Honourable Members in expressing our sincerest condolences to the family of the deceased.

This House with acclaim accepts the Resolution of sympathy and so instructs that the appropriate Resolution be sent to the family.

As a mark of respect I now invite all Honourable Members to join with me in observing one minute's silence.

The House stood for one minute's silence.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 2.00 o'clock this afternoon.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 2.00 p.m. today was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 12.50 p.m.

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is in session.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am obliged to draw it to Your Honour's attention that the office of Chairman of Committees of this Honourable House of Assembly is now vacant. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have consulted on this matter and as I am advised that the House is disposed to elect to the high office of Chairman of Committees of the Honourable House Assembly the Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central.

Mr. SPEAKER: If such be the will of the House, then so be it.

Mr. D. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Opposition and the Government side for putting that trust in me. It was obviously unanimous and I intend to do my best and I hope that everyone will follow suit by doing their best in helping me to do a good job. I am quite sure that with the type of people in here things will go well in the future.

I thank you.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, 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. D. A. C. SIMMONS: I beg to second that.

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

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

ORDER NO. 8 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SIX MEN'S BAY, ST. PETER FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move this Resolution for the acquisition of 27 acres of land at Six Men's in the parish of St. Peter for the purpose of housing development.

Mr. Speaker, there is a long history to this particular Resolution. In 1986, during a period of a previous Barbados Labour Party administration, the Government of the day had decided to acquire this land to accommodate persons living near the foreshore, tenants who were affected by severe marine erosion at the time. You will also recall that under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, lands near the foreshore were exempted from those parcels of land of which a person could become a qualified tenant and get the benefit of the Act in having the option to purchase their lot under that progressive legislation.

For some strange reason, Mr. Speaker, after the Barbados Labour Party administration demitted office in 1986, the last administration decided to abandon that acquisition. The abandonment of that acquisition literally caused chaos in that particular tenantry. You had a situation where Government had already made definite plans to place persons on lands in accordance with certain defined plans and then after the abandonment you had those persons who were normally qualified tenants, persons who were paying rent for as long, in some cases, as 40 years to the management of Alleynedale Plantation not knowing where to go or what to do.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, you had persons from other parts of Barbados hearing about this vast acreage of land because we are talking about 27 acres which had become vacant and where there was very little order. As a result a number of persons from all over Barbados, including persons from outside of* Barbados, because if you go down there sometimes you would believe that you are living in St. Lucia or Guyana or St. Vincent, these people came and squatted in this particular area. I am not surprised that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West would not want to hear this so you had a situation, Mr. Speaker, where there were as many as 161 tenants and squatters combined and the Government of the day or rather the last administration failed for some strange reason to carry out the mandate of the people because in acquiring that land, the earlier Barbados Labour Party administration between 1976 and 1986 had not only satisfied a promise to the people in that area but were complying with the commitment to the people of St. Peter and for some strange reason that commitment was not followed through.

There were 161 tenants and squatters combined, persons who had been paying rent in some cases as I said for over 40 years not knowing where to go and what made the situation worse, Mr. Speaker, was that the landlord himself, the person who subsequently owned the land was then placed in a difficult situation because even though the last administration had changed the decision to acquire the land the landlord to whom the land was handed back was in a difficult position in that he could not develop the land without actually going to Town Planning and because

of the way the land was laid out, the settlement that was planned, he was not to deliver a conveyance to any of these 161 persons on the land and that is why the situation was so chaotic.

What, Mr. Speaker, was even worse about the situation was that even though he was in that position, in order to prove to himself and to tell the world of Six Men's that he was the owner of the land, he then proceeded to create fear in the Six Men's community and one cannot blame him. He filed writs in the Supreme Court asking the squatters and tenants to leave the land. Now, even though one cannot blame him and one would have sympathy with the tenants, he found himself in a situation where if he allowed them to remain on the land for a period in excess of ten years, it would mean that he would no longer be able to claim title because of the doctrine of adverse possession. They themselves, knowing that they were not the rightful owners of the land and had no intention whatsoever of getting the land by that means, were in a position where they did not want to give up the land but at the same time they did not want to have a title which their consciences dictated that they should not have.

Mr. Speaker, the only solution - and this is the solution even if for whatever reason the last administration felt that they should have abandoned the acquisition - the circumstances should have dictated was that reason should have prevailed and they should have gone back on their decision to abandon the acquisition and instead to acquire the land. So Mr. Speaker, the only solution at this time is for the Government to acquire that land, the whole 27 acres, take the landlord out of his dilemma of not being able to deliver a conveyance to those persons because obviously he would have to go through the expense of Town & Country Planning. 2.15 p.m.

My understanding is that he is an old man and would not even live to see, as you would know, the fruits of his labour. I am speaking of an old term, Mr. Speaker. So we, with this acquisition, Mr. Speaker, would be able to have a completely new realignment. We would be able to deliver a conveyance to all the persons in that tenantry. We would be able, Mr. Speaker, as a Government to control and rationalise development of the tenantry in an ordered way. It is going to mean, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to send in the surveyors again. There are a number of persons whose houses are built straddling areas of 2 lots. There are houses that are in the centre of water courses. All of these things we will need to do and as a Government, Mr. Speaker, we are also committed to giving those persons who are tenants on that land, the same rights that they would have had to purchase the land under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. When I say under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, I mean no matter what is the cost

to Government, I mean at 10 cents per square foot. This, Mr. Speaker, would not apply to squatters, some of those people who moved on the land as recently as a few months ago. But persons who had the right to purchase under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, those qualified tenants would be entitled to purchase at 10 cents a square foot.

We would be able, Mr. Speaker, to control the illegal squatting and regularise the tenancies. We would be able to know who are the squatters and who are the real tenants. We have already done a survey of the entire area and that information is within the Ministry of Housing although from time to time, because of the chaos that has been created as a result of the failure of the last administration not to follow through with the acquisition, these squatters are rising month by month.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, to provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities like roads and waterborne facilities. We have a situation where, in some of these areas, because of the difficulty of the public utilities companies, Barbados Light and Power and the Barbados Water Authority not knowing exactly where to locate mains and poles, some people, especially the most recent additions, are without these facilities and it is hoped that we would be able to have an orderly and structured development once we have completed this.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, to create the opportunity for householders to purchase the parcels of land on which their houses are sited as I indicated. I just do not mean to purchase at any price, I would like to repeat, those qualified tenants under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act. It is strange that as a previous Barbados Labour Party administration is the same administration that brought the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act to benefit persons like these same poor people in that area, we are hoping that we would be able to give back those persons the same rights that were taken away from them when the abandonment took place. I cannot repeat it often enough, Mr. Speaker, that they will be allowed to purchase the land at 10 cents per square foot.

We also feel, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to stop the illegal squatting. It is estimated that we could probably, in addition to the 161 houses that are already on the site, that we could actually get in another 100 lots and it is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that persons in dire need within the St. Peter area will be able to be relocated in this area. That would also include the road in St. Lucy which, I understand, the Ministry of Public Works is planning to rename Kellman Road, the Judge Gap.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of persons who have been dislocated as a result of the amendments which

were also made by the last administration to the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act where persons who have been living on sites that have been subdivided in lots of less than 5 tenants lost their right to purchase. Those persons have been dislocated and even though that Government made, in the legislation, provision for compensation a corresponding provision was not made for house lots. We hope that with this 100 additional lots we would be able to provide for those persons.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we are hoping as I indicated earlier that we would be able to compensate or to take the landlord out of his dilemma and to pay him for this acquisition as soon as possible, as soon as the process has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that when this process has been finalised we will come back to Parliament to formally vest the lands in the National Housing Corporation so that the National Housing Corporation would be the agency for ensuring that Government's policy is carried out.

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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I beg to second that, Sir, and I reserve my right to speak.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the piece of land that we are dealing with today, Sir, stretches to the area where we now call Port St. Charles to the South and the Judge Gap to the North. I am very glad, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South has now taken his seat because there is a lot to be said in this debate today, Sir.

It is quite interesting, Sir, that when praise is being showered that Port St. Charles will receive that praise but, Sir, a man by the name of Mr. Broomes should really be the man today getting the praise for the Marina in St. Peter because it was his idea, Sir. He was the one who first touted the idea about a Marina in the north of Barbados and it is on that same land that we are now debating whether that land should be the marina or whether it should go to housing.

I am very clear in mind, Sir, and I honestly believe that in this country we must decide what is the best commercial land and we must decide what is the best housing land and we have a serious conflict here today, Sir. Firstly I am in support of the people of Six Men's getting land and I wish to say that from the outset. The people of Six Men's are entitled to have land and they are entitled to have land like what I have said previously, where Government is prepared to take up land and put in the necessary infrastructure and give them that land.

I think it is unfair for a Minister to get up in this House and behave as though we are dealing with a piece of tenantry land as it stands under the Tenancies Act. It is unfair.

As you know, Sir, the Tenancies Act does not allow people to own land that is abounding the sea and this is not just a normal piece of tenantry land this is a special piece of tenantry land. 2.25 p.m.

I think, Sir, that instead of the Minister coming here today to compulsorily acquire this land he should be coming here today and telling the people of Barbados that the Government has made a decision and they have located a piece of land somewhere in St. Peter where they will put in the necessary infrastructure, where they will add on certain things to the houses of the people and give those people rights to land that they are entitled to.

But honestly do not believe, Sir, that the people of Six Men's should be entitled to the land at Six Men's but they should be entitled to land belonging to the Government and this land belongs to a poor man, a poor man who has been able to attract investment as high as US\$100 million to build a cruise facility at Mount Six Men's but he is being deprived, whereas to the South someone else can attract that investment and is given a golden handshake.

We are in a serious situation in this country, Sir. Because it is unfair for Mr. Broomes to be deprived of his investment whereas other people to the South are given handshakes for their investments. I am saying Sir, as I said in the Special Development Debate, that the Special Development should run from Gibbs in St. Peter straight down to the Arawak Cement Plant...

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: ...or St. Lucy on the whole. I support the Honourable Member for Christ Church South, because he knows well what he speaks of. I am saying, Sir, that we are in a serious situation and I will repeat this all the time. That the people who are now squatting and the people who are entitled to lots at Mount Six Men's should be relocated somewhere else.

I want the Prime Minister to seriously study this, because you cannot develop Speightstown in the way you are talking about developing Speightstown and cut it off at Six Men's by the Manning, Wilkinson and Challenor building. You must allow that development to spread throughout St. Lucy and you are depriving the people and even the same people at Six Men's of getting proper job opportunities. Because, I am convinced, Sir, that if the development which is planned for Six Men's is done,

the same people at Six Men's will be the main beneficiaries. We are in an era today, Sir, where the main problem in Barbados is the problem of jobs and we are depriving the same people that they want to help of getting an opportunity to get jobs.

Can you imagine, Sir, the project that was planned for Six Men's if that is stopped, the number of jobs that the people of Six Men's will be deprived of, Sir? As I said, I have no problem with the people of Six Men's getting house lots and I want the Prime Minister to rethink this one. Because I will support him if he decides to acquire land somewhere else, but I will not allow him to come in here with his Minister, Sir, and acquire the land at Mount Six Men's. Because, if you look at the true economic use of that land, Sir, he will be depriving Barbados of a right for totally utilising land that has a better usage.

Housing can be anywhere, Sir, but you cannot get a port development anywhere, Sir, and that is a point we must keep in our heads. If the Prime Minister cannot find the right piece of land in his constituency, can I identify a piece of land not far away. I can show him a piece of land not far away on the other side of the Judge Gap which will be suitable for relocating the people of Six Men's and they will still have all of the necessary amenities that they need.

There is land at Colleton, right down under the Hill that can easily be compulsorily acquired from the Wards. The people of Six Men's can easily be relocated and they will not be far away from where they are accustomed to living. It would have no effect on them, Sir, because what Government would then have to do, is to make sure that they spend enough to ensure that the end product is better than what they had originally. So I am saying, Sir, that the people of Six Men's can be winners in two ways. They can get the port development and they can still get their house lots.

So when the Honourable Member from St. Andrew comes in here and gives the impression that he is relieving the owner of Mount Six Men's of his problems, I am saying that it cannot be accepted to be the truth. Because everybody knows that since the 1970s the Broomes family has been trying to put a marine development in Six Men's. And what is also astonishing is that when the idea was first touted there were people laughing at Mr. Broomes and that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. People said it could not happen, but all of a sudden the other marina has come along and can be developed.

So we have to ask ourselves, Sir, if certain people have special rights in Barbados and other people do not have rights. It is clear to me, Sir, that if Mr. Broomes thinks about building a marina, something is wrong with his head.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: It seems so. But, if somebody else thinks about a marina, a beautiful idea. I am saying, Sir, I have no problem with the people who own Port St. Charles Marina, neither do I have a problem with Mr. Broomes and I honestly believe that he should be entitled to have his marina the same way the people down the street are entitled to have theirs. I am saying the same way they were not deprived. Mr. Broomes should not be deprived of having his development. I am also aware that there is a US\$100 million investment for Mount Six Men's. We talk a lot about Six Men's but the true name is really Mount Six Men's. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Broomes should be given good reasons why he cannot have his marina.

Do you know what is interesting, Sir? Port St. Charles Development wanted to buy land the other side of the road. Do you know what was the price, Sir? Forty dollars per square foot was asked. Do you know Mount Six Men's is the other side of the road of Port St. Charles too? I want to know the level of compensation that Mr. Broomes will be given for his land. Because, his land is more valuable than the one the other side of the road. His land runs to the sea also, Sir.

The Honourable Minister talked about in 1986, but I hope the peppercorn compensation that was offered to him then will not be offered now. I am in here in 1997 and I will be supporting Mr. Broomes in this matter. I feel that anytime you have an idea and you are deprived of the idea you should be paid royalties for your idea. Mr. Broomes deserves to have some royalties for his idea because he was the first person who touted the marina. As I said, I have no problems with the people who have it now, but the history and the record must be set straight. After listening to the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, no one in this Assembly would have gotten the impression that a marina was originally planned at Mount Six Men's, a marina and a port facility. I want to know what is the position today. Is the Minister that Mr. Broomes cannot have his Port Facility anymore? Those are the questions I would like to be answered, Sir. I would also like to know the level of compensation that they are prepared to pay Mr. Broomes for his land. Because, you cannot deprive a man of his gold basket and then expect him to take ashes in compensation for his gold. The same way that you would not do it to others, you cannot do it to Mr. Broomes.

Mr. Broomes is a hard working black man in this country. I remember him well working the plantation up the hill and I think he is entitled to get some gold. Do you know the reason why St. James was called the gold coast is because it is on the beach? It is beach land on the gold coast and Mr. Broomes has some of that land where

the rich and the famous would like to put their hands on it, Sir. Mr. Broomes would like to get some of that gold.

I hope that if Government decides, Sir, that it is their best interest to acquire that piece of land that they will be compensating Mr. Broomes at the right level of compensation he deserves. It is prime commercial land. The land we are speaking about is no tenantry land. So anybody who comes in here talking about Mr. Broomes has tenantry land, is misleading this Assembly. The Act does not allow that land to be called tenantry land. The same way you cannot go down by the Royal Pavilion and call the land down by Royal Pavilion tenantry land, you cannot call the land in Six Men's tenantry land. I think it is rather disgraceful to hear the description of that land. It makes me wonder, Sir, if that land, Sir, as to make people believe that it has no value, because that was the interpretation previously in 1981 that tenantry land was supposed to be land that the plantations do not want and here now we are coming to saying that there is land at Six Men's where the owners do not want and people want. That is not true? It is good commercial land, Sir. 2.35 p.m.

I know, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Christ Church South would share that view. He knows land well and he knows the value of land well. I am saying that if that land is allowed to go the channel it is going, it is going to have a serious effect on the compensation for properties beyond the Judge Gap because if that land was approved as commercial land suitable for a marina or a port, the people would then be able to sell their properties further down at a much higher price and that is something we have to bear in mind. That is a point, Sir, that we must consider.

I will not allow any Minister to come in here and devalue the land of my people in the constituency of St. Lucy because the same way the people around Port St. Charles want \$40 a square foot, I feel a development like the one at Six Men's would give us the people of St. Lucy \$40 a square foot for our land too so I am not going to allow anybody to come in here and feel they can just come to the north of Barbados and describe land as rab land as though it does not have any value. That cannot be tolerated.

I am saying to the Prime Minister that if he feels, and I support him on this, to go at Colleton - below Colleton House there is a large area of land to the west of Colleton Great House where these people can be adequately relocated and given the necessary facilities. I must make that point. It is very important for me to make that point because we cannot behave as if we do not have alternative land.

If we did not have alternative land, I would have to support this but we have alternative land. That is why I cannot support it because the people of Six Men's are good people. I am telling you that. The Prime Minister might not know this. I used to go fishing with those people. I used to spend many nights down there going out in their moses so I have nothing against the people of Six Men's. I expect them to be treated fairly and if the Barbados Labour Party does not treat them fairly, I will come and do it myself if I ever get the authority to do it.

It is not a problem that I have something against the people of Six Men's. What I am trying to do is to represent their interest and if we relocate the people of Six Men's, we would not have to talk about realigning boundaries, putting in new amenities and all of that. You would go and develop the land the way it should be developed, relocate the houses and the allocation would be there already.

I am saying that Mr. Broomes should not be deprived of his land, Mr. Speaker. That is very important, and it must be said.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Repetition? I could repeat that a thousand times in here because it is important. Mr. Speaker, I know you know substance and you know why I would have to support Mr. Broomes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also heard you speak about spending tonight but you know you have been repeating yourself for quite some time.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, and as I said, anytime you have a key point to be made, and anybody who feels that because Mr. Broomes is a black man I should not call his name, that is up to them, or because Mount Six Men's belongs to Mr. Broomes and they have a problem with my saying that, that is up to them too, but I know it would not offend you, Sir.

I am saying, Sir, that the people at Mount Six Men's should be given land. I feel that Government has an obligation to give them land. I am saying whether it be in St. Lucy, whether it be St. Peter, that they should be given a house lot. Furthermore, they should not only be given a house lot, but I am also saying that they should be given two additional rooms because they went through a lot of punishment already where they saw land being acquired, then there was abandonment, now it is being reacquired again, abandonment and then it being reacquired again. No, No, No.

We have to make a final decision on this because what will happen now, Sir, is that 10 years from now the people at Mount Six Men's will be picked off one by

one, and let me explain that, Sir. Because they are so close to the Port St. Charles Development and the type of development that is going on in that area people will come and buy them out one by one 10 years from now.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand. Sometimes it amazes me. The Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act gives you a particular time before you can sell your property and people who are not acquainted with the law want to educate me on the law. That is why I said 10 years from now. I have given them adequate time to settle and then decide how much they want to settle for.

I am saying, Sir, that sometimes we as parliamentarians have to protect people because it is clear to me that the same way the people in Worthing sold out their properties, it will happen in Six Men's too. The price will be right and they will still have to go and look again.

I am saying what we should do is if we want to give them land for housing, we should relocate them at Colleton. They will still have the beach facilities. They would still be in the bus route and they will still be near to Judge Gap.

Thank you very much, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy did not stick to his pet issue of calling for an international airport for St. Lucy and leave the matters pertaining to Six Men's in St. Peter that he does not understand to more serious minds.

Mr. Speaker, Six Men's is not just a parcel of land. Six Men's is an established community, a long established community where people have lived for hundreds of years. It is a community where people have lived and worked as agricultural labourers on Six Men's Plantation. They have worked and continue to work as fishermen. In fact, the largest cluster of fishing folk in St. Peter now and perhaps on the West Coast are the people in Six Men's. The most thriving boat building industry in Barbados is located at Six Men's in Barbados so Six Men's is a cohesive community, a well-developed community with a long history, a tradition of looking after itself as a community both in terms of social relationships and employment. This, Mr. Speaker, guided the Barbados Labour Party's perception on how Six Men's and its development should have been approached.

Six Men's, Sir, is not like a piece of land north of Heywoods that was vacant that was designated for a marina. It was an established community and the notion,

therefore, that we should take a long established community where people lived, worshipped, worked and allow a man who had a notion from the 1960s to bring a religious cult similar to the Jimmy Jones cult, because that is all it was, a cult, a religious group that had no relationship to Six Men's, to move 100 families some of whom had houses there and agricultural plots that they were working to move all of them and let a religious cult come and establish a community, was such a disgraceful notion that Errol Barrow never took it on seriously. He heard it twice, before 1976 and after 1986 and he never took it seriously, neither did we.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on becoming the Member of Parliament for St. Peter, one of the first things that I did was to write to the then Minister of Housing a letter on January 9, 1985 urging him to regularise the status of Six Men's as a community because there were people on the seashore who were facing encroachment from the sea and there were people living in the village - it is called Six Men's Village, Mr. Speaker, because that is what it is in the minds of the people. There were people in the village who could not enjoy security of tenure because of the peculiar standard of Six Men's as a village in relation to tenancies legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I went to the point of bringing a Private Member's Resolution in this House bringing to the House's attention that people who are part of a community did not enjoy any security under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act and urging the House to give them security. The village and community could not be treated as a tenantry under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act because of its nearness to the seashore.

Six Men's is a community, Mr. Speaker, that has always been a community. There are people living at Six Men's who can trace their roots in Six Men's for 300 years. There are boat builders there whose grandparents were boat builders.

What we have this evening is the polluted notion, the nonsensical notion from the Honourable Member for St. Lucy who is saying that we should take a whole community, with churches, the tradition of boat building, a strong fishing folk and cart them to some other part of Barbados to make way for somebody to deal in a speculative way with a church group of the same dimension as Jimmy Jones with no *bona fides* to put a marina at Six Men's when it would have been so obvious to take vacant land north of Heywoods and put a marina there. 2.45 p.m.

He is now asking, Sir, to reverse that as well. I have never in my time heard a more nonsensical but also a wicked solution by the Member for St. Lucy because

he would now want to come and disrupt a whole community, disrupt not only a way of living but a culture, a culture of boat building, a culture of people relating to the churches in their neighbourhood....

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member is giving the impression that boat building goes on at Six Men's. That is not true, Sir. It goes on at Shermans and the Honourable Member is misleading the House. Boat building goes on at Shermans, St. Lucy.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, may I also say that Mr. Broomes on whose behalf he talks in this House bought Six Men's as a tenantry and the people of Six Men's have been paying rent as tenants for years to the previous owners of Six Men's plantation and they are organised as a village.

This is the fourth occasion when the matter of Six Men's has been coming to this House. I am glad it is being brought so that we can put the agony of the people of Six Men's behind them once and for all. They have been evicted without security and we tried previously in 1986 to adjust that by seeking to acquire the land to give them security. Subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, and subsequent to the abandonment of the acquisition of Six Men's by the previous Democratic Labour Party administration, people who can trace their ancestry hundreds of years to Six Men's and who did not only have access to house spots but also had access to agricultural lots and I make the point, Sir, that there are a large number of people in Six Men's who were living and working in Six Men's, many of them had agricultural lots and found that the process of chaotic squatting that had been allowed to fester in Six Men's since 1987 has deprived many of them of access to the agricultural lots from which many of them historically have made a living. They have been subjected to a kind of chaotic social development where people are living 'cheek and jowl' and people are in constant dispute over rights of ownership, people's houses are set in the water course exposing people who were not previously threatened by the dangers of flooding, exposing them for the first time to this danger because that is a reality now in Six Men's. We have also had the situation where some people in anticipation of the Government coming to act, have years ago gone and built houses that they have not finished in the expectation that the Government would come some day and give them a completed house but in the interval exposing people to health problems through infestation by rodents.

That is the situation that faces the people of Six Men's because of a decision by the DLP to abandon an acquisition that was intended to be put right by them. The Member for St. Lucy, in his folly, has got up today to say

that you should cart the whole district from Six Men's to somewhere else so that we will take the boat builders from Six Men's who are making a living building boats in Six Men's and training a new generation of Barbadians in the skills of boat building and carry them inland. We are going to take the fishermen of Six Men's, the most thriving community in St. Peter and on the West Coast and carry them inland because he sees it as a matter of access to land and we see it as a matter of protecting the integrity of a long established community and giving people a vested right to live and work and worship where they and their ancestors have been born and have thrived for generations. This is what this is about. We are seeking to acquire Six Men's not because we want to disadvantage Mr. Broomes but because we want to put things right for those people in Six Men's who have a need for things to be put right with them.

I would wish Mr. Broomes would stop harassing people particularly people, Sir, whose grandfathers have been keeping the rent book for years, who were paying the previous owners and who would be anxious to pay him. I would wish him to stop harassing those poor people because there are some people who say, Mr. Arthur, I have the rent book and I would like to pay Mr. Broomes but he is not collecting the rent. I would like him to stop threatening to put people in court as he has done, people whose grandfather and grandmother lived in Six Men's and paid rent and want to pay him rent, I want him to stop harassing them, Mr. Speaker. I would like him to stop doing that because that is the reality of the relationship of Six Men's to their environment, that a superior landlord holds the terror of court action against them and over their heads in circumstances where they would be glad to pay.

Sir, as I said, Mr. Broomes has this view that he would encourage a church group of no repute and with no income to come and move everybody out of Six Men's and convert it into a marina. We said no but now the Member for St. Lucy wants us now to revert to that situation when it was so much more obvious to take existing vacant land and put a marina on it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister has spoken very clearly about Government's plans for this area. We have a responsibility to put things right with persons who have seen Six Men's as the community of their ancestors and we will proceed to put things right with them. There are, however, Mr. Speaker other persons who believe that squatting and an incohesive and inconsistent development must be part of Barbados' present and its future and that you can go and squat on land and put houses in water courses and then the Government has to come and move them or that if Government touches your house then Government must come and give you a fabulous new residence.

Six Men's now has to be developed in an orderly fashion. It has become disorderly because people have gone and put houses at Six Men's, some in infringement of people's long-standing rights, some in the places where roads would naturally run, some in water courses and very straightforward decisions will have to be taken about re-ordering the way in which squatting has taken place.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that what has upset me the most as Member of Parliament for St. Peter is that I have written to the Town & Country Planning time after time in the late 1980s bringing his attention to the difficulties that were being caused by people with illegal squatting and nothing was done.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I keep writing and asking, why don't you all stop this. Every time somebody puts down a new house and they cannot get electricity or they cannot get water, it becomes a problem for the Member of Parliament for the constituency. I have lived with this as a problem and it has just grown and grown like a cancer for ten years.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. No society should have allowed a situation of such incoherent disorderliness in a community to take root to allow the notion that squatting is the way to go, to allow people to live in circumstances where they cannot have access to lights and water because they are squatting and we have to put a stop to this thing in Barbados but this is what was allowed to happen in Six Men's. The Member for the City speaks about Murphy's Pasture, that is 14 people but I am talking about 160 families affected and the Member for St. Lucy's solution is to move all of them off the land. So that in one fell swoop he would take one of Barbados' oldest communities, abolish it, take Six Men's off the land and allow some church group from the United States of America to come and establish here. 2.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Six Men's is also developing so we have to bring order to the development of Six Men's. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to say as well that a study is now being undertaken to determine the feasibility of having the major fish landing site on the West Coast at Six Men's.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, people who have been following developments in Barbados would know that the fishermen have already effectively, by their patronage, chosen Six Men's as the preferred landing site and it would mean that the study that is being undertaken is to determine the feasibility of realigning the road and to have a fish landing facility at Six Men's because you have there already a fish landing site, you have a boat building facility that people

are doing of their own accord and at nights now, Sir, Six Men's has evolved as a fish frying site if not on the scale of Oistins, as popular for people in the North.

It is natural therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us to see the natural development of Six Men's as the principal fish landing site on the West Coast of Barbados and to improve the facilities by the realignment of the road.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, whatever else happens, Six Men's must be kept intact as a community. Mr. Broomes' name, Sir, has been brought into the debate and therefore I can refer to it. He has not only been issuing threats to carry people to court, Sir, but quite recently people of Six Men's had to complain bitterly about unplanned developments that were taking place up in the hills that could have threatened them with the possibility of watercourses being blocked off by boulders posing the threat of the kind of Weston type flash flooding that is quite possible when people block watercourses with boulders. That is the kind of man you are dealing with and pressure from the same community stopped Mr. Broomes from continuing with this kind of illegal, inconsiderate development. So that those people, Sir, live under a continuous threat.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. Even though Mr. Broomes owns the quarry, Mr. Broomes is not in legal possession of the quarry at this point in time, Sir, and the Honourable Member knows that.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: But, Sir, if he is not in legal possession of the quarry it only compounds the problem because then he is illegally quarrying a quarry he is not in possession of but he is blocking the watercourse. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the situation became so grim that the Member for Christ Church West in the late eighties voluntarily undertook to represent all of the people living in Six Men's in court against Mr. Broomes.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: In the Registry, Sir. The Member for Christ Church West and I went. That is a fact. Sir, the matter became so bad and we have a Member for St. Lucy coming in here, without knowledge of the history of the situation, without sympathy for the community.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I gave him chapter and verse and I cannot allow him to say that, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House by saying that I do not know anything about the situation.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard in this debate the most outrageous and irresponsible arguments advanced that I have ever heard from a

member of the Opposition. It is a fact. Port St. Charles was brought into this debate. Port St. Charles is taking place, Mr. Speaker, on a parcel of land that was vacant. There was no established committee on Port St. Charles. It was not Mr. Broomes' land. Many people had ideas. A Mr. Hinds also said he had an idea for building a marina. Building a marina is not something that is patented. But Port St. Charles was a piece of land in bush. Six Men's was an established community of 300 years. What the Member for St. Lucy wanted skilfully to do is to appeal to this coarse politics of subtle racism and pockets of envy that you can come and allow people to develop Port St. Charles but some black man wanted to have a marina at Six Men's and you did not allow it. What I am saying, Sir, is that the black man is not looking to develop a marina for himself. He was going to give the land to a church group in the United States of America of dubious *bona fides*, Sir. The essential point, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that there was a community based there and you cannot therefore compare the decision to allow the building of a marina on land in bush with a decision that had to be taken allowing a marina to be built to displace a community that has been part of Barbados for in excess of 300 years. That is the point. And it is unworthy that these kinds of nonsensical arguments enter this political discourse. That is how I see it, Sir. If Six Men's was vacant and in bush and I had said, okay, forget what Mr. Broomes is saying, let somebody else go and build a marina on another piece of land that is vacant and in bush then there would be an issue but there cannot be an issue, Sir, with a Government saying, let us continue to keep 160 families together as a community.

I strongly, Sir, resent the implications that have been brought into this debate by the Member for St. Lucy because I know, Sir, the kind of sentiments to which they are intended to appeal. I say to the House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that it would have done a great mischief and would have imposed a massive hardship on the people of Six Men's were their lives then or now dislocated by carting them away from their churches, away from their homes, their shops, away from their livelihood, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Minister for bringing this Resolution to Parliament, that we should proceed now with the orderly development of the community of Six Men's and that we should see this, Sir, not just as an acquisition of a parcel of land, but an attempt to make sure that a village that has always been a village and a community that wants to continue as a community, Sir, is given the same right as any other village and any other community in Barbados to have that as their lot for the future. 3.05 p.m.

I am obliged to you.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reiterate that this is an existing tenantry and in response to...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House again, Sir. It is not a tenantry, Sir, as we know it.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is an existing tenantry and it was bought by the gentleman, Mr. Broomes from the Plantation as a tenantry. The total area of the tenantry is 238.9 acres and this part of the overall area of the Plantation.

Even if the Government has not decided, Mr. Speaker, to acquire this part of the land and we had decided to do nothing about it, it would mean that Mr. Broomes still would be unable to deal with the land because he would be compelled under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act to sell the land. Those persons who would have resisted, apart from the squatters, his title to the land would have obtained a title by adverse possession. So, as I indicated he was in a dilemma. Complete the purchase under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, in which case he would have to sell the tenants the land at 10 cents per square foot and those persons who had squatted on the land would then be able, especially those persons who had been on the land for longer than ten years, would be able to obtain a squatter's title.

The difficulty of Mr. Broomes and his company was even echoed by his lawyer when certain questions were raised as to why he served these writs on some of the tenants, why was he serving these tenants who had been living on this land for so long. We had writs that were served on persons who were living on the land since 1910, 1920, 1937. Persons who were living on the land for years and the excuse that Mr. Broomes' lawyer used was that if he did not bring the action at this time the persons will be able to get a title by adverse possession. This is nonsense because in any event, the title would have been acquired under the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act and this would only have applied if it was a squatter's title.

So there is no way that Mr. Broomes would have been able to obtain proper title and would have been able to convey in the manner that the Honourable Member is speaking. It is a contradiction when he is speaking about the representation of poor persons when it is those same poor persons that he is talking about that this particular Resolution is protecting. It is protecting the tenants in that their security of tenure will be protected. It is protecting the landlord in that he will now be able to obtain a reasonable price in accordance with the normal negotiation procedures under the Land Acquisition Act for land which otherwise he would not be able to develop at all.

So, I do not think that what the Honourable Member is saying really holds water with respect to this particular bit of legislation, even if as he says the Honourable

Member had a plan for a marina in 1986. The Honourable Member should tell us what the owner of the land did between 1986 and 1994. There was bare chaos in that particular area between 1986 and 1994.

Asides.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: So between 1986 and 1994 what happened?

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The plan, Sir, was first of all in 1966 and they were disregarded in 1966 and 1976 as well.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: But what happened between 1986 and 1994? Absolutely nothing because when the land was given back to the land owner, at least he had the opportunity to do the things that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy spoke about. It shows that nothing could have been done and this is now the final time and we would hope, God forbid, that Honourable Members...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I am concerned, Your Honour, that this is an acquisition of land. Is the Government acquiring land for private citizens? I do not believe that the Government should acquire land from a citizen as if the Government is in opposition to the citizen. The Government should make a dispassionate decision that they need this land and they acquire it.

The Honourable Member in the course of his presentation seems to be attacking the party from whom we are acquiring the land. So it seems to me. Surely, he cannot intend to do that. I wish he would change the pattern of his presentation. The Government must not appear to be attacking the person from whom they are acquiring land as if we are acquiring the land for spite and I know that is not so.

Asides.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: I would hope, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, God forbid, that the Honourable Members on that side would never again get the opportunity to unfair the residents of Six Men's.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. How can you unfair squatters? The Honourable Member for St. Peter said that most of the people were squatting when he was trying to prevent them from squatting. Now he is saying that we are unfair squatters.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Unfair squatters, Mr. Speaker, those residents of Six Men's who have been living on this parcel of land for over 40 years and who had the right to purchase the land. As a matter of fact, there is

correspondence to show that the previous owners before Mr. Broomes had promised and were making arrangements to sell the land to the tenants.

So we are just carrying out the instructions of the former owners. We are carrying out the tenure of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. I heard the Government are carrying out instructions... Mr. Speaker, my point of order, Sir, is that the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Government could not possibly be carrying out instructions of any private citizens, Sir.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: For the benefit of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, we are carrying out the good intentions of the previous owners, Mr. Speaker, the tenure of the Tenancies Freehold Purchase Act and we would hope, as we said already, that nothing will stand in the way of the poor people of Six Men's being able to purchase these lots at 10 cents per square foot.

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

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

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

ORDER NO. 9 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CODRINGTON, SPOONERS HILL AND LONG GAP, ST. MICHAEL FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENT

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of land at Codrington, Cave Hill for road improvement. This was a major project which included the widening of the junction at Codrington Hill with Cave Hill and the widening of Codrington Hill with the Stadium Road.

Other improvements carried out included the provision of additional turning lanes, the construction of side walks, the provision of bus laybys, the setting back of guard walls and the installation of traffic lights, Mr. Speaker. This was all part of the World Bank project. When construction of this project started, it was realised that the project could further be extended to include the junction of Spooners Hill with Long Gap. 3.15 p.m.

When construction of this project started, it was realised that the project could be further extended to include the junction of Spooner's Hill with Long

Gap. The road widening works proposed for the Long Gap junction were designed to give a safer entrance to the Long Gap/Spooner's Hill area and to provide pavements for the greater safety of pedestrians, including children from the area attending the Lawrence T. Gay Primary School.

We have already come to Parliament for the earlier acquisition of those parcels that formed part of Phase 1 of this process. This acquisition is for Phase 2 of the project which has now been completed which included the whole acquisition of properties.

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

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I beg to second that, Sir.

His Honour R. D. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a short intervention on this acquisition here before the House. The Spooner's Hill area that the Honourable Minister alluded to butts and bounds the constituencies of St. Michael North East and St. Michael West Central. As the Minister rightly said, the improvement in that area that took place over the last year and a half to two years has been of tremendous benefit for the area not only for the flow of traffic coming from the country but for the children that use the area going to and from to the L.T. Gay School.

The road, as I said, Sir, has been widened. In the year we have had a facility put in place for a pedestrian crossing for children crossing from the other side of the road from the North East constituency into the L.T. Gay School. Children come from as far down as Fairfield and Lower Spooner's Hill to the School so any more acquisitions of land to make the area better equipped for use by the children will be well appreciated.

I would also like to say to the Minister, Sir, that on that area from Spooner's Hill right down it is a pity that we could not go further down because, as I said, coming from Fairfield and Grazettes going to the L.T. Gay School there are two huge pieces of rock on the left and right hand sides of the road and when you come up from the bottom of the hill by the curb the children have to step into the road to walk towards the school. I would really appreciate if the road improvement extension could be done just below Walcott's place by Fairfield Road that would take you right down to the Tudor Bridge area.

With those few remarks, Sir, I support the Resolution.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I am very happy to hear the Honourable Member who just sat down who represents my homestead in this House. I am very glad to see that he is

looking after the children. It is always good to hear him speak something about the little children in that area.

I really rise to speak to the Minister. I cannot believe that this Minister comes in here today to acquire land after having completed the works. Mr. Speaker, if you drive up Spooner's Hill, the work is completed and this Government, and this particular Minister promised us within weeks of coming in here that he would not fall prey to that wicked and dangerous habit which the Government of the day that they were replacing had.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I would not even ask him to withdraw the remarks he made.

In my presentation I indicated that while the works were in progress it became necessary to do an extension to the existing work. This existing work was done with the permission of the owners. This is not a situation where you have a project.

What I referred to earlier and what the Honourable Member is referring to is where a Government embarks on a specific project and before all of the various acquisitions have been completed, they actually start up the works and complete them. This is a different situation. This is where the actual work was already in progress. All the acquisitions were done and it was necessary to complete the work. The same contractor continued the work with the permission of the owners, something completely different to what the Honourable Member is referring to.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, Sir. It is not completely different. This is not the point at which we are going to discuss the intricacies of the inability of anybody to participate in the granting of contracts to continue a second project. The Honourable Member is aware that you have Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3 of projects that appear to be the same project to the ordinary naked eye but, in truth, the project had been completed and the Government made a decision that they wanted to extend the programme beyond the point of the project and at that point it became a second project.

I am not going to argue that. I just wanted to put in the record for this Minister and his colleagues who had vociferously, ponderously, pointedly, copiously told the population that they would never be caught in this situation where they would be seeking to acquire land.

The Honourable Member said "permission". Now, Sir, if my friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central had said that, I would have looked the other way. If my friend the Parliamentary Secretary had said that, I would look the other way but you, Sir, and I know that when it comes to land that permission does not count.

They went in and started works on people's land and talking about permission? They come into this House of Assembly to acquire land after they have finished the works *and* he is coming in here talking about permission?

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I will not nail him to the cross is because I see him over there pleading with me to give him a chance. I just want them to know that as they come now into their fourth year of Government they are beginning to understand that with the best will in the world, these things have a way of coming upon you.

This land at Codrington and Spooner's Hill, all the acquisitions are not in place. The point is, even now there is another project where letters are going out to people. Some of the people are not owners of the land but they are people who have been paying their taxes and the letters are going from his Ministry to those people. Those people are behaving, and the Ministry is behaving as if those people are the owners of the land but that is how it is because you do not have enough resources to have every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed when you are doing these projects which have to be completed.

I am very glad to see the Government coming into its own in the business of understanding the administrative process that goes on in this country. When they were jumping up and down and giving the population the impression that a Daniel had come to judgment, now I have to sit in here on this side of the House and watch them, I would not say squirm, Sir, because the squirming will come in a different Bill. This is only a little one but I am glad to see that the project is coming to an end, and I am going to vote, along with my colleagues, to allow the people whose land has been acquired to get paid for it.

Now, Sir, when the Minister gets up to reply, I would like him to tell us when the people in Spooner's Hill might expect to be paid for this land. 3.25 p.m.

Is this an IADB project or a Government project or a Government of Barbados project? If it is a World Bank project it means that the money was secured and that the money is in the bank and it only has to be drawn down. There is no excuse why these people, even though it may be 160 square metres...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: That money should go in escrow. Do not try to pull that on me. The one or two who have been discovered are usually the ones who need the money. I hope that you will be able to tell us so that I can help tell them because some of them are my friends and they have asked me but they should really have asked the representative for St. Michael North East but she is not in

her chair and usually nobody can ask her anything anyhow but they really should be in a position to ask because some of them called me to ask me when they might expect to get the money.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will be able to tell the people from St. Michael West Central who are affected that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central has looked after their interest and is now able to speak categorically and say when they are going to receive the money. I will certainly do that, you know that I will do that this very evening; I will call the two who spoke to me and tell them that their friend, the representative has said that the money is secured and that it is in the bank.

Seriously, I would like you to tell the people when to expect the money because we come in here and acquire people's land every week and you know there was a Minister of whom it was said that he always used to be in court. A person who was running against him went out and told the constituents, look at him, every week they got him in court and that is what was said about him.

Every week the Honourable Member comes in here acquiring people's land. It is the Honourable Member for St. Andrew that acquires the land without compensating people. There really ought to be a law against that, Sir. The House of Assembly should not be able to come in here and acquire people's land and once they have acquired it and the other place agrees, they say, that's that. Nobody goes to court, the Chief Justice does not lock up anybody for not paying people and that is not fair.

I am still waiting for the poor woman in Deacons Road, the one who has died and had four people left behind. The estate has not yet been recompensed. Will the Minister please tell when he gets up when we might expect to receive the coppers for this? It is a small amount and it is the World Bank and I know you have the money already.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, with respect to the problem of payment, that in the Ministry of Housing as the Honourable Member for St. Michael West in what I would call his provocative statement very well knows that the person or persons that are dealt with by the Chief Legal Officer would be the person named on the tax bill and if a person's name is on a tax bill and that person is not the rightful owner as sometimes it very often is, it is fairly obvious that it would be difficult to communicate with the rightful owner and I could say for a fact that right now, the Ministry of Housing is having difficulty in locating persons who are the rightful owners of land. Maybe the Honourable Member for St. Michael West is not really representing his

constituency well if he knows that there are persons in his constituency who actually own the land...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. I said nothing about persons in my constituency. Just like Your Honour, I am very cosmopolitan in the whole of the St. Michael area and even St. Andrew, especially Belleplaine, and I have friends and colleagues and relatives who communicate with me. They are represented by the Labour Party people but they cannot find or they do not see them except for one or two so they have to ask people like me or Your Honour to see what we could do so it has nothing to do with my constituents.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: For the benefit of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West the money is available and he could inform those persons that he knows about to communicate with the Division of Housing.

On this question of acquisition, I would also like to state too that there are times when negotiations have taken place in some of these acquisitions with persons who are the owners of the land even after the works have been completed and it is suddenly realised that the person does not have the type of title the Legal Department in the Ministry of Housing would require. In such cases, the solution would be to come by way of acquisition. These are the types of acquisitions that we would be dealing with after the event. There is a policy within the Ministry as far as possible to ensure that before a project is started the acquisitions are done and this Resolution in no way departs from that policy.

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

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

ORDER NO. 4 - TO MOVE THE PASSING OF A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE VESTING IN THE BARBADOS INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF LAND AT NEWTON, CHRIST CHURCH IN EXCHANGE FOR LAND OWNED BY THE CORPORATION AT SIX MEN'S, ST. PETER AND GRANTLEY ADAMS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of 9.51 hectares of land at Newton. It goes back to 1989 when a decision was made that land should be vested in the Barbados Industrial Development Corporation in exchange for the lands of the Corporation at Six Men's, St. Peter and at Grantley Adams International Airport which were taken away from the Corporation for housing and airport purposes.

It was hoped that the negotiations would have been completed at the time by private treaty but during the course of the negotiations it was discovered that the owner of the land would have had to pay land development duties in excess of \$100 000 and rather than going by way of private treaty which would have, in some respects, meant a penalty to the owner of the land, it was decided by the lawyers to go by way of acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, in those circumstances, parliamentary approval is hereby sought to vest the said 9.51 hectares of land in the Barbados Investment & Development Corporation in exchange for lands owned by the Corporation at Six Men's, St. Peter and Grantley Adams International airport respectively, the actual acquisition to the Crown having already been completed.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution No. 4 is a rather interesting Resolution. This Resolution should be seen as Six Men's Part 2. 3.35 p.m.

Before this land was bought by the IDC for an industrial park there was a great political divide, Sir, on whether this land should have been used as industrial land or whether it should have been used for housing. The Barbados Labour Party believes that it should have been commercial land and they went ahead and they allowed the IDC to cut up this land for commercial land.

The Democratic Labour Party, Sir, when they came to office decided that the best thing for this land was to vest this land to the National Housing Corporation so that the nice people of Six Men's would have been able to be relocated from the beach side because they were threatened by the waves etc. They decided to disobey the feelings and the plans of the Barbados Labour Party and to make this land suitable for housing.

It is on this land, Sir, where the Minister at the time decided that this should not only be a housing project but it should be such that a church should be built on an area allocated for commercial use. It would be the beginning of a new dawn in the housing policy of the Democratic Labour Party and it is interesting when this debate is taken in the light of another debate.

When one follows what was said previously the land belonged to Colleton and this point must be made. The piece of land belonged to Colleton Plantation and it is divided by a road when you come from the Judge Gap and other lands on the other side. So you have a situation where the people from the seaside were moved to another piece of land belonging to Colleton.

There is also another piece of land owned by Colleton that now has grass and shrubs, etc. That is why I feel

that if you were to relocate all the people in that area you will be doing exactly what was done when the people were challenged by the sea or the seaside. Sir, you would not be disrupting any community. You would just be going the natural process.

I am saying that I am glad today that people in the Barbados Labour Party have finally realised that what the Democratic Labour Party did in the eighties was a wise decision and there is need for housing in that particular area and not the area for commercial use, and they would now admit that they made an error.

I hope they would not admit 10 years from now that the next piece of land to the North of this said lot that is only divided by a road, that they would not decide that they need to acquire that land to put housing because the suggestion would have been given to them.

I am not bothered by the adjectives that were used in this debate. I am saying that the same natural division that is happening in Six Men's today would not occur if we were to do what I had suggested previously.

So, Sir, we on this side have no problem in supporting this debate because it was our idea to change the land from being commercial land to housing land and we will support this because we honestly believe it was a wise decision to protect the nice people of Six Men's from the sea, and the high waves. We look forward to the day when they can look across to St. Lucy and speak to their neighbours again.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, again it is very unfortunate that the Member for St. Lucy has not stuck to calling for an international airport for St. Lucy and leave matters whose history he does not understand.

This piece of land was the subject of one of the DLP abandonments on assuming office in 1986. The DLP came and found grant funds for the building of a fishing complex in Speightstown. They abandoned that. They found a plan, not only a plan, but an acquisition already approved to acquire 27 acres of land at Six Men's to resite people from the seaside and to develop it in a coherent way, they abandoned that.

There was a plan, Mr. Speaker, not only a plan, it was an industrial estate laid out at Colleton to bring industrial development...

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. He is giving the impression, Sir, that the land at Colleton was compulsorily acquired by the Barbados Labour Party to resite people and that is not true, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if he would just listen and stop loving to hear himself, Sir. By 1986, this parcel of land that is the subject of the debate today had been provided with services in anticipation of an industrial estate being sited on that piece of land to bring manufacturing jobs to St. Peter and to St. Lucy. The Democratic Labour Party on assuming office decided, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that in the same way and for the same reason they abandoned the fishing harbour, Sir, they abandoned the acquisition at Six Men's, they also abandoned their plan to locate a manufacturing enterprise on this spot.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order, Sir, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. The Honourable Member is giving the impression, Sir, that the Democratic Labour Party was beginning to abandon the fishing complex...

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member for St. Lucy should start by saying that this piece of land had in fact already attracted expenditure of the Industrial Development Corporation and roads had been put in and services for the purpose of establishing an industrial estate at Colleton. It was part of the overall strategy for the development of the north of which Heywoods and the Arawak Cement Plant were but other aspects together with the Speightstown Fishing project and the Democratic Labour Party, Sir, abandoned the proposed use of this parcel of land for industrial activity. It was then put into housing in light of the fact that they had also abandoned the acquisition of land at Six Men's for housing. What we are doing now today, therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is simply effecting an exchange of a parcel of land but it has a history and if the Member for St. Lucy does not understand the history, Sir, he would do well not to speak on those things that he does not understand.

Now, the notion of an industrial estate at Colleton goes back for many years and there were some people who saw that as a potential site for a free zone as well. What the House should in fact be regretting is the closing off of one of the development options that was open in the North by the decision of the Democratic Labour Party in not allowing the industrial estate to be established because there was enough land in the rest of the area at Six Men's Village to accommodate the people on the seaside of Six Men's. So that this, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is an attempt by Parliament to once again tidy up a situation that was made untidy by the Democratic Labour Party.

I really truly regret, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal to have gone ahead with the plan for an industrial estate at Six Men's was not proceeded with. In the course of the last 2 years the Ministry of Industry has had to indulge in a frantic effort to put in industrial capacity in Barbados in response to rising demand. Had the decision been proceeded with 10 years ago to have the industrial estate

at Colleton a lot of the recent frantic demand to have to do things in a hurry to meet excess demand could have been pre-empted.

I notice that the Member for Christ Church South is anxious to speak, Sir, because he was the Minister who in fact was involved in the putting in of the infrastructure at Colleton for an industrial estate and it will stand forever as an indictment on the Democratic Labour Party that there would be opportunities to bring industrial activity in a significant way to the North that could have been indulged in while not falling short of the provision of house spots for people in Six Men's affected by the sea, and that a shortsighted and foolish decision was taken to abandon the industrial estate at Colleton. I am obliged to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the Prime Minister inveighs against my colleague the Member for St. Lucy that he should not speak on matters that he is not aware of and then himself gets up and proceeds to speak about a matter of which it is clear that he himself is not seised. 3.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this Industrial Park, Sir, is in a strange way related to where Your Honour now sits. There was a representative from St. Peter who sat in that distinguished Chair which Your Honour now occupies. He was known to be able from time to time, to go and make decisions without reference to anything else except his own whim and fancy; and having decided on a number of projects in St. Peter, he would put his Government in severe difficulty.

On one very famous occasion he raised the question about industrialisation in St. Peter. When it was drawn to his attention, I believe by his side, that there was not a sufficiency of industrial like surroundings, he immediately set about finding an industrial park in St. Peter. It was not known before he had announced, that an Industrial Park would be established at Colleton and thus, Sir, began the saga of an industrial park at Colleton.

When the Prime Minister gets a chance, he could ask the IDC to send him the file and he will see that this is a case of rearguard action where the Industrial Park having been announced, it was necessary to proceed to double check that those who represented the Barbados Labour Party did not speak with forked tongues.

But the truth is, Sir, the Honourable Member cannot inveigh against the Democratic Labour Party about the development of the North because it was the Democratic Labour Party in the context of developing Industrial Parks that took an industrial park to St. Lucy. Before I was a spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party, I was a

spokesman for Barbados. I used to be in the United States telling the whole world that we had X number of industrial parks, one at Grazettes, one at Wildey and one in St. Lucy.

The St. Lucy's Industrial Park was not a massive one, but we were able to attract to St. Lucy, one of the early garment industries. We were able to get a factory into St. Lucy that developed to become an extension of the Harbour Industrial Park. They manufactured garments in St. Lucy. Just outside of Mount Gay there was an industrial park.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, in St. Lucy, just across from St. Lucy's Church.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: So, Sir, the St. Lucy Industrial Park is a well-known landmark of the development of Barbados. It was among the early industrial parks. The St. Lucy Secondary School bore some relationship to our developing the North.

It must be remembered that the North was represented by two Democratic Labour Party Members of Parliament.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Now, Sir, I do not get into northern discussions, Sir. There are certain northern politics that I do not get involved in.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If the Member for St. Peter wishes to engage in cross talk with his colleague from St. Lucy that is their business. But, I know that the North has always been the beneficiary of the largesse of whichever Government was in office. I do not see how the Prime Minister would seek now to resile from the position which was established before his time that northern climes have always seen a certain amount or plenitude of opportunity. I am disappointed if the Prime Minister would seek to resile from that.

The first time one ever heard of an airport in St. Lucy was not from the present Honourable Member for St. Lucy. An airport in St. Lucy was a serious consideration by representation of the North.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: They have never put a monitor on it. I had never been sure if it was international or otherwise.

Indeed, the most famous Prime Minister Barbados has ever had, was not averse to speaking about the North with great aplomb. The most famous Prime Minister Barbados has ever had, used to speak of the North in similar terms to the Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

I heard the Honourable Member today talking about the Arawak Cement Plant.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Tom Adams? Tom Adams was from the North too?

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Tom Adams was not the most famous, he was the most infamous.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir. The Honourable Member wanted me to say that. But the most famous Prime Minister of Barbados was Errol Barrow.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Ministers start to talk, those of us who have not been there must recede.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I want to make the substantive point, Sir, that this is not a mere exchange of land although the Resolution says so. The truth is that the Industrial Park at St. Peter having been established...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No. The roads were cut. The Barbados Labour Party had to prove that they were putting it in place. The roads were cut and the Park was designed. I am sure the Honourable Member for Christ Church South will confirm. Barbados was never able to attract a single solitary industrialist who was interested, despite whatever concessions might be given, in locating at Colleton. It was a peculiar problem.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It was located in St. Lucy because the transportation system was amenable.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not going to argue with the Prime Minister from his seat, but I will say to him that the record is there. We were never able to attract a single industry into the Colleton Park and part of the reason, I suspect, is after certain information became available.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: What was the industry that you would put in the Colleton Industrial Park? You could check and see. The people who promoted industry overseas were never able to attract anybody. In fact, they did not attract a lot to St. Lucy, either.

The original Van Roalte people who went to St. Lucy were the only people we were able to attract, but they had a large quantity of employees in the St. Lucy Park. Then they linked them with the Harbour Industrial Park. So, the Colleton Industrial Park was nothing more than a capacity of the Barbados Labour Party to say that they had opened an industrial park in the North and more particularly, a capacity of the then Representative, Mr. Burton Hinds, to show to his constituents that industry was coming to the North.

That is really how the Park came into existence and the Democratic Labour Party raided against the large quantity of money that had been spent to put roads into a place next door to where people were living in squalour. 3.55 p.m.

I recall, and the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central if he was in his place would recall, that we had political meetings in which we were able to point out to the people of Six Men's that their erstwhile representative had poured money into building roads in an industrial park that was totally empty while they were squatting next door.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member at that time was in Jamaica. He was at that time disturbing the politics of Jamaica so he had no time with what was going on here. That would be a later episode. He was in Jamaica at the time forecasting. In the words of the Honourable Member for St. John he was forecasting in Jamaica at the time.

Sir, it was the then Honourable Member for St. Peter who caused that industrial park to be put there and it was another representative of St. Lucy who pointed out that the proper use of that land mass over there was precisely what we are doing with it today because the agents of denudation had already started to work on the sea coast of the Six Men's area going toward St. Lucy and already the persons who lived on the seaside of that land were

having difficulty where they would wake up some mornings and find the sea right up to their doors.

It was the then Honourable Member for St. Lucy, Evelyn Greaves, who had proposed that we should move the people on the coastal area of Six Men's and put them over on the land that had been made into an industrial park. It was that Member for St. Lucy of the day who persuaded the Democratic Labour Party Government to do the sociologically correct thing and move the people across to the landward side.

We have never understood why the Barbados Labour Party found it so difficult to accept that very straightforward matter and it had to wait until 1997. It is not surprising though because the Prime Minister took nine months to remove VAT. It is a pattern in the Labour Party that anything that is good for people they have to make sure that the people wait long to get it.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy has said that we will not oppose this. We cannot oppose it. This is policy that was put in place by the Democratic Labour Party in 1989.

Mr. Speaker, it was in Colleton, just across from this land that the first publicly funded halfway house was created, the most successful halfway house in the Caribbean, right across in Colleton. The whole area of Colleton is an area that cries out for social services.

I am satisfied that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy has a greater social conscience in the context of representation than the Member for St. Peter. The Member for St. Peter did not even take the trouble to discover, even though this was part of his constituency - and, Sir, we had a lot of trouble in Six Men's during the by-election. We had to put all manner of measures in place in St. Peter in the by-election but in Six Men's in particular we had to install two people in Six Men's. We could say they were reasonably successful, Sir. Indeed we had problems trying to dislodge them from Six Men's.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been part of the Democratic Labour Party's policy to try to socialise the whole area of Six Men's and the Colleton area. Therefore, the Prime Minister should seek to get a better brief on what happened in what is ostensibly his area because he represents St. Peter and this is part of the parish of St. Peter. I was amazed that he did not demonstrate an acute knowledge of what is happening in the Six Men's area.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am being reminded, Sir, that Six Men's has better roads than St. Michael West but that is

part for the course, Sir. The Honourable Member is in the best position to know because he knows that when the Labour Party is in office St. Michael South and St. Michael West Central are not likely to get anything at all. That is why I separate you from us very early so that it can be remembered that your constituency is not linked to mine because otherwise you would not get anything, Sir.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Well, Sir, I am being told that the Order Paper has something which can accommodate you.

Seriously, Sir, I was really amazed that the Prime Minister would use words like indictment. I was really flabbergasted that he would use words like indictment when he obviously did not understand that it was the Democratic Labour Party that moved for this highly desirable social policy which is being perfected by them today in the exchange of land that would bring the people from the seaward side of that road heading further north to the landward side over into the industrial park.

I think it is a good thing to have the exchange of land. I wish the Minister responsible for Lands would have been much more explicit in explaining which lands are being actually...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is saying from his seat that We are supposed to be able to read and we can see the Resolution and read it. The Minister knows that he is supposed to explain. He has to make the assumption that some of us do not understand what we read, and the Minister really should have told us which lands are being exchanged because I am not sure that it is a fair exchange with the lands at Grantley Adams and Colleton.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to help put the record straight that the industrial estate was a clear manifestation of the way the Barbados Labour Party used to disperse funds in those days. There was a clear case of squandermania prior to our coming in in 1986.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I withdraw squandermania, Sir, in the face of that very clear information confirming what was said. I did not mean squandermania. It was how they catered to the whims and fancies of Speakers. Your Honour might take note of how the Labour Party responded to Speakers of yore bearing in mind how Your Honour has not been treated in terms of largesse, as far as I know, and...

Mr. SPEAKER: You are not supposed to know everything.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: Well, if Your Honour is saying to me that you have been so treated, I wish you would have it extended across the border because I have not seen any evidence of it but, perhaps, later on we will see. When Hinds spoke in those days and said: "I want a development" he used to go and measure it out. 4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, he used to mark them out. The Speaker of the day did not hesitate, he did not get involved in surveyors and all that rubbish, he would go and get his own and mark it out. As a matter of fact, he should be credited for having developed the area between the new hotel which now occupies Hey woods and an area about that used to be a swamp. He brought many, many loads from Maynards to fill in the swamp.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I have enlightened the House and saved the House from believing the Prime Minister when he said that the DLP should be indicted. I just wanted to keep the record quite clear because this measure is one which we can support precisely because after so many years the Labour Party has finally decided to follow the very clear and humane policy of the DLP to shift those people from the degradation of the constant and rampant denudation across to a haven on the other side of the road. I hope that the Prime Minister will see to it as he has done in the rest of St. Peter, in fact all of St. Peter, I hope that he will see to it that the necessary amenities..

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: In fact, I think that it is now standard that once it has been established that people will be there the rest will follow, lights, water and the works. We hope that it will extend beyond the Judge Gap into the other side of Colleton because you do not wish it to be a lop-sided development where on the one side you have everything and on the other side you have nothing.

Sir, I think I had better stop because the Deputy Prime Minister is back in her chair and she will only add an entirely new dimension to the debate so I think I am going to stop here and hope that the Prime Minister will not wish to indict the DLP for a matter which had nothing whatsoever to do with the DLP.

I am grateful to your Honour.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make a few observations on this matter because it is quite clear to me that with the passage of time many Honourable Members' memories particularly on the Other Side are not clear as to the real factual situation in respect of this area.

It is a fact that the former Honourable Member for St. Peter repeatedly brought to the attention of this House the threat to the security and the well being of those residents whose houses were situated on the seaside of that land area between Six Men's and Shermans. Anyone who knows that area will recall that it is subject to poundings by the seas regularly. The decision was taken at that time to remove those houses from the seaside and they were to be placed on the land side and they were to be placed at Six Men's because the Labour Party always felt, and I think it is a good policy, that where you had to disturb a community by removal of houses it is vital that you endeavour to keep people next to each other when they are removed because, as Honourable Members would point out, you are trying to minimise dislocation and you do not want to exacerbate the problems that arise when people are called upon to remove.

The industrial estate had its origins in the conception that wherever you would have a cement plant there are associated industries which use cement as a base and therefore there was the distinct belief that an industrial estate in that area would start off with a good base. I well remember the possibility in particular of the establishment of a utility light pole made of cement as opposed to wood that in particular was an industry which it was expected would come as a result of the establishment of the cement plant.

In addition to that it was the question of building of a precast building both for low cost housing and also for slabs and things of that kind. There was no difficulty at all in obtaining land at Colleton for that exercise. Indeed the owner of that land at Colleton was a gentleman who was a member of the Industrial Development Corporation in Barbados for many years under both Governments, the late Mr. Lisle Ward and he was exceedingly enthusiastic about the idea of the development of Colleton as an industrial estate. It was bad agricultural land, according to him, it was up underneath the hill and he had difficulty in getting crops to grow and even when they got crops to grow he had difficulty in being able to collect the produce because it was situated next to a tenantry and everybody in Barbados knows the problem that arises when you have agricultural crops in a tenantry in Barbados. If you doubt me, go at Graeme Hall and you will notice that at the ABC roundabout whatever crops they have tried to grow there, I doubt that the Ministry of Agriculture has ever reaped one tenth of the produce and if they grow canes somehow or other, they get burnt.

I must say that I agree with the Prime Minister about one thing because I remember it very clearly and

distinctly that the land that was acquired from Six Men's was a relatively small parcel of land in relation to the total estate of Six Men's and it was an area of land situated to the West of a river that used to run into the sea to the east of Challenor Warehouse at Six Men's itself. One of the advantages that Six Men's has is that Six Men's has some of the deepest water, nearest to out promontory shore anywhere in Barbados.

What was envisaged under the Labour Party regime and I hope it will continue now would be that a reclamation scheme would take place between that promontory of land at the Challenor Land which I call the Challenor Warehouse at Six Men's proper where the whole jetty was and Shermans. There was a plan that you would have to reclaim by bouldering the whole of that area so as to protect the road and the houses on the other side from the pounding of the sea.

Asides.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: What the Honourable Member does not know is that my understanding of the marina in addition to the Broomes' scheme was that there was to be a marina there but the marina would run 90 degrees to that reclaimed land there whereas the Broomes' scheme involved excavating the river that I talked about and having a by-pass road nearer to the hill. 4.15 p.m.

I remember these things very clearly so that what has happened in fact in that area is that having abandoned the acquisition of that small area of land which was acquired in those days for the removal of the houses and regularising the then tenantry you had then to make a decision to encroach on the industrial estate. That is what has happened.

I want to say this and I well remember it. The Honourable Member may not remember it but when the by-election in 1984 came, part of the platform of the Labour Party in that area was that roads which were going in would be increased and that we were going to join the industrial estate with the residential estate. I remember going in there. There was a famous rum shop in that area that many members of the Labour Party used to congregate in. So that what I want to say, what has happened is that tremendous developments and new changes have occurred. There has been the development of the marina. There has been a phenomenal change in the need for land in the north of Barbados. As a matter of fact this change has been so great that all of us as Members of this House should monitor it very carefully because I hope not forever to have to pay taxes if the land values that are going on in the north are maintained and with the taxes that should be captured as a result of that phenomenal rise many of us

should be able to get some kind of tax reduction. We ought to be able to.

I want this to be very clear. I am watching this very carefully because I understand there are people paying \$1 000 a square foot for land. If they are paying \$1 000 a square foot for land, I hope that the Commissioner of Valuations and other people are making clear and understand what the laws of Barbados are. We have a capital value basis for our land taxes.

Aside.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: It is a fact, one thousand dollars. I am told that it is the highest price. It is a small piece of land and if it is on the seaside...

The Honourable Member thinks that he is sitting pretty. He says in a couple of years he is not going to have to work at all. So when you hear the Honourable Member trumpeting the development in St. Lucy he knows why. A big land owner in St. Lucy can only benefit.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is giving the impression, Sir, that I have spoken in this debate to promote my own interest and that is not true, Sir.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: So what we have to do, Sir, is keep under constant review the land needs in this area. I have always said it is my view that we have to have a land use policy in relation to land on what I call the first level of our country, the land nearest the sea underneath the first set of hills. It is a small amount of land. There is a great need for the land and therefore all of us have to tell our people like I have to tell the people in Oistins that everybody must recognise that if they want to live within the area between the hills and the sea you have to go up. That is a problem that we have to face. And it is a problem that a decision has to be made on very, very soon.

I am very glad to see that this whole problem of that area of land between the Maynards Hill, as I call it and the Colleton Hill, because that is the only area, the area under the Maynards Hill and the Colleton area, that is an area for which there is great demand and I hope that a rational plan will be developed in which more intensive use is made of the land and at the same time one is able to exploit the unquestioned commercial potential of that land on the sea coast. Those are the two things that you have to reconcile and there is a very important thing, that the coastal conservation agency in Barbados should be paying attention as a matter of urgency to the problem of the coastal erosion between the old Six Men's jetty and Shermans.

It is a very important point. A special scheme should be developed. I know what I am talking about. I saw that coastal attack between Oistins and St. Lawrence Church and we were able to persuade the European Economic Community, as part of the Oistins Re-development Scheme, to do a comprehensive groyning from St. Lawrence Church right up to Oistins and today we can boast of the fact that all the way to the Dover Convention Centre, all the way up to the new Turtle Beach Hotel, all the way to the Bougainvillea Hotel, all of Maxwell, all of Welches that used to be under attack...

I remember when the late Honourable Member for St. Thomas, Minister Boxill was here, I had to carry Minister Boxill in Welches in Christ Church and show him an area where the sea was undermining the road in Cashell and in Welches and all of that took place.

The same thing can happen between Six Men's and Half Moon Fort. If a comprehensive coastal conservation scheme is not undertaken as a matter of urgency sooner or later you will find that that area is under such an attack, not only the houses on the seaside which you have had to move already but the very road that is there.

At the same time, if you are prepared to spend the amount of money you will find that you are able to reclaim sufficient land there to have a similar type of situation that you have at Trevor's Way in Bridgetown between the fish market and the entrance to the Harbour. All of that is reclaimed land and that is what we have to do. Then you will be able to have a real big marina, fishing boat harbour, everything in that area. So it is not incompatible.

I do not think that we should place these matters in extreme because as long as we put our heads together in this area and we lead and be not led in this area we would be able to use the land to its most optimum use and we would get taxes. The people would have housing of a much better quality and there would be development in Barbados.

As far as the land at Grantley Adams Airport is concerned I only want to say this. I have been advocating for many years, I tried my best during the time when I was able to have influence in decision making at the highest level to ensure that all the lands around Grantley Adams Airport be properly planned.

I believe that Barbados has an excellent opportunity to have a free trade zone for air cargo. I really believe that. And it would be better to start at Grantley Adams because the runway is there already. If they start it in St. Lucy they would have to build a runway. Let us, Mr. Speaker, develop the one we have to its logical limit first. I believe it would be less expensive to do that. When that is filled up then we can try St. Lucy. After all St. Lucy has got a lot

of resource based industries. They have cement and 350 people employed down there and I just understand that Harrison's Point Lighthouse and the land around there has been sold for no less than \$5 million so you will understand what is going on down there in the north. 4.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that a concerted decision will be made to do a physical planning exercise to ensure that the land surrounding the Airport in Barbados is properly zoned with a view to its being developed as a free zone particularly for those industries that relate to air cargo.

I just read recently that Federal Express has opened a new terminal in Miami, totally devoted to packages, a 24-hour packaging centre. They are saying that they are going to do that in various areas in the world because the Governments have lost control of their postal industry and that is what we have to do. We have an excellent geographical situation. We have an excellent airport. We have excellent industrial development laws. We have good promotional skills. What we need to do is to designate the area of land and let us get on with encouraging people to put in facilities so that Barbados' Airport could be used for 24 hours a day. Although they would make a lot of noise at night over my house when they are coming in. It would not matter to me because I know that once that is completed that we in the South will be in the same position as the people are in the North, there would be plenty of jobs available.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Members for their comments on the history of Six Men's. I would just like to reiterate that this Resolution pertains to 9.51 hectares of land at Newton, Christ Church. The actual acquisition by the Crown had already been completed in 1995 and this Resolution seeks to vest the land in the Industrial Development Corporation.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ORDER NO. 12 - TO MOVE THAT THE HOUSE
RESOLVES ITSELF INTO COMMITTEE OF
SUPPLY TO CONSIDER THE GRANT
OF SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE
SERVICE OF BARBADOS

On the motion of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER seconded by Right Hon. O. S. ARTHUR the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. D. CARTER in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in Committee of Supply.

ORDER NO. 12 - RESOLUTION TO GRANT THE SUM OF \$1 242 040 FROM THE CONSOLIDATED FUND TO SUPPLEMENT THE ESTIMATES 1997-98 AS SHOWN IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES NO.

7

HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
TOURISM AND INTERNATIONAL
TRANSPORT - \$392 040

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively straightforward issue. The sum being sought here by way of a supplementary, \$392 040 is to facilitate the replacement of the distance measuring equipment navigational aid at the Grantley Adams International Airport.

This distance measuring equipment is really an essential navigational aid in the provision of air traffic services. The one currently in use was purchased in 1974 and had a life expectancy of some 15-20 years so it has clearly outlived its useful life. In any event, a number of the parts are really obsolete and no longer being manufactured. It did provide some very good service, but even back in 1994 consideration was being given to replacing it because of the high cost of repairs. But, because of the existing financial constraints at the time, it was decided to defer the decision especially since the manufacturers had indicated that they would have been able to continue to maintain and repair the equipment as necessary.

Very recently, and more importantly subsequent to the preparation of the Estimates, the said manufacturers had indicated that many of the components for the system are no longer available. For example, the built-in test equipment, certain intermediate frequency amplifiers and the test units, they clearly indicated and strongly stated have become obsolete and could not be built any longer and that replacement parts for many of the components were no longer available. The useful life of the distance measuring equipment has now been exhausted. It is obsolete and it simply has to be replaced.

In the Estimates this year, Head 35, subprogramme 4 Code 35070.4 Item No. 625, the figure of \$40 500 had been included in the Estimates. That was originally intended for the acquisition of the replacement built-in test equipment. But as I said, the manufacturers have indicated that that is no longer possible. It is not being manufactured anymore.

A decision was therefore made to purchase the equipment and the cost of this replacement equipment is US\$211 200 and translates into BDS\$430 848. A down payment of 20 percent or BDS\$86 200 had to be made with the order. So, what we are seeking today is a supplementary in this sum. The cost actually involves not only the actual equipment itself but also the installation of the equipment and training of four technicians to be able to use the equipment.

The sum being sought today, \$392 040 is merely to supplement the original figure of \$40 500 that had been placed in the Estimates when it felt, on the advice of the manufacturer, that the equipment could have been repaired. But subsequent to the Estimates they have indicated it cannot be repaired and we have to purchase a new one.

Asides.

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: It is self-explanatory. It is distance measuring equipment and it allows the aircraft to know the distance it is from the Airport and other perhaps more circuitous routes have to be used for that to be done now. More word of mouth communication between the airplane and the tower has to be done. It still can be done. The airplane still knows where it is, but this facilitates the whole exercise greatly. So we are seeking this sum to be able to purchase this equipment at this time.

As I said, it is not really in my view any contentious issue and Mr. Chairman, with those few comments, I will beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Christ Church East Central.

Mr. W. C. C. CALLENDER: The Airport lies within my constituency and as the Honourable Member was speaking about this piece of equipment, I remembered that there was a crash just a few months ago. It was reported that the distance measuring equipment was not working and I believe that the Honourable Member could have perhaps brought that to bear in the discussion about how important this piece of equipment is. Even though the aircraft may have their own monitoring systems, it is important for the safety of people on land that this kind of equipment is working and since I fear for the lives of the dear people of Christ Church East who are within this area, I cannot do anything but support this measure wholeheartedly.

Thank you.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, this particular matter is a very important one. I am not sure, listening to what was said by the Honourable Minister, that I can support this without getting a commitment from him.

He said, Sir, that the original piece of equipment was bought in 1974 and that it had a life of between 15 to 20 years which means it had a maximum life up to the day of 1994. I think, considering the problems we are having these days with aircraft throughout the world, it is a big slip.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: It has a life of between 15 to 20 years so the maximum time that this piece of equipment should have been working should have been in 1994. To come three years after, Sir, to replace a piece of equipment as crucial as this I think something is wrong.

The Minister already admitted in his debate that the Democratic Labour Party set about to replace it before and it took the Barbados Labour Party three years to replace a crucial piece of equipment which could have threatened the lives of the people in Christ Church.

I am saying, Sir, that no talk from the Honourable Member for St. James South can stop me from making this point. The Honourable Member for St. James South is part of the Cabinet and she has failed this country by not voting enough money previously to make sure that the lives of people in Christ Church were not threatened.

I know that you will support this, Sir, because you look after the interest and the health of the people in Christ Church. I am saying that this Resolution is three years late and we expect better planning than this from a Government that has so much money to play around with. The lives of the people in Christ Church are more important than \$394 000 so no excuse from any Cabinet Minister could stop me from making my point.

I am saying, Sir, that I expect you also to support me on this because as a parliamentary representative for Christ Church your first interest is to represent the interest of the people in Christ Church. I know that you cannot do it so I will do it for you.

I am saying that the Cabinet has failed by not providing the necessary money to protect the lives of the people in Christ Church, a piece of equipment as important as this, and they failed to replace it. Three years ago they recognised how important the equipment was and every day you are having plane crashes because of this vital piece of equipment when you hear complaints all over the world. Can you imagine that? All over the world you are hearing that planes are crashing because the pilot took the wrong distance and landed the wrong place.

Can you imagine, Sir, that my friend, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South could be home sleeping one night and because of the failure of this piece of equipment a plane lands on his house? You know how I

would feel, Sir? That would hurt me because there is no way I would like to come here on a Tuesday and do not see him but all because of a Cabinet who failed to do the necessary thing and would not buy a vital piece of equipment.

>

I do not want to hear about this happening in here again. It is deplorable because I also know that if the airport was in St. Lucy as it should have been, seeing it is in the flight path, that he would have argued for that piece of equipment for St. Lucy also, and that is why I can afford to defend him, Sir.

Thank you very much.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy thinks constantly of my welfare, but I want to assure the Honourable Member that having been a Minister responsible for Civil Aviation for a number of years, I know that although this is a vital piece of equipment, I do not believe the dangers are as great as the Honourable Member sought to let this Honourable House know to be the dangers.

The question of re-equipping an airport to the highest standards, as the Grantley Adams Airport, is one that is continuously a problem for successive Governments in Barbados. If one were to install the latest and every piece of equipment, there would be a tremendous demand on the public purse annually so therefore judgments and choices have to be made.

I remember in my time, like in the time of a predecessor as Minister of Civil Aviation, the late Prime Minister Errol Barrow in Barbados, that we used to be bombarded every Estimates with the need for a lift for the air traffic controllers. We used to be told that when they walk up there how tired they were and they could not concentrate and things of that kind. I believe there is a lift now in the new Air Traffic Control Tower, but we have not had any accidents as a result of postponing that decision so that you have to make a choice.

It is quite clear that this equipment is a vital piece of equipment but it only supplements other areas. It is vital and it should be replaced. I think what we should be looking at is whether our replacement programme could not be revised because a piece of electronic equipment that can last 15 years, I think, one has got remarkable service out of it.

Quite apart from the technological obsolescence that inevitably arises, this is an area in which there is fast change. Lots of change takes place in this area but we must remember that however we want to have the best airport in the world and the best equipment it is always a question

of whether it is the correct judgment to spend money to keep it 100% up-to-date or try and stretch the equipment that we have.

In the future, this is a point the Honourable Member as an accountant would appreciate, that if the Airport is to be fully up-to-date with all this equipment, the charges for the airport have to reflect the cost of depreciation of the equipment over a period of time.

Many Governments today have taken the view that airports are institutions that should be privatised and they should pay their own way. There should be no cross subsidy. Duty free operations and air traffic, landing fees and things of that kind and other services would have to be considered.

We in Barbados have to look at this in light of the fact that an airport is a vital necessity for our tourism industry. We may not, at the present moment - I have not done an economic study on it but I believe one is going on - have reached such a stage of utilisation of the airport that we can say that airport charges should reflect the true cost of operation of the airport. We may be near there.

Aside.

Sir HAROLD St. JOHN: That excess that goes into the Consolidated Fund may not be a true excess because unless you have a proper charge for depreciation of things of that kind you are fooling yourself by saying that you have an excess so, therefore, you have other services there.

While I can understand the venom with which the Honourable Member spoke, I think it was a little misguided in the sense that he was really trying to portray the impression that we are more exposed than in truth and in fact we were. The point he was trying to make was a point that I believe may have some validity in it in that you should keep constantly under review your operations to make sure that you have as an accountant - he speaks from an accounting point of view - that you should have a proper schedule of depreciation so that you could replace them in better time. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended getting involved in this debate but arising out of what the Honourable Member who just sat down has said, I think I need to ask a couple of questions about the comment.

First of all the Minister. I wonder if he could take the opportunity when he is responding to give us some idea as to where we are in relation to articles that were very current not too long ago about the state of our airport and the alleged decisions by people from other countries to rate

our airport. It is something on which I do not think there has been a statement from the Government since that furore. I think you should take the opportunity to let the public know where we are because the impression was given for reasons which had nothing to do with the airport in my view that they were in a position to make public statements and make judgments in their own country about what is happening in our country that would affect our livelihood by determining what is the quality of our airport and the distance measuring and other capabilities would have been included in the so-called inspection. I accept the need to buy new equipment because the facilities and the spare parts are not available and so I am not going to raise any question about that but I want to make a comment on this question of privatisation of airports.

These international agencies and people who have to advise countries like ours always have new concepts that they wish to try on others. I am always very amazed at how I do not hear anybody saying that you have to privatise Heathrow or John F. Kennedy or Miami but we have to privatise Grantley Adams and I do not understand that. For us, the airport is one of the most vital aspects of life in this country because we rely on tourism for our livelihood as a country, not just a few people working in tourism because if we have no tourism we have no country in the sense that we have to find alternate economic activity and therefore the question of privatising is not really a style. It is not like privatising water in Britain or privatising something else, it is a matter of life and death for us and I think that before we consider privatising the airport whatever that means we have to take very careful examination of what are the implications for us as a country.

I will only give a preliminary indication that we are not going to be walking into any privatisation of the airport in Barbados as part of the 'new-fangled' desire to globalise the world to suit the people who do not globalise for themselves or who do not privatise for themselves. I cannot think of any reason except for the services at the airport which are already privatised as far as I know; and certainly the duty free shops and these kinds of things have been privatised. They go up to the highest bidder give or take the odd political input here and there.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am aware of how these things operate. I have a good friend who was running a very efficient operation at the airport but he happened to fall on the wrong side of the political divide and he is out and somebody else is in. Those are the vagaries of life in this country but I am not quarrelling on his behalf I am just saying that his time will come again so I do not have a problem with that.

Those areas are privatised and I did not raise this question because we only have half of an hour in the budgetary exercise but I heard the Prime Minister said that they are going to be taking steps to privatise the airport.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Corporatise is not the same as privatise, the newspapers said privatise and you know these days I have to pay attention to the call-in programmes.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He wants to ask you a question. I am pausing to allow him to ask his questions. You know, Sir, in music you have to stop the organ and let there be an unaccompanied part.

I take the point that the Honourable Member is making from his seat that corporatising is quite different from privatising but you see the Honourable Member who just spoke said privatising so I am responding to that and I am making the point that we do not need to privatise our airport unless somebody is going to explain to me what they mean. As far as I know the services which are provided at the airport at the moment which can be privatised are already privatised. If we are talking about having an airport authority like they have in the United States, if that is what is meant, that is a different matter which we will have to look at. But the structure of that should not be like a statutory board. If that is where we are going, we will look at that when the time comes and we will see how it can go. I thought that the Port had originally been in something near to that and perhaps what we need in this country is an airport and seaport authority that would have real, and I mean real as opposed to superficial authority and power, where the Chief Executive Officer and the principals involved would be career people, career in the sense of Chief Executive Officers and those people not responding to five-year changes or four-year changes and that sort of thing. That is a matter that we will debate in due course.

I just wanted to respond to the question raised by the Honourable Member for Christ Church South about privatising because 'people in Barbados get some very strange ideas and they have a feeling that as long as you say private sector that automatically means efficiency. And it has to be said that some of the most efficient operations of things in Barbados have been done by the public sector. The National Insurance is a clear example of the public sector, the I.C.B. is another one. We used to have the Natural Gas Corporation and the airport itself. The airport has been run as a public institution and I do not think that anybody who is fair could quarrel with the quality of our airport, all things being equal. We will find areas to 'nit-pick' from time to time in the political divide but anybody

who is fair will have to say that over the years Barbados has seen a very highly developed and well-structured airport. And while we may quarrel about things that could have been better, none of us who is honest and fair would run down our airport especially after we have gone through some others.

I recently visited an airport in the United States and I have to tell you that they are not nearly as efficient as people who come down here and shoot off their mouths tend to suggest. There are areas where they are downright horribly inefficient in the United States. In Europe it is slightly better but certainly in the United States there is a lack of courtesy, there is a lack of speed and a lack of sensitivity. Another time we will spend sometime talking about these things. I wish the Minister when he responds will just deal with that whole question of where we are in relation to how we have been "classified".

The other thing in which I have heard some reaction is this: When the Minister first said that he was going to block out the capacity of people who had come to greet arriving passengers from seeing what was going on below, he gave a reason and we accepted it at face value at the time; because I believe and I think that we over here share the view that when the Government has responsibility for some aspect of certain activity and is seeking to put in place measures which will improve the situation that we should at least give them a chance. I think that the Minister owes it to us since this is the first time since the Estimates that we have had anything like this, to give us some idea what are the pros and cons in terms of what was anticipated. There are many people who have some disquiet at not being able to see their people as they arrive, they cannot see them until they actually come out of the Customs and it does cause some disquiet. 4.55 p.m.

There are many people who are not sure if the person was on the plane and sometimes you are standing outside the gate and you have to wait until everybody is out. Sometimes the person is delayed inside because they have to pay customs or do something and those waiting are not sure.

Now there is no system by which you can go and ask, well was so and so on.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not talking about Honourable Members. Honourable Members have ways and means of finding out things and usually have passes. I am talking about ordinary members of the public. I am not criticising. I am just drawing to your attention some of the drawbacks of a system which was designed. When you go to the airport to see somebody coming in, in the past you used

to be able to see them. The Honourable Member is drawing to my attention that at Gatwick that does not happen. That is true but nobody goes to the airport to see anybody come in except the West Indians and they get accustomed to lining up in Gatwick. They are not in their own country so they do whatever they are told to do. But down here in Barbados this is their own country and when they go to the airport to see somebody come in they want to see them. I am only drawing to your attention that you now have to stay on the outside and they are on the outside literally and you have to wait until passengers burst through the relatively small door.

I know what the problem is, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that Honourable Members on that side, when they arrive do not have to come through the door. They do not have any waving or anything. Most of the Honourable Members over there go to the lounge and before long their loved ones see them from early. I am talking about ordinary people.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am really amazed that Honourable Members are not aware. If Honourable Members can see I can only tell you that my constituents complain that they cannot see when people are coming in. The point is that the Minister has not explained to the public. He told us in here and it obviously was not carried in the Press but he has to explain to the public why he blocked them out. The people are grumbling that they cannot see when people come in.

It is a small point for us but for those persons who have to go and meet people...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I thought it was a small point for us but my friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is now telling me that he was not sure if his people were on the plane. What I am going to do is ask the Honourable Member for St. James South, the next time I am coming in to come and greet me so I can look up and see her and she can look down and see me.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No. We are not going to let them know and we will have an experiment. If I see you and you see me then I would come back in the House and say we can see. If not, Sir, the Honourable Member for St. James South is going to have to wait outside the door and when I come through the door she is going to have to hug me. So make up your mind.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West and other Honourable Members have

spoken about one aspect of security of the airport. Many of us regret that former times have passed.

I am sure that people still hanker over the time when you could go to the old Seawell hangar and walk on the balcony and see people depart and people arrive but those days are long past. I think we have a public duty to educate the public as to why those days cannot return. The reasons are not because any of us as administrators of the airport or as Ministers of Government or Cabinet want to block out the views of people from seeing their loved ones or saying fond farewells. The reality of the twentieth century and the twenty-first century is that security is too vital an issue for each one of us and particularly for people in public life. The various isms and ideologies have no known boundaries in assassinating distinguished people. Internationally known people and ordinary people have suffered.

We are very fortunate here in Barbados that those extremes have not overtaken us but because we are in an international competition, particularly in our main earning sector, the tourism sector, we have to put into place measures that will anticipate and will act as a preventative mechanism against the likelihood of any such thing occurring. That is the principal reason why the Government has sensibly sought to make it not uncomfortable for people but to make it more secure in the interest of our relatives, in the interest of our country and otherwise. So you are not blocking out vision. You are really putting in place security.

Really there is no inconvenience. Anyone can simply speak to the airline, to your tour operator, to your own travel agent and find out when any of us have exited from any part of the world and where we are at any time. It is so easy now with a computer for me to plot wherever my friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael South may be travelling at any time and he can do the same for me. As a matter of fact he and I always knew when each of us was travelling and I would report to the public on him and he likewise on me, where we were going and what we were doing. So I really would not like the short-term political view to be taken on an issue of this nature. I am sure Honourable Members do not intend to take that view because it is too serious a view.

I wish we did not have to put in place at the Grantley Adams International Airport the level of security that we now have in place. 5.05 p.m.

I believe that we have managed to maintain, in a discrete way, the expenses for travellers and it is attached onto your airline ticket, no doubt in some way or the cost that you pay in your departure tax and we all wish we did not have to do this. But I would much prefer that it

be done and the little inconvenience stays because I believe that security is the most important part indeed, of travel these days.

I recently have been in Boston, United States on public duty and the wait that I had exceeded anything that I have had at the Grantley Adams International Airport. As I travel around the United States and other countries who then try to judge us and to evaluate our efficiency and our own institutions, I believe it is only because they are big countries that they can dominate and act in this way. If I had to judge some of their airports, which are international airports, some of them internal, we do well and we exceed many of them in our standards. I hope that the United States in its global domination and fantastic fear of what is going to happen in the next century as it competes against Asia, will stop using the might of its institutions for downgrading the airports and the services that are rendered in third world countries, particularly a country such as Barbados.

I am not saying that we have always maintained the excellent standard that we yearn after, but we have been moving from a moderate way of performance to an excellent standard of performance under successive Governments. We have spent money at our Sea Port and our Airport consistently to upgrade them, because they are so very vital to the economic survival of our country. I hope that we will spend and continue to spend the money as wisely as we have been spending it in the past. When I hear the Honourable Member for St. Lucy look at the short-term political point of saying that because 15 years have passed, you should long since have put in place the new distance measuring equipment I think he forgets that we have not had here, in Barbados, certainly any major accidents. There have been two light airplanes, I think we have had some problems with...

Asides.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: ...because we have been ahead. But the Honourable Member knows, he is a good accountant, that because your depreciation period may well be 10 or 15 years or whatever, it does not mean that the equipment should be condemned at the end of that period, and it remains for sometime good equipment if it is properly maintained.

The Honourable Member very well knows that sometimes he may have on his books, having depreciated it, a piece of equipment or something which, he has down to zero, but he would never sell it. Let me make the point, Sir, that I am one of those who believe that we have to have a proper maintenance programme, particularly at our International Airport and at all of our Ports and in all of Government's institutions. We spend and buy very expensive equipment and we therefore have to have the

capability of maintaining that equipment. That shows the link that we must make between areas like these and our educational system.

If there is one area where I have detected a weakness in our systems it is in our maintenance capacity and capability with particularly the technical type of equipment that we are introducing into our institutions. There is a tremendous possibility ahead for the country in creating additional jobs at a high technical level in making maintenance itself into an industry. It is one of the things that I would like to see the Government move to. We do not need to have to bring people in from Puerto Rico or elsewhere to repair The Grantley Adams Airport or to repair anywhere else.

If there is one good lesson that came out of the transition from Nyasaland and Bechuanaland into Zimbabwe and other countries in that area, it was this, that because there were sanctions in place these countries learned how to maintain whatever they have and they have made it into an industry. To some extent this has happened with Cuba itself, those of us who follow what is happening in that great country will find that the Cubans can keep equipment and keep it working effectively for a long time, by cannibalizing, by experimenting, *et cetera*.

They are under an economic squeeze, a very unfair squeeze in my view. They have to do it for their survival and they have done it. We have that capacity and capability here. My father was a carpenter, he is a carpenter still, he has retired now, 101 years old, God bless him but he has never let go, he has not let go of wood that anybody would handle, he has used his hands and skill to make it into an industry. I would hope that the Government would have the capacity at a very high level of maintaining whatever we have in a

The only Giber point I want to advert to is the idea of what the Honourable Member for St. Michael West termed corporatising. We have run institutions that are fully owned by the Government reasonably well. We short sell ourselves sometimes. There are some fully owned Government institutions that perform as excellently in terms of managerial skills as anything in the private sector and better. We can do it in many other areas because we are using the same human resources as are being used in the private sector. It is the same: workers and people and one has to have faith in them. But I would expect that part of the challenge to us is how to get people to recognise that they are owners of their own resources. It is a problem for all of the political people today, particularly if we go after the very evocative expressions that have crept into politics as a way of saying how to gain power. But the truth is that Barbados has managed to progress with a

good deal of the ownership of very vital resources remaining in the public domain and being used in a spectacular way.

I do not believe that there was any private institution in Barbados in the last 50 years that would have developed the Airport and the Sea Port in the way that successive Governments have had the vision and the ability to develop them. I feel very proud as a Barbadian about this. When the divide came in the 1950s and 1960s about the conversion from the old way of doing business with the lighters or what not to the new Port, there was a political divide because there was a political point to be made. But at the end of the day the point is that Governments have made a success of our Port and we have one of the most efficient Sea Ports and one of the most efficient and well-run Airports today, both run by Barbadians. There is no foreigner, no non-national running them, neither of them. If you look right from the Boards right through, they are generating profit. The Port Authority is tested on the anvil as BS&T or any other institution is tested and they are generating profit.

I know the Honourable Member wants some more. He has to learn a few things though, Sir. They are generating profit and generating a good profit and I would like to see the same done, for instance, in other areas.

I believe that Harrison's Cave generates profit, although no doubt it is probably swallowed in the NCC and elsewhere. But I would like to see that move again, run by people like ourselves in here. So I would beg the country at this stage not to sell ourselves short. The economic antagonists would love to start a debate in which to say how we are exposing our people in Christ Church and elsewhere to the dangers of very bad maintenance and that turns up in the FCC. The next thing the Americans would do is to say that Barbados' Airport is very badly maintained.

I know the Honourable Member did not intend that, but I have learnt by dint of, I suppose, experience and having been a Minister of Government that sometimes I am very careful, even if I have to make a political point, how I couch my words. Because, while we can understand it here, in this Chamber and we can understand it as we campaign against each other in order to replace each other, yet it is used against us as well as outside in some ways that we never intended. 5.15 p.m.

Let me say, Sir, that I will support the plea for a proper programme in place, which I am sure the Minister will probably explain, for replacements over a reasonable period of time. I would wish to support a programme that we have in place very strong and useful maintenance in

order to keep our equipment up-to-date even when we cannot replace it, and keep it functioning.

I trust that as we modernise the airport to answer the challenges of our competitors Cuba, Latin America - America itself where tourism is now becoming a very high generator of jobs for the future and therefore we have to compete against America itself and Britain and elsewhere. I hope we will always be a step ahead and that the people who work in these institutions would recognise that they are doing their country and themselves a service by giving high activity and maintaining high standards in whatever they do.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would wish to join this debate and I would also like to make an appeal that we approach some of these subjects with the kind of balance and understanding that have characterised the debate on this item because I believe that all of us have been seeking to arrive at what is best for Barbados even though we may couch it in different terms.

The Honourable Member for St. Lucy is concerned about safety and security. These are very important considerations and that particular aspect of his speech may have been missed. He was appealing for safety and security and quite rightly he was pointing out that we should, both Governments, show a little more foresight in our preventive maintenance as a technique that we should use, not only in terms of airport development, but in the other parts of our infrastructure as well. I think we should pay a little more attention to the pearls of wisdom when they drop from the mouths of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in particular. I genuinely think so.

Sir, let me make this point. I believe I have an appreciation of the virtues of privatisation and I also have an appreciation of the virtues of public enterprise. Throughout my whole career, Sir, I have been a public sector person but I appreciate the virtues of privatisation.

Perhaps the Honourable Member for Christ Church West was speaking with a little diffidence because he mentioned the areas in which, through public enterprise, the fortunes of Barbados have prospered. He himself now plays a leading role in the National Insurance Fund, but I know that diffidence prevented him from mentioning that as one of the areas in which public enterprise has served Barbados well.

I would like to say this about our airport as well and join the Honourable Members in praising the work at the airport.

Aside.

Rt. Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I have not yet come to praise the political public officials. I am talking about

the public officers. They have done tremendous work because it is one of those technical departments in which, as a Minister, you have to rely particularly on the expertise that is there. I think they have done and are doing a particularly good job and they should be recognized.

Our ports are very important in our development. I think we have to look more at how they can become and develop into greater commercial earning centres, not by privatisation, but by the development of businesses that are cognizant with the operations of an airport. I think this is important and we should look for ways and means by which we can further develop our airport along these lines. I believe we have the imagination to do it and I believe we have the determination and simply taking up something and selling it - I am talking about the infrastructure as such - like the seaport or the airport, is not necessarily the answer except in very grave circumstances. I am glad to know that is not being suggested.

I think if there is more discussion on these issues, what appears to be conscientious may, in fact, find common ground among and across the divide that may separate us in this Parliament and we will be able to come up with what may be good for Barbados.

Let me say something about the distance measuring equipment. There are many areas in which we need additional equipment in Barbados. We have to recognise that some of the most critical times and points in air travel are at the point of departure and at the point of landing, takeoff and landing. We have to make sure that we have equipment that is efficient, that is appropriate for our circumstances, and also that is affordable.

Now, sometimes we take a look and believe that airports in developing countries can develop the same way and with the same kind of equipment as the great international airports because when we start to talk about airports we tend to think of Heathrow, Gatwick, John F. Kennedy, Miami and, perhaps, Dallas, Fort Worth but there are many other airports, even in the United States, which do not have the facilities and do not have that level of equipment as those large airports. Sometimes if we travel a little more widely, we will see that the facilities that we have in Barbados are of a very high standard. We only have to maintain that standard and improve upon it as our circumstances will permit. 5.25 p.m.

We are going to support this particular measure that is before us. I thought I would make that intervention to make it clear that we appreciate the need for the supplementary and we know that forward planning will continue and that when in a short time when the reins of Government are handed over and there is a change of

Government, we will inherit an airport and other infrastructural facilities that we too in our time will be able to improve upon because in politics I believe whether we are on this side or on that side the true politician and the politician that makes a contribution to the development of a country is the politician who can make two ears of corn grow where only one grew before. If we can all approach our task in this particular manner, I think our country will be a better country.

Thank you.

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, a number of Members on the Other Side have tried to water down the contribution of the Honourable Member for St. Lucy but I believe that I have to refer to some of his comments lest the very wrong message goes out abroad to perhaps the travelling public that there is anything wrong with our equipment.

First of all the Member speaks about the fact that the equipment should have been acquired in 1994. It was not this Government that made the decision in 1994. In any event, the equipment was being repaired satisfactorily up until April this year when the manufacturers for the first time indicated that the parts had become obsolete and were not being manufactured anymore, that was in April of this year but those are the small points. The fact of the matter is that no plane crashes anywhere because there is no distance measuring equipment or because it is malfunctioning because there are back-up systems. You have ground positioning systems, a satellite operated system on virtually every plane except perhaps the very, very smallest one which tells a plane exactly where it is. It is on every plane virtually.

In any case, in addition to that there is also radar which is also available everywhere to inform every plane where it is. The fact of the matter is that there are what you call 'redundancies' in aviation otherwise called 'back up systems' so we have a ground positioning system, we have radar and we have distance measuring equipment. No plane crashes because anyone of them individually is not functioning. The Member for St. Lucy must not get up and purport to pontificate on issues that he knows nothing about because it would send the wrong signal to the travelling public.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House because I spoke from what the Honourable Member said and if anybody gave misleading information it has to be the Honourable Member for St. Michael North. What he is now telling the House is that he is asking the House to vote \$400 000 where it is not needed at the airport so in that case I am suggesting to him that he should make this money available to NHC to put people in housing.

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, as I said there are always systems to ensure that adequate safety and security are maintained in the aviation industry, that is a fact. I think that will wipe away the nonsense of the Member for St. Lucy. I appreciate the fact that the Member for St. Michael West asked rather than sought*to pontificate on the issue of the status of our airport because recently it does seem that there are a number of self-appointed experts in issues relating to the Ministry of International Transport. Only yesterday I had to clarify that in fact there had been no increases in our marine charges or head taxes after an expert last Thursday on television purported to say that there had been. I have been able to watch television programmes as well and hear a number of former members not of Parliament but certainly of the Senate speaking again on the issue of our airport being, they call it in some cases classified, certified and all sorts of things and I think the Member did the right thing by just asking what the position is.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, there was never any issue about our airport, that was never an issue.

Asides.

Hon. R. St. C. TOPPIN: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to hear myself.

There was never any issue about our airport. What was done in December 1996 was in relation to our Civil Aviation Section, our institutional set up and our systems and so on. There was never any issue in relation to our airport at all. I want to say now that our Civil Aviation Section has not been categorised by the United States. Again contrary to many reports that have gone abroad, the visit by Federal Aviation Administration made certain examinations of our system. Subsequent to their visit there have been further discussions where I travelled to Washington or to Miami and had talks with the FAA and there has been no categorisation of our civil aviation section. In fact, the basic truth is that in relation to the United States and the FAA you must have either a national carrier operating into the United States or an application by a national carrier to fly into the United States for their entitlement to look at your system for the purpose of categorisation, to kick in. There is simply no basis otherwise to do it. Barbados has no operation to the United States by a national carrier neither do we have any application for any operations by a national carrier in the United States so Barbados has not been categorised and the United States have informed that the visit in December 1996 was a government to government consultation between United States and Barbados as a result of which no issue of categorisation was arrived at all.

Now, notwithstanding that fact, they did make certain observations and even before the visit of the FAA in

December last year, we in the Ministry of International Transport had already started to put in place a number of measures to ensure that we spruce up in areas where we might have fallen down a little bit and in that respect we have already strengthened, added bodies to, our civil aviation section in terms of provision of a technical officer. We already added one technical officer, we also have brought in from overseas, from IKO, a technical legal advisor, an expert who has already spent two weeks in Barbados on a fact finding mission and he has already pointed out to us as well certain areas in which we would want to, in his words, do some dusting primarily in relation to our regulations and now we have to update our regulations. He is going to come back to work on them as well.

There is also the question of the provision of technical guidance materials where you simply have to translate documents from legal language into layman's language so that any maintenance man can go and take it up and read it and understand it. All of these are areas which we are now working on. In fact, we had taken steps to start to work even before the visit of the United States Federal Aviation Administration. 5.35 p.m.

So we are working seriously on our problems. As I said we took note of their comments. We had nothing to hide about them coming but it has been classified as a Government to Government consultation. No question of categorisation arises. In fact the FAA would have to rewrite its own rules for there to be a categorisation of Barbados. I just thought I would clear the air.

I am glad the Member asked and I hope the position now is clear to all in Barbados as to its status. There is no question about our airport at all and our civil aviation section has not been categorised by the United States Federal Aviation Administration.

With respect to the point made by the Member for St. Michael West about the frosted glass, I am well aware that we have a culture in Barbados, a tradition entrenched, where we wish to go to the airport and see people. You will see them anyhow when they come out but we have this culture that we like to see them as they are walking in to the arrivals hall. As it now stands with the frosted glass you can still see them a bit but once they go into the door you cannot see them anymore and I am not even going to go into the argument of whether it is done in Heathrow and so on. We had to make a choice between if we stay with our tradition and custom or whether we were going to heed the requests that were made by Immigration and Customs Officers about their safety and their feeling of safety while they were on the job primarily at the airport and even after.

The morning when I came to this Parliament when I gave the explanation as to why we had done it, I had actually been on the phone for about 35 minutes with one Immigration officer, a female, who was terrified and she implored me not to let anything happen in Parliament that day that could have reversed the decision because she was the one who had been at the immigration desk when a certain man in the visitors gallery had pointed his fingers at her in the form of a gun when a certain person was standing up that she was supposed to clear at Immigration.

There have been cases where immigration officers' car tyres have been slashed and customs officers as well have had their car tyres slashed, windscreens broken, car windows broken, when they go back to the car parks. All of these things have happened already with immigration and customs officers. So we have to make a choice as to whether we stick to the tradition or the custom or we look at the issue of security. We felt that on balance the issue of security outweighed the issue of the custom and the tradition. That is the sole reason we went that way.

I do not know if there are any other questions. Other members have dealt with the question of corporatisation. It has already been agreed that the airport will be corporatised. As to exactly how, the experts are still assessing it and it might be premature for me to give any definitive statement on it. For my part I would like to see it go the same route that the Barbados Port Authority is going to go. There is always a danger when you have a monopoly of any type in a country whether it be an airport or a seaport. It is a danger if the monopoly falls into the wrong hands and that is what we will have to guard against in the issue of corporatisation of the airport.

At this stage I do not think there is anything more I can add before the recommendations of the experts come on my desk. I do not think there were any other issues raised and with those few words I beg to move that Head 35 stand part.

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

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT -\$850000

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the Ministry of Health and the Environment seeks today to supplement its vote for Sub-program 13, the solid waste programme, in the sum of \$850 000. This figure represents the final payment to the contractors who were constructing the Greenland landfill, a firm called Norconsult Canada Carib Limited.

Out of this money, apart from the final payment to them, lighting fixtures for the entire perimeter of the

Greenland landfill will be provided and some small pieces of equipment to assist in the maintenance and mothballing programme until we actually move into Greenland will be purchased.

This project has a long and colourful history as a capital programme and capital project in Barbados. It dates back long before 1994 when a previous administration recognised that we had to think in terms of trying to find some proper means of landfilling or incinerating, some proper means of solid waste disposal and the then Government approached the Inter-American Development Bank for a pre-feasibility study to be done to frame a solid waste programme for Barbados. Out of that several components of the programme were discussed and this Administration finally agreed to what the particular components of the programme would be and they were a landfill to be located at Greenland, a bulky waste site now located at Bagatelle in St. Thomas, a hazardous waste facility, a transfer station and composting facility to be located at Vaucluse and the concept of recycling, re-use and waste minimisation. Greenland was agreed to after a much protracted process.

The then Administration set up a committee comprising several Government Departments including the Ministry of Health, but several other Ministries, NGOs, members of civil society and interested parties and professionals including professional organisations such as the Barbados Association of Professional Engineers and the Barbados National Trust. It was a broadly constituted committee. This committee was given all of the information in relation to the possible sites available for a landfill and they were asked to choose on the basis of the information presented to them by the engineers and the report of the company contracted to do the pre-feasibility study, Stanley Inc. out of Canada.

When that committee met in the first quarter of 1994 they were given all of the studies and they were given some 3 months to go back to their principals because individuals would have been representing various agencies and professional organisations, 3 months to go back to their principals, get instructions and make a choice. The meeting was held some 3 months subsequently and all of the persons representing the various entities except two voted and those two representatives abstained. Everybody else voted in favour of siting the landfill at Greenland.

It was determined that the clay soil composition of Greenland made it imminently well suited to a landfill site, that there was on site adequate cover material, that it would provide an ideal below the ground landfill particularly because it had already been a quarry site for the Arawak Cement Plant which took in the region of 70 truck loads of clay out of Greenland during the high point of its excavation period. No formal decisions were

taken until the latter half, perhaps the final quarter, of 1994 when the matter was then put again to a wide cross section of technocrats both local and foreign who advised the Government on the matter. The recommendation of this committee which had been set up was put before the Government. 5.35 p.m.

The Government by then had changed but acted on the advice that had been worked on for some considerable time prior to September of 1994. The records are there and can be produced. I do not think that this is controvertible.

People will still continue to argue whether Greenland was in fact, a good choice or not. Today, we come before the House to seek the final payment against a background where we were told that it would not have been possible to put a landfill in that site. So that is the first negative that we have overcome. There were those who at one point were saying that it could never be done, that we would dig down so low that we would get to water once we reached a certain depth, that the vehicles would stick, that it was just not possible to do it. So we have overcome that first barrier. We always argued that the advice rendered by all the technocrats, foreign and local gave us reason to believe, and all the engineering advice, that it was possible to locate a landfill at that site.

The cost of construction, now that it is completed, is US\$10 311 218.42. The project was brought in well within the time frame set for construction and there has been a small cost overrun of 0.5 percent. Part of the cost overrun was occasioned by the fact, as you will recall that this project was the subject of litigation and there were some delays. Once we had contracted the contractors who would do the construction, they had to leave their equipment in Miami, pending the outcome of the litigation and then bring it down here. There was some cost for those delays. The claims were put in by the contractors and that cost is US\$182 254.29.

This project has perhaps been one of the most controversial that I think any Government has ever seen, but it is not the only one. When the Central Bank was constructed there was tremendous controversy. When Sherbourne was constructed there was tremendous controversy. When the ABC Highway was constructed that too was attended by controversy. The Honourable Member for the City sought to set up the Barbados Drug Service and that too was attended by controversy, as was the construction of the Deep Water Harbour, as was the construction of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It was said at that time in the 1950s when the Barbados Labour Party was constructing it that it was going to sink, that we were putting it in a marsh, that the land was bog land, that it would be an unhealthy, choleric site for a hospital and all kinds of things.

So that this project has been attended by controversy is not in itself new. It has been part of the history of capital projects with the Barbados Labour Party and it has been part of the history of the development of capital projects by Governments on both sides. Because I am sure that those Members who have been here for much longer than I would be able to speak to some of the other capital projects in their time in here that have been attended by similar controversy.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that this has also been one of the most transparent Government projects ever built. I want to remind this Chamber of some of the mechanisms for transparency which have been established and which over time has been forgotten. In all of the debate by those whose personal financial interests may be adversely affected or those persons who consider themselves to be environmental crusaders, though they never crusaded against Mangrove, in all of that a lot of what the Government has done to ensure that this project has been transparent has been forgotten.

There were, during the course of this project, two town meetings, one at Belleplaine in St. Andrew when the electricity in the area went off and brought the meeting to an end, and the second town meeting at the Bethel Methodist Church, both of which had large audiences. There was a Steering Committee comprising all of the objectors. They never tell you this when they seek to criticise that all of these people who are objecting publicly were formed into a Steering Committee, saw the environmental impact assessment and had sight and access to the consultant's report long before they came to the desk of the Minister. All of the information was put before them.

There was a second Committee that was set up, a Solid Waste Management Task Force whose responsibility it was to advise the Government on all matters relating to solid waste, except Greenland, because, the committee of objectors or Steering Committee was looking specifically at Greenland. So the Task Force, the mandate from Cabinet comprised everything other than Greenland and they were told that they could not look at Greenland because the other Committee was already looking at it. But they have developed a framework for solid waste management in Barbados that the Government has taken on board as part of its global policy.

We have used much of the local knowledge of peak long livers from the area and people who have worked in the area with various Government agencies and other agencies for a long time. We have brought them inside and asked them what they had to offer by the way of advice, by the way of information and by the way of past experience. We have delivered to every media house in Barbados a copy of the Stanley Report on which the

Government's decisions were based. So there was nothing clandestine about it. The Stanley Reports which were guiding the Government were delivered to every media house in Barbados for them to dissect as they wish, publish as they wish or make available to the public in any form that they chose.

The Executive Summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment was published verbatim in both Sundays newspapers, the *Sunday Sun* and the *Sunday Advocate* at the Government's expense. Other components of the programme and of the EIA which were of interest to the public were also published in the newspapers. Notices indicating the other information on the EIA and the Stanley Reports and other technical reports appeared in the newspaper and copies of these reports were made available to the public through the Project Execution Unit of the Solid Waste Management Programme. People came including some of the objectors and again, we copied all of the materials at our expense and gave them to objectors. So that the public have had access either personally and directly or through their agents, to every component of this project at every stage of its development.

I wish to share with this Chamber, Sir, some of the design features that have been built into this landfill, so that people can appreciate the kind of technical work which has gone on and the substantial differences between the way this landfill has been designed and constructed as opposed to the way that the Mangrove Landfill was designed, constructed and operated.

Built in at Greenland are five kilometres of drain and pipes under and around the landfill, sub-drains to divert ground water away from the bottom of the landfill into a particular drainage area. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you think of the landfill as an oval shape, the diversion systems were to take the ground water off the landfill, bringing it around the oval on the perimeters of the oval and into a particular drainage area and into what are called retention ponds. 5.55 p.m.

When people talk about the retention ponds being wet or they see a wet area at Greenland, the landfill is designed in that way. If it were not wet we would, in fact, be concerned. It is designed to collect water there and that water can then be drawn off and used for irrigation purposes for the grass and so on in the area. It is deliberately designed that way. Instead, there is a leachate containment system designed into this landfill.

Now, this is different from the Mangrove Landfill because what happened at Mangrove is that leachate from the garbage used to be recycled onto the landfill itself but in this system and in this design the leachate will be drawn off and collected and removed from the site all together.

Surface water, drainage channels, culverts and burns have been designed into this landfill.

There is a biological leachate treatment system comprising three lagoons in series so there is a treatment system for the leachate.

There is a landfill venting system to control gases in the landfill. You will recall that at Mangrove, before we brought it under control, there had been perpetual fires there for months and that was because of the existence of unvented gases and the absence of a system such as this.

It is secured and fenced in and will soon be fully lit. There is a ground water monitoring system consisting of wells upstream and downstream of the landfill to check the ground water control and monitoring.

There will be a weigh bridge and scale house which would allow for the accurate determination of waste, because you know we are going to be charging tipping fees there. There is a workshop with four work areas to ensure that equipment there is properly and safely serviced. A substantial amount of cover material on site means that there will always be adequate cover material which was one of the difficulties at Mangrove, the absence of cover material on site, to keep covering the waste as it goes into the ground.

Litter screens have been built into this landfill. If you have been to Mangrove you will see that plastic bags blow about but at Greenland we have designed it with litter screens so that when the wind blows the screens catch the plastic bags and you would not have the large dissemination of plastic bags all over the place.

We have built in a system of grids as you come in and out of the landfill so that, trucks which go into the landfill, any garbage, mud or material that the tyres pick up will be automatically removed by the grid as the trucks drive out of the landfill and the trucks will not be carrying onto the road any of the material from Greenland and dirtying the roads with it.

There will be a cradle to grave system so that we can identify waste from the source of origin to its source of disposal. We have done a new access road and the roads into Greenland are also being upgraded.

I have sought to give some of the design features but I particularly want to emphasize some of the problems as they occurred at Mangrove and say why they will not occur at Greenland. We will have going to Greenland material that is, to a large extent, inert. The composting facility which will be sited at Vacluse will take those materials, grass, shrubbery and so on which can be broken down into compost and we will be producing a high-grade

compost for the agricultural sector. That composting facility is expected to take 15% to 20% of the waste out of the stream.

The rendering plant which has been constructed: the offal which used to be one of the most foul-smelling substances will be diverted to the rendering plant so no offal will be disposed of at Greenland.

We will have a community oversight committee of residents from the surrounding communities whose responsibility it will be to help to monitor what goes on there and to report back to the Government if they are concerned that anything has gone wrong because the communities there have an interest in protecting themselves and in ensuring that the strict standards which we want applied at Greenland are followed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has two minutes.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: We will be conveying, and we have said this, the waste to Greenland in sealed vehicles and a limited number of these vehicles will be going down to Greenland every day. There will not be a mass entourage of garbage vehicles going into Greenland on a regular basis.

The landfill is expected to last 19 years. The first cell will give us a life of seven years and this again is one of the differences in the design between this landfill and Mangrove. Mangrove had a large operating area so that at any time there was a vast amount of waste exposed and hence more odours emanating. At Greenland you will have a small work area only so that the way the landfill is designed and the way it will be operated at any time the area over which waste is spread will be far more compact and will therefore tend to give less problems.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: One minute, please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: In the one minute that is left to me, Sir, I did not have time to address what date we are going to open. I am going to announce that date to the public shortly. What we are going to take time to do, and one of the critical things is to make sure that Greenland is provided with adequate resources.

People have seen now that Mangrove has adequate resources it is a completely different operation from what it used to be before and we are going to make sure that Greenland has the proper resources of every type to ensure that it is properly operated.

What we are going to do is to ensure over the next few weeks, before we decide fully and announce the date at which we will start operations, to guarantee the public

that everything which can be done to ensure an operation there that the public does not have to be concerned about will not cause distress and discomfort to communities and is an operation of which we as Barbadians can be proud that we have developed an area of expertise in solid waste management. That is now what we are taking the time to do, to ensure that what happens at Mangrove is not repeated at Greenland, and that all of us can be proud of what goes on at that new landfill site, Mr. Chairman.

I beg to move that Head 36 stand part, Sir.

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

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution brought before the House today seeking \$850 000 for what the Minister described as the final payment comes as no real surprise. The Minister in her submission tried very desperately to set a background against which the landfill was sited at Greenland. I am not sure why the Minister would have attempted to try to lay blame on the siting of a landfill on the previous Administration when the Minister knows full well that the background against which a decision was made was not necessarily the Minister's own doing but was a result of a political decision taken by a new administration that while they were canvassing said to the public of Barbados that they would close the landfill that was in existence at Mangrove immediately after the September 6 General Election and that they will be creating* a new landfill some other part of Barbados or a new method of disposal of waste. 6.05 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I would hate to interrupt the Honourable Member but the Honourable Member is misleading the House on two points. First of all the Government never said that it would close the landfill immediately. May I refer Your Honour to page 32 of the 1994 Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which said:

"Close the dump at Mount Stinkeroo and compensate the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts."

It does not say immediately, it says to close it and to compensate. We have done the compensation and we are moving towards closing. Secondly, I have not sought to lay responsibility for taking the decision to site at Greenland on the former administration and merely gave the chronology of events but said clearly that it was this Cabinet that took the final decision based on the advice and information which had been amassed before September of 1994.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, they said that they would close the dump at Mount Stinkeroo and compensate the residents of Arch Hall and Bennetts, they would build an incinerating plant, they would promote recycling

and other methods of disposal and give incentives for environmental friendly projects etc. They had a specific plan. They told the public exactly what they would do, they would close Mangrove and they would build an incinerating plant. It said nothing about going to Greenland.

When the Barbados Labour Party Administration came to office, it was not possible for them overnight to close the Mangrove Landfill and they found themselves with a situation where they had to take a political decision because of the weight of the representative of St. Thomas who declared to his constituents that it had to close and it had to be sited somewhere else, so it had to close and a decision was made that the landfill would have to go somewhere else other than at Mangrove. The Minister said that double studies were done, which is true as commissioned by the Inter-American Development Bank and the Barbados Government and the Environmental Impact Assessment that was carried out by Stanley Associates the results of that did not conclude that any landfill should be placed at Greenland.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. The environmental impact assessment identified four sites as being suitable for the placement of a landfill and Greenland was one of the four that was identified. It did not say to go to Mount Stinkeroo, it did not say to go to Greenland, it did not specify, it identified four suitable sites and Greenland was one of the four identified.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I sat and I listened to the Minister without interrupting the Minister once and I wish that you would let the Minister allow me to speak without the Minister interrupting me. It is only fair that I should be allowed to finish speaking. I sat and I listened to you even if you were speaking things that were out of order. I sat and I listened.

The Stanley Report, Mr. Chairman, considered 42 sites as possible land filling sites in Barbados. That list was reduced to 17 and was further reduced to 4 as the possible areas where landfills should be sited and Greenland is one of those areas. The other three were Mangrove, Harrison Point, Lamberts and Greenland was the fourth in terms of priority.

If you examine the Stanley report very carefully and you examine the comments as they related to each individual site and you would take the professional advice available, you would have decided if you were taking the advice of the consultants as an administration you would have taken the advice in terms of the priority that had been established within that Report. The advice that was rendered did not suggest that Greenland was the best and most suitable for the placement of a landfill. It did suggest

that Greenland would be one of the areas and to be quite honest with you nobody said or argued that it was not possible to place a landfill at Greenland. Nobody argued that. What was argued was that if you place a landfill at Greenland the mitigating circumstances that will prevail will be as such that it would be very costly to the country and if you examine the records, this \$10 million that you have examined today is not the cost of placing a landfill at Greenland. Let us walk through and let us examine the real cost of setting up a landfill at Greenland. It is not US\$10 million. We are asking about the whole project. You now have to consider the whole infrastructure to the road, right next to the Greenland landfill. South of the Greenland landfill there is a little bridge called Maynards Bridge where the project people extracted clay, they took it over to the sand dune area, 300 000 cubic metres, they took several truck loads over a bridge that was designed to handle about three or four, say ten trucks at the most and you are putting trucks over there in excess of twenty to twenty-five tons, hundreds of trips backwards and forwards to the extent that if you go under the bridge, you will see all of the structure is cracked.

The MTW came in and put a temporary column and two beams under the bridge which are presently holding it. Now you took 300 000 tons of that material over to the quarry, then when you excavated at Greenland and then the walls started to cave in with merely two inches of rainfall, all the sides of the landfill started to collapse, you then had to go and take back up 200 000 tons of the same material that you carried down there and bring it back to prop up the landfill.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. I do not mean to interrupt the Honourable Member but the Honourable Member is misleading the House. He started by saying that we took out 300 000 tons and we brought back 200 000 tons. If you follow that reason you will see that it will not be possible to have a landfill there because you would have brought back all that you took away in the first place.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, is that there was no heavy rain which caused the sides to collapse, that did not happen. A crack appeared and we decided to change it but we did not do the nature of work that he said we did nor was there the problem that you said there was.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I will not state precisely the number or the actual tonnage but I am telling you and I am giving you a fairly accurate estimate. Let me put it another way for you. A significant amount of that material was removed and put on the sand dune. A significant amount had to be taken back because the landfill cell that had been excavated started to collapse and you had to protect the site by bringing back materials and placing it back into Greenland which in effect will reduce the life of the landfill area anyhow. You said that it

would be good for 19 years, well by bringing back the material it will significantly reduce the landfill.

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I sat and I listened politely. I am in no war with the Minister. I will get to Stinkeroo just now. 6.15 p.m.

I asked a parliamentary question in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, and I am not dealing with the environmental impact assessment, because...

Certain remarks made by the Member for St. Michael East were ordered to be expunged from the record by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the law calls for a public enquiry to be held.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is misleading the House. This is the exact point of issue on which a case was brought against me by the so-called Greenland Association and the courts have already decided that there was no need for precisely what the Member is speaking about, Sir. That matter, Sir, has already been decided by the courts of law. I appeared in court on this same issue.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Now, the Minister said that they have prepared a state of the art landfill site. I am not going to dispute that because I believe that it was a serious attempt to address some of the mitigating circumstances that would prevail. But in the channelling of water around the area which she calls the pond or the cell, there is a trench that is prepared to the Western slope of the landfill which if there is a heavy rainfall it is a complete waste of time. It will not control any water. In fact what is amazing about it is that even though that trench is there now and it has not a large landfill, with the few drops of rainfall, there is over one million gallons of water in a pond in the middle of the landfill at present.

It is a fact, it is still there. It is not going to go away, because it is soil. It is not just a wet area where you are absorbing the leachate that is going to run into that area. You are going to need about 10 000 trucks to draw off the water that is presently at Greenland.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order, Sir, the pond that has water in it was designed precisely to hold water so if the member for St. Michael East is surprised that the pond designed to hold water has water in it, that is a matter for him. But he is really just misleading the House about the purposes for the pond.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. This is not a joke. There is a significant amount of water and the garbage is supposed to be placed in the water. There is no place else to place the garbage.

The Minister sat down here today, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that she is going to announce the date for when the landfill is going to be open. The Minister has said to this House on about 4 or 5 different occasions that the landfill will be open within 5 to 6 weeks. The Minister said so in 1995. The Minister said so in 1996 and the Minister said so in 1997.

The Minister knows and said in this Assembly that no garbage will be going to Greenland unless it has been baled and compacted at a transfer station. There is no transfer station yet. There is not likely to be any in the short-term.

Aside.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I would not deal with why. I think they know why. The Minister knows there is no transfer station. We have been called upon to spend an enormous amount of money, over \$20 million on an area that we know, when it is put to the test, will not respond in the manner that the Minister is hoping that it will respond.

Aside.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am not the administration. That is your concern right now. Now I will deal with the roads. I do not want to deal with Mangrove. I will come back again. The cost of this entire project has not yet taken into account the road infrastructure that will have to be put in place to accommodate the trucks that will have to go down to Greenland. No work has taken place as yet on the roads' infrastructure.

Now the trucks that are going to Greenland are not trucks that we see on the street everyday. The trucks that are supposed to be going are trailer trucks that are about 40 or 50 feet long with compacted material, huge, heavy compact trailers, trailers that can compact garbage as well.

The area you would have to go when you come to the end of Highway 2 A through Benn Hill, you would go around that bend to get to the landfill. It is a very narrow road. It will cause a tremendous problem and this would be after you have the transfer station because that is not there.

The Minister is trying to convince the public of Barbados that all is well with this landfill and they are going to have to fork out some money to finish paying for a project that is just going to be lying down in waiting from the cradle to the grave. You have the grave. The Minister knows very well at present... 6.25 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: You talk about Mount Stinkeroo? At present, would you believe, Mr. Chairman, that the whole concept of land filling now does not exist at Mangrove anymore? What is happening at Mangrove now is that you are now putting up mounds over the entire area, over all of the cells that ever existed at Mangrove. You are building mounds and you are filling those areas on the whole wide spectrum of the landfill at Mangrove and you are going up in the air, not for Mount Stinkeroo that is a cell, but you are creating a monster Stinkeroo.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. For the Honourable Member to indicate that we are building indiscriminate mounds at Mangrove is really incorrect.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The nature of the land filling process that is going on now is very specific. We have had experts design what the final contours of Mangrove will be like and because we know we are going to be moving out of there into Greenland, we are into shaping the landfill at Mangrove consistent with the design to allow proper drainage *etcetera* once the land filling there is complete. These were given to us by the experts who have done the design for the final contouring at Mangrove. That is the nature of the mounds.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: At present, if you take a trip to Mangrove you would establish for yourself that all of the available space for the cells has been taken up. There is no space available at Mangrove. The Government has determined that they are the experts. They are the planners who could come in and solve this problem overnight. They are now in their fourth year of operation, having given the people of Arch Hall and Bennetts the belief that they would have shut down Mangrove and they said publicly by the 30th of June.

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: So what is happening to the Barbados Labour Party now is that they are falling on their own weight and on their own silly rhetoric when they did not understand that some day would come when they have to take command of the management of the disposal of garbage in the country.

It is in your hands and there are a number of areas that we will have to speak to, because I would like to go

on to address the whole problem with relation to the solid waste disposal.

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am not in here to take out any Minister. I am in here because the Barbados Labour Party has totally misled the Barbadian public. You have created a situation for yourself where you know that you cannot open the landfill at Greenland. You know you have a long way to go before you can achieve that and stop making the promises that you are making to the Barbadian public because you cannot achieve them. We are going to judge you for your failure to honour your word by saying you are going to do this by a specific time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have one minute more.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I will come back to deal with a number of other areas as they relate to solid waste, because the Minister has to establish the time frame and so forth which she says she cannot really discuss. But I really would like the Minister to come back and acknowledge that she has a problem and let us try to work on it. It is not your problem.

Asides.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I know I am a problem for you, because I keep pointing out exactly what the flaws are in your Ministry. Why I do it, is because you were very severe on the Democratic Labour Party and you today, are mismanaging the whole implementation of a Solid Waste Programme in this country.

It is only a matter of time before the entire collapse of this area of activity in Barbados comes to a head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, you had your time. The Honourable Member for St. Peter.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to begin by congratulating the Minister of Health for tackling with resolve and in an unflinching manner, a series of major and very complex projects, which must be done. In the process of their being executed, Sir, we have raised a large number of contentious issues, but they are being done.

These are projects that have, in past administrations, Sir, been the very symbol of mismanagement. The Democratic Labour Party, Sir, speak on matters of solid waste management without conviction or without honour. Because, the legacy of the Democratic Labour Party on solid waste management issues is a big landfill in the centre of Barbados, with fires burning. Happily, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has put that matter...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member should be aware that the placement of a garbage disposal site at Mangrove was done by the Barbados Labour Party. And it was first done in an unscientific manner. It was done without any preparation, whatsoever, to the site. There^was just simply a matter of dumping garbage in an open area.

The very first attempt at proper land filling which was a system was done in 1992 by the Democratic Labour Party and it was done during a period of great financial difficulty.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the legacy of the Democratic Labour Party is the legacy of mismanagement and their legacy will stand for ever.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the Right Honourable Prime Minister takes a trip to Mangrove today, Mount Stinkeroo or no Mount Stinkeroo, it still smells bad. Management or no management the result is the same, so you have a problem.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, everybody in Barbados knows that it is only an invention of the mind of the Honourable Member for St. Michael East that he would compare and equate the condition of Mangrove today to the Mangrove that was left behind in September of 1994. Everybody in Barbados knows that there is no comparison between the two. But this Minister of Health, Sir, has had to make tough decisions in circumstances where experts have differed, tough decisions, Mr. Chairman, Sir, in circumstances where the Physical Development Plan of the Democratic Labour Party would have caused us to put a landfill at Lamberts in St. Lucy. If the fight for the Democratic Labour Party is to get a landfill in the centre of St. Lucy then the Democratic Labour Party must say so.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. Lamberts is not in the centre of St. Lucy. St. Lucy's Church is the centre of St. Lucy and it is disgraceful for any Member to suggest that any political party would remove a church to put a landfill, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the reality is that the Physical Development Plan approved by the Democratic Labour Party said that the next landfill was to go at Lamberts. If he wants to say that it is in the East rather than in the Centre, Sir, that is his sense of geography. 6.35 p.m.

If they want the landfill to be at Lamberts, tell the public so because this Minister as well as this Cabinet had to make a decision that was contentious. No matter where

you put a landfill in Barbados, given the legacy of Mangrove, it will be controversial.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Prime Minister is misleading the House because the Minister said that a committee made the decision. Now the Right Honourable Prime Minister is contradicting precisely what the Minister said so one of them should decide who made the decision. Either the Prime Minister or the Minister is right but somebody has to be wrong.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of elucidation. The Honourable Member in framing his point of order has misled the House. He is saying that I said the Cabinet did not make the decision. The committee beforehand made a choice and the Cabinet acted on it and made a decision. There is no conflict between the Honourable Member for St. Peter and myself.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is simply this that at the end of the day a decision has to be made. The experts differed so there is no point coming to the House and saying that a Stanley Report said X or Y because the Town Planner had one view, every expert had a view but a Government had to govern and a decision was taken.

The Democratic Labour Party feels they have to be held to the fire at some stage if we were not going to go to Greenland. Which part of Barbados would you go to create the controversy because the point is that no matter where you go in Barbados, given the experience of the Democratic Labour Party at Mangrove, they have made solid waste management a controversial issue rather than an issue that is bereft of public dispute. That is why the Honourable Member for St. Michael East believes that he can make a political issue by not putting himself on the spot by saying if he did not go to Greenland where he was going to take it.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. I have repeatedly said that this Government, and when I speak of this Government, the Democratic Labour Party Administration, commissioned a study...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: I am elucidating and the Honourable Member has given way.

This Government commissioned a study which was done by Stanley Associates and the technical people advised the country that the best and most suitable site to place a landfill was at Mangrove but it could not be placed at Mangrove because of political decisions which went against the advice of the Stanley Associates, so if I had

the responsibility I would have followed the professional advice available to me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point of order.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I want back my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will get back your time.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: One of the experts also said it should have gone at Harrison's Point in St. Lucy. Another one said that it should have gone to Blowers in St. James. Another one said it should go at Lamberts in St. Lucy.

Mr. B. M. TATTT: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. He is giving the impression that there were a number of experts giving a number of opinions. There was one opinion given by one set of experts commissioned called the Stanley Report and in all of the ones he has called they were in the Stanley Report and they were graded. They made a categorical recommendation about where it should go. The Minister should not get up here and confuse people.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, I can now begin to understand why the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was such a monstrous failure when he was called upon to manage solid waste management because he visited one expert and one expert alone. There were a variety of views expressed.

I want to say as well, Mr. Chairman, that the previous experience in solid waste management in Barbados was in my constituency, outside Black Bess, but there was no controversy because it was well managed. Many people do not remember that there was a landfill at Black Bess in St. Peter in the centre of my constituency to the east of Speightstown but it was not an issue because it was properly managed.

Solid waste management has become an issue in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, not because solid waste management needs to be controversial but because the Democratic Labour Party and the Minister of Health did not allocate the resources to Mangrove Phase 2 to allow the scientific approaches in management to have been taken into effect. That is a fact.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. How can a Prime Minister who is a Minister of Finance, having accused somebody of being a monstrous failure then get up and make a statement to the effect that the Minister of Health did not allocate funds.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: You said the Minister of Health did not allocate funds to Mangrove and I demand he withdraws that, Sir.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I would gladly do so and say that he did not get his Cabinet colleagues to agree that solid waste management was of a sufficiently deserving nature to be able to have the resources that were wanted by the task at hand.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to Greenland, a wonderful job has been done using the best available technology to put in place a facility at Greenland.

As regards the question of the interim transfer station, I accept full responsibility for the decision, the reason being that at Estimates Committee this year we were faced with a question as to whether we should build an interim facility and strand over \$1 million or proceed to build a complete facility. I took the decision that we may just as well proceed to build the facility and do not strand \$1 million of investment. The money has been voted in this year's Estimates just as the monies have been voted as well and we will deal with the question of the roads.

The Ministry of Public Works will very shortly also be straightening up that section between Mile & a Quarter and Benn Hill that provides a threat to public safety. That is being done as a matter of policy. But the reality is simply this that Mangrove is now being incomparably better managed than it was three years ago. That is a matter of fact. The new landfill in Greenland has not been given a chance to prove its worth but the Honourable Member for St. Michael East who apparently has a new found eloquence in these matters now that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West has been taken out of the fold of the Democratic Labour Party...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. When I entered Government, I was given specific responsibilities. I became the Shadow Minister of the Environment and it is my responsibility as Shadow Minister to shadow the Ministry of the Environment and I am doing the job that I am assigned to do. It is not a matter of doing it before.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The Honourable Member has now come to tell us how many gallons of water there are in a pond, how deep the tracks are, Mr. Chairman, a lot of mumbo-jumbo about things of which he understands nothing whatsoever.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. I take serious objection to that. I raised some very serious concerns and this is not a laughing matter. Garbage disposal in this country is a very serious matter but I

can understand their making jokes at it. That is precisely why we now have a problem on the south coast of this country...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to the point of order.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: ...because it is the attitude of this Government on the disposal of waste and that is why we are having a problem and why the whole Barbados community on the south coast is now so seriously affected by the kind of attitude that I now see emanating from them. I am now clear in my mind why they are having a problem on the south coast but I will deal with that very shortly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Prime Minister, you have three more minutes.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, I was in here when the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, then acting Minister responsible for Solid Waste Management, made the point that if given the correct resources Mangrove Phase 2 could have been managed in a scientific manner such that solid waste management could be a credit to the country. Mr. Chairman, I accept that he was not given the resources and when he speaks on this matter I know the position on which he speaks. 6.45 p.m.

The Member for St. Michael East, Mr. Chairman, Sir, he is dealing only in propaganda.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. I do not deal in any propaganda. I said on the Floor of this House that I go and I research, I read, I visit the site, I examine, I take advice, I ask professional people and I have all kinds of information that I can give him chapter and verse and I object to the Prime Minister making those kinds of remarks. Who does he think he is? That he is the only person that knows everything that goes on in this country. He does not know everything. Who does he think is? You are only a Prime Minister for a short time. He is big and powerful now but he is not going to be there forever. He does not have to behave so. You are not the authority. Other people have sense too.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am making one point here Sir, that the management of landfills is no different conceptually from the management of any other complex technical matter that a modern government has to face and that it requires the committal of resources and putting yourself to access the capabilities and the expertise to get the job done. The Member for St. Michael West went on record as saying that he felt that Mangrove Phase II could have been scientifically and effectively

managed by the appropriate committal of resources. That was not the case.

I give the assurance to this House that in relation to Greenland, we are committing the resources, we are seeking access to the best available technologies, Mr. Chairman. This Government's commitment to Greenland is so strong that we have already spent over \$10 million to make sure that we get the very best system to put in place. We have given the full commitment to do whatever is necessary to have the solid waste management facility and the composting facility put in place. The people of Barbados should come to see solid waste management in the future not within the framework of Mangrove Phase II where there is a resource failure and where once the resources were committed, the problem went away but as something that can be handled and that we should take out of all the artificial controversy and contention that is being foolishly injected into it because no matter where you put a landfill in Barbados unless you now change the record of their management, there is going to be a controversy.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the experience as a Member of Parliament of having two landfills in my constituency but there was never any controversy before because they were well managed. I have the fullest confidence, Mr. Chairman, I really do that once we are resolved to deal with problems as they arise in the management of the landfill and once we are resolved to commit the resources to get the job done and once we are resolved to get the expertise to get the job done we need not at Greenland face the same kind of problems that evolved at Mangrove Phase II.

That is why the Government feels confident about going to Greenland because we are going to commit the resources to get the job done.

In the final analysis, I really believe that the Minister has had to face tough decisions without flinching. She has done so, she has had to expose herself to the scrutiny of public comments on a matter that is controversial, but the job will be done and if the Member for St. Lucy wants to continue to criticise this Government because we did not see it fit to carry the landfill to Lamberts, then all I can tell him is that he can wait for some time in the future when they will have the chance to give St. Lucy the landfill and international airport.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I rise to get involved in this debate but before I proceed I would like this House to understand that I am still not sure what is the total cost of the landfill at Greenland. The Rt. Honourable Prime Minister said \$10 million and the Honourable Minister of Health said it was \$20 million so I am still in a \$10 million divide.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: No, we are in Barbados, I do not deal with U.S. dollars. When I hear \$10 million in Barbados, it is \$10 million.

I also wish to start where the Prime Minister has ended. He said a landfill at Lamberts is what I wish but he does not tell the House, Sir, that Lamberts is very close to St. Peter, that in fact it abounds his constituency. What the Prime Minister did not tell this House is whether it is true that the Democratic Labour Party wanted to put a landfill near to St. Lucy near to his constituency and that he has failed the people of St. Lucy and also the people of St. Peter by not putting up the same argument that I put up as to why there should not be one at Lamberts and at Harrison's. The Prime Minister would have been around at the time and he had a right to defend the people of St. Lucy and St. Peter from getting a landfill.

Sir, this argument over a landfill. It was mentioned that the landfill at Black Bess was properly managed and that is not true. There was never a landfill at Black Bess, it was a dump and it was never properly managed. The people at Black Bess had to chase the people out. I know it well, Sir, because it was operated the same time there was one at the Cottage in St. Lucy.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the records of the House have always to be faithful and accurate. This business about people from Black Bess chasing out people who were managing a landfill at Black Bess is absolutely not true. A landfill was carried out at Black Bess, the land was then capped and the land now is in sugar cane. I know not where this nonsense about people being run out of Black Bess arises because it is absolutely not true.

I will ask that the remarks be struck from the records.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, I always used to be up Black Bess and I know that from the time that you land at the bottom of Black Bess Hill you used to pick up the stench. I remember the little hut that was on the site at Haymans at that time so I am quite aware of what I am speaking of. I also hear some statement in here that I would like corrected. The Honourable Minister of Health, I am not sure that she said .5% or .05% but I would like it corrected. I am told that landfill is 5% over the estimates and the Minister is telling me that there has been an overrun at Greenland of only \$51 000. I would have to see the figures to believe this because I know that the estimated cost for the landfill in the first case was no \$20 million. I want to know how .5% which happens to be \$51 000 can be the total cost minus the estimated cost.

I am saying to you, Mr. Chairman, that the original cost for the landfill was no \$20 million. I want to know

how come, Sir, that now it is \$20 million we are only \$51 000 under because the original cost was not close to any \$20 million. They have spent a lot of money more than estimated and I want to know who are the financial experts who have given these new figures and given an overrun of only \$51 000. It has to be 50% overrun and not .5% because there is no way that I hear any figure of \$20 million before. All of a sudden you are hearing \$20 million.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. We have said the figure was repeated. That the construction was US\$10 million or BDS\$20 million. The exact cost overrun and I have the figure here was \$56 460.23, not 50%. This is a project that was brought in under time and with very little cost overrun.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have some new maths in this Parliament. The total cost of the landfill as noted on my pad is US\$10,301,218.43. Is that the correct figure that you heard Sir? Multiply that by two and it is \$20,622,436.86 and I need no calculator to do that, Sir. An overrun of \$622,436.86. The figures given in here today by the Minister are very misleading to this Parliament and she should withdraw those figures, Sir. \$600,000.00 cannot be \$51,000. 6.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, something is wrong. I might have to withdraw those words because I am not aware that we have devalued the dollar. It is clear to me the Minister or the Prime Minister has devalued the dollar and I want to know which one is true because if the Minister is right, the Prime Minister has devalued the dollar without notifying this House and that is not possible. I want to know which one is correct because, Sir, going by the figures of Government, \$622 000 cannot be \$51 000 so I still need to get an explanation from that side. An over-run \$51 000 makes figures sound pretty. I want to know which is correct, Sir, and I rest my case there.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I believe the Honourable Member's case is about the inaccuracy of the Front Bench in this debate and I really am disappointed. I am bitterly disappointed. I wish the Prime Minister was in his seat because it is not the first time in a debate on solid waste it has sought to obfuscate the issues by throwing into the melting pot information that has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

Now, the Prime Minister in his capacity as Prime Minister because he came in, as he has done in the past, walked in like a Sir Galahad coming to the rescue of some poor damsel and he...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: No, I did not say she is a poor damsel. She does not look like a poor damsel to me at all. But how she looks is not called for at this moment otherwise I would spend some time on that but she is no poor damsel. I am saying that he came in as though he was c'oming to rescue a poor damsel and he has done it before. He walks in at his full height and he gets up and then he outs with information that is not accurate.

Now, this document here, Sir, 1993 to 2000 Development Plan is the authentic statement of Government policy on all the issues related to matters in Barbados. The physical Development Plan which the Prime Minister has quoted before in here in debates, as Honourable Members know, relates to the requirement of a particular piece of legislation in here but here is what the Democratic Labour Party said on the issue of solid waste disposal.

On page 105 of the Development Plan -

"Solid Waste Management. Effective and efficient solid waste management reflects positively on public health through the prevention of communicable diseases such as leptospirosis and dengue fever.

The quantity and extent of littering and indiscriminate dumping are of great concern. Consequently environmental education will be directed at all persons in the community to sensitise them to the dangers of littering."

Listen to this now, Sir.

"The recommendations of the integrated solid waste management study on disposal alternatives will be implemented."

That is what we said, Sir. That is what is in here and the Prime Minister has put forth that we were going to put a dump in Lamberts. The recommendations were in the solid waste disposal document that the Minister referred to and that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East has been referring to from the time we have been debating this issue. We said we would implement those recommendations therefore it is valid to speak of those recommendations because the recommendations were to give alternatives. I know about them because, as the Minister accurately said, I was the Minister who asked for the study to be done so that Barbados would have the basis on which it could make an informed decision about its solid waste disposal.

Solid waste disposal is not and ought not to be a political issue for the divide. Solid waste disposal is something that is going to affect Barbados for as far as the

eye can see as it has affected all other countries. When I was Minister of Health, contrary to what the Prime Minister seeks to do, in his less lucid moments in here by speaking about "monstrous failure", I sought to put the Ministry of Health on a track toward the twenty-first century as I did with most of my other areas. One of the things we had to do and which the Minister, in her moments when she is being fair, will agree is that she has found it to have solid bedrock information on which she can make informed decisions.

Now when we asked for the study, we asked for the study because we did not have the expertise in Barbados. To the extent that we had expertise in Barbados it was that expertise that told us that phase one at Mangrove would have lasted much longer than it actually did and such mismanagement as there was at Mangrove was the direct result of misinformation and miscalculation by a set of experts who recommended that a phase would last 7 years. It is clear to me now as it was soon after the decision was made that they miscalculated on the actual level of solid waste that is generated in Barbados on a given day. And so when they expected that phase 1, which was opened in 1992 with great fanfare and a lot of pride by me, was to last to the point where by the time they had opened the second cell we would have been able to go comfortably into the integrated information and we would have had a solid waste disposal system that would have carried us comfortably into the twenty-first century. We would have been able to get the information and the money to build what is now at Greenland, except that the decision where it would be located had not been made and would not have been made then.

Mr. Chairman, it really grieves me sometimes. I do not mind the political arguments when we are running for elections etc. but when we are sitting in the House, I believe that we owe it to the country, we owe it to the young people in this country to let them understand that these are serious problems which must be dealt with at a different level from the constant harangue and misrepresentation and sometimes complete misinformation.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am addressing all Members of the House, including my friend the Honourable Member for Christ Church South through the Chair, and especially my friend from the City who has had her troubles with solid waste disposal and other waste disposal.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Anyhow, Sir, you know when the Member for the City interferes with me, Sir, I usually react, but my problem, Sir, is that when we got the advice we had 3 experts in Barbados. We had the Manager of

the Sanitation Service Authority who has managed to survive all difficulties. If he is an expert in anything it is in survival. We had Mr. Arthur Archer who, and I am calling his name not pejoratively, Sir, who is arguably the most knowledgeable Barbadian in solid waste disposal. Then we had another expert, a young man called Mr. Belgrave who had come from Boston who had been working in solid waste disposal and it was the 3 of them who did the feasibility study for the scientific landfill which we created at Mangrove. Principles which were articulated in their report from the landfill at Mangrove have been incorporated into the landfill at Greenland.

The whole concept of a recycling landfill where the effluent would be able to be reused was pioneered in Barbados and has been used as a model in the Commonwealth. The fact is that the landfill filled up earlier than was anticipated and as a result of what I call internecine warfare in one of the statutory departments of this country. 7.05 p.m.

In the statutory organisation in Barbados you had this internecine warfare between the deputy and the manager and the deputy suffered from what happens in management in Barbados, at least old time management in the past where it is felt that if you go behind somebody's back and carry somebody's name that you are going to be regarded differently and better than the person, *etcetera*.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Yes, he is retired. He should have been retired a long time ago. Why did I not retire him? Because I am a very compassionate person.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: But I thought both of you would be aware that I am a compassionate person.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, I did not retire anybody, because it was not my business to retire people. The point I am making, Sir, is that some of the difficulties which occurred even in spite of the overflow of solid waste, occurred because of this other difficulty which manifests its If in Barbados even today, where people do not work as a team toward goals and toward problem solving, but are constantly trying to bring down each other because they believe that if they can somehow get in close to the person who is the decision maker, other than either of them that it would ease their way forward.

It makes no sense and that is why we spend a lot of time, I certainly spend a lot of time in my career trying to

teach people new modes of management so that we could do away with these things that had been drugged into us by people of the past who used the concept of divide and rule as the way forward. All of that contributed to some of the difficulty at Mangrove. What is not known and what is not always appreciated is that when the fires were burning at Mangrove, I was the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is true. There are people who conveniently forget that I stopped being Minister of Health in Barbados, some considerable time ago.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I recall the Minister of Health of the day saying that he would resign in six months if he did not get the thing under control. I was the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time, Sir, but the Prime Minister gets up in here today, as they have done in the Press over and over again, and gives the impression that I presided over the fires at Mangrove.

I have never done this before, because I really believed that we had a collective system and there are some blows that you have to take. But when the Prime Minister comes in here as he did, and tries to give the impression, from his "holier than thou" stance that I was a monstrous failure, my honour requires that I put the records straight. And, putting the records straight will require me to remind this House, and you, Mr. Chairman, that I was the Minister of Foreign Affairs when the fires were going.

Even so, I am not unmindful of the causes. The problems which the current Minister of Health inherited are not unrelated to an arrogant position taken by a parliamentary representative without information, but in the pursuit of re-election. This has manifested itself into one of the strangest decisions made in this country which nobody is paying any attention to now, but will come back to haunt this country in time when citizens make demands for nuisance, payment in cash. It is a strange decision that has been made in this country and I have not said anything about it because I like to study these things and see where they are heading. It is only a matter of time before other citizens in this country who suffer a nuisance of one kind or another demand from the courts or demand from the Government through the courts, depending on the position held by their particular parliamentary representative that they are compensated for nuisances. It is a novel and interesting departing in the law and I look forward in the future to how it is going to play out.

Those are the things that have helped to drive the decision from Mangrove to what my friend, the Member for St. Andrew has called "environmental madness." I

am sure he would not mind a little plagiarism on my part if I borrow a phrase from him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please wind up.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: It is environmental madness that we would go and stick a landfill in the midst of an area that is fragile in nature. It is an area, Sir, that is ecologically fragile and the issue that the Right Honourable Prime Minister refuses to face is that one is not discussing, if proper management of a landfill is desirable or if it will have a safe result, we have all been discussing the efficacy of having a landfill where it has been located.

We now acknowledge, as a people, that is a *fait accompli*, but the hard headedness and stubbornness of the Right Honourable Prime Minister will haunt us in the future as we come to deal with the legacy of a landfill at Greenland.

I am grateful to you, Sir.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened at some points with horror at some of what I have heard in this debate.

Long, long ago before any of us were on this earth, Barbados elected for landfilling as a manner of solid waste disposal. It may not be sanitary landfill by today's standards, but they were landfills nonetheless. I do not accept that in all cases they were dumps. There are people living in this generation, Mr. Chairman, Sir, who take for granted what they see.

They see a cricket ground at Empire on Bank Hall, people living, cheek by jaw, right on to the cricket ground. That was a landfill before it was a cricket ground. Hill Road, Bank Hall is another heavily populated area. There are legion, Mr. Chairman, Sir, but for the first time in the history of solid waste disposal in Barbados a Minister of Health and a Government distinguished themselves by creating something which came to be known as Mount Stinkeroo. We should be ashamed to recollect, Sir, it became a tourist attraction in this country. Taxi drivers were taking people to Mount Stinkeroo. That is a fact of life.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, that a Minister of Health could not manage a landfill in Barbados or could not preside over the management of a landfill in Barbados did not surprise us at the time, because the entire Government was in trouble. They could not even manage a landfill, we could not expect that they would be able to manage an economy and all of that was part of an

accumulative effect that helped to bring that Government down.
7.15 p.m.

I give credit to the Minister of Health that she had the courage to take hard decisions that had to be taken. I was Minister of Health one time and one of the first decisions I had to take as a Minister of Health - it was a hard decision too - was a decision to put two-million gallon tanks to carry sewage in the middle of the City of Bridgetown at Emmerton which was going to cost me in terms of the electorate of the City of Bridgetown. That was not an easy decision for a brand new Minister of Health, young and green, to take. That was 1976. So I give a lot of credit to the Minister of Health that she has brought solid waste disposal in Barbados to a place where Barbadians are far more aware and conscious now. People now almost as a matter of course separate their plastic, glass, paper and so on.

I am pleased and proud. I listened carefully to what she had to say when she introduced this Resolution and I am satisfied that in the end what really will go to the landfill at Greenland will be largely biodegradable stuff because we are hearing that offal is coming out, we are hearing that other non-degradable elements are going to be separated and sifted out and a transfer station will be part of that process. Nothing more sophisticated in terms of a sanitary landfill can be found anywhere else in the world.

Barbadians are a happy people, Sir, and we must stop beating up on ourselves and instead of taking all of these negatives to the question and to the issue, we should be looking now to be more positive about it. We have to get away from this pull-down society.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we are not going to go into the 21st century with our national psyche overlaid with this attitude which we hear on the call-in programmes, we read in editorials, we read in letters to the editor, this constant pulling down inclusive of what is good and desirable in our community.

I have no difficulty whatsoever, Sir, in supporting this Resolution. I commend the Minister of Health. I went to the trouble myself in asking for a visit to the landfill at Greenland. The Minister of Health accompanied me and took consultants down there. I am satisfied that what I saw is a credit to Barbados and a lot of those, including Honourable Members on the Other Side, really need to go down to Greenland and see and stop speaking from...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. I said in the debate today that I have gone to Greenland and I am not disputing whether new techniques have been introduced or not. Greenland has not been put to the test. We will have to wait to find out how Greenland is going to

perform so you can have the designs and whatever, if it is unsuitable it will manifest itself sooner or later. There is nothing more I can say. The Minister does not know what is going to happen; neither do we.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that I saw a superb engineering undertaking there. I am satisfied that it will never amount to what we saw at Mount Stinkeroo.

I give my support to this Resolution, Sir.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The debate is scheduled to finish at 7.30 p.m. and I believe the Minister should have some time to wind up the debate.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We only have 7 minutes to go. I think the Minister should have an opportunity now to wind up the debate.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to office in September of 1994, I was then 32 years old. I must confess to you that I did not at all foresee or anticipate that this project would excite the kind of public attention and controversy which it later did.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. It is not the Greenland site that created any controversy. It is the political confusion that was created by the then Honourable Member for St. Thomas who went around Barbados creating a hue and cry about Mount Stinkeroo. That is what caused the controversy.

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member...

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please sit? That is not a point of order.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: That is what caused the excitement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Member please take his seat?

Asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN stands.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please carry on.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I did not anticipate. I read the records that were available. It seemed to me that there was a large consensus among all the interest groups and when the decision was announced persons whose representatives on the committee that had oversight of the matter that had voted in favour at the meeting where it was chosen were suddenly back-peddling. It was an absolutely amazing experience for me.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order, Sir. My understanding is that professional people who sat on that committee were instructed and told this is what will happen. They reduced professional people to nothing and many of them through their own dignity refused to speak publicly about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: All right. You have made your point of order. Please carry on.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have read the Minutes of the meetings that took place in March and May of 1994, long before I became a Minister, long before the Members on that side had ensured that they would no longer be the Government and that Mr. Sandiford would no longer be Prime Minister, and then those persons were suddenly back-peddalling. This is just a matter of fact. It is not something to excite controversy.

The choice in relation to Greenland was not precipitated...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. The Minister said that the decision to go to Greenland was made long before she became a Minister? The Solid Waste Disposal Report did not come in and was not decided upon until after she became a Minister.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The Report came in after the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was no longer Minister but certainly before the Honourable Member for St. James South became Minister. It did come in.

The point I am making here, Mr. Chairman, is that over time I have had to revisit this decision, to sit with Barbadian professionals, foreign professionals, experts of all different types to look at the geophysical studies, to look at the geotechnical surveys, to look at all the preliminary work that was done in relation to the construction of this landfill.

The decision to go to Greenland was not precipitated by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas. 7.25 p.m.

It was based on sound professional advice. It was the clear and unequivocal opinion of this administration that it was not a good idea to have an above ground landfill, situated on a top of a hill with residential communities and hotel plants in close proximity which was Mangrove and we had therefore to choose a site that was not an above ground landfill, that was not within close proximity to residential communities, that was not a quarry, preferably in clay and therefore lend itself...

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: If what the Minister is now saying is true, how then can the Minister at present be facilitating an above ground landfill at Mangrove. Why does the Minister not close it. It is not a below ground. If that is her policy, her principle, why is the Minister now involved in an above ground landfill. It is a foolish argument.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: You will recall that in 1995 the Ministry of Health cut down the mountain known as Mount Stinkeroo up at Mangrove and reduced that mound and we did further excavation to facilitate below the ground land filling as opposed to above the ground land filling.

Mr. Chairman, I have only two minutes which is not really much time. I want to make two points that the other component of the programme which deals with recycling, re-use and waste minimisation will now be coming on stream because we have on board a waste management co-ordinator to deal with that component of the programme and it would be remiss of me, Mr. Chairman, while on my feet and before this debate closes if I did not take this opportunity on behalf of my Ministry and on behalf of the Government and I would like to think on behalf of the Honourable Members of the Other Side and all Barbadians to thank Dr. Hugh Sealy who has now resigned from this project for his commitment for giving the best of his professional advice at all times, for refusing three job offers that paid him twice as much money as he would have got working with the Government to stay to see this project through to the end. A man with young children who had to send his children to school and later on to University and he refused the money because his commitment was to the Government and people of Barbados to give of his best. There is no where else in the Western world that a young man of 35 years old was building simultaneously the two largest capital projects of Government anywhere, the Solid Waste Programme and the South Coast Sewerage Project.

I want to add to it, Sir, that part of the difficulty we had in executing his duties was the fact that one of the main objectors to this project personally harassed him and his children by standing outside of the house and tormenting him morning and night.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. The Minister cannot castigate a member of the public in that manner on hearsay or on rumour.

Certain remarks made by Mr. J. O. TUDOR were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. CHAIRMAN.

Mr. J. O. TUDOR: On a point of order. The Minister is misleading the House and she should not be able to get in here and make statements about a member of the public that are not true. She must not come in here and do that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister please wind up.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am happy, Mr. Chairman to extend the thanks of all Barbadians to Dr. Sealy for his commitment, his professionalism and his skills and to be glad that we have somebody of that calibre to deliver this completed project to the people of Barbados.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

On the motion of Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to HIS HONOUR the SPEAKER, the passing of one Resolution in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, seconded by Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON, the Bill was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House be adjourned to Tuesday, October 28, 1997, at 11.00 o'clock in the morning.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the adjournment, I would like to take the opportunity to suggest to Honourable Members that they might anticipate that we would do the Foreign Policy Debate which we hope would be a full-dress debate on this matter on the 25th November.

Asides.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: When will you be here? 7.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting intimations from the Other Side, and I want to be accommodating in this matter, that perhaps this is not the best possible date. Maybe I will advise the House on a later occasion of a date that could be more agreeable between the two sides. This is a very important debate. Barbados has to be positioned for the Twenty-first Century and there are a number of initiatives currently being taken by the Government which need to be debated and I hope at a high and a policy level. A new

date will be communicated to the House on another occasion.

The question that the House do adjourn until Tuesday, 28th October, 1997 at 11.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7.40 p.m.

CONTENTS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER
1

Confirmation of Minutes of Monday, September 29, 1997.

PAPERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER ____

1. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 16) Order, 1997.
2. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 17) Order, 1997.
3. The Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (No. 18) Order, 1997.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE
2

1. The Annual Report of the National Assistance Board for the year April 1, 1994 to March 31, 1995.
2. Annual Reports of the Department of Labour for the years 1992 and 1993.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER**2**

Bill to amend the Shipping (Oil Pollution) Act, Cap. 296A.

OBITUARY SPEECHES
2

Condolences were expressed on behalf of the late Joseph J. Payne, former Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly and representative for the constituency of St. James North.

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 2; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 3; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 4; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 5; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 5; Hon. R. N. Greenidge, 7; Mr. J. O. Tudor, 7.

Condolences were expressed on behalf of the late Adesta Whitfield Edghill, the father of Mr.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES . . 12

Mr. Duncan Carter was elected Chairman of Committees by acclamation.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, 12; Mr. D. Carter, 12.

J. M. Edghill.

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 9; Hon. D. J. H. Thompson, 9; Sir Harold St. John, 10; Hon. H. deB. Forde, 10; Mr. W. C. C. Callender, 11.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 12

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 8 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND SITUATE AT SIX MEN'S BAY, ST.
PETER..... 12

Hon. G. W. Payne, 12, 20; Mr. D. St. E.
Kellman, 14; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 17.

ORDER NO. 9 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF
LAND SITUATE AT CODRINGTON,
SPOONERS HILL AND LONG GAP, ST.
MICHAEL 21

Hon. G. W. Payne, 21, 23; His Honour R. D.
Marshall, 22; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 22.

ORDER NO. 4 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE VESTING IN THE BARBADOS
INDUSTRIAL & DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION OF LAND AT NEWTON,
CHRIST CHURCH 24

Hon. G. W. Payne, 24, 31; Mr. D. St. E.
Kellman, 25; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 25; Mr.«B.
M. Taitt, 26; Sir Harold St. John, 30.

ORDER NO. 12 - HEAD 35 - MINISTRY OF
FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TOURISM AND
INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT..... 32

Hon. R. St. C. Toppin, 32, 39; Mr. W. C. C.
Callender, 32; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 32;

Sir Harold St. John, 34; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 34;
Hon. H. deB. Forde, 30; Rt. Hon. L. E.
Sandiford, 38.

HEAD 36 - MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND THE
ENVIRONMENT 41

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 41, 55; Mr. J. O.
Tudor, 44, 46; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur, 46, 47;
Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 50; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 51;
Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 54.

SUSPENSION 11

ADJOURNMENT 56

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller, 56.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Rt. Hon. O. S. (St. Peter) CALLENDER, Mr. W. C. C. (Christ Church East) CARTER, Mr. D. (Christ Church East Central) FORDE, Hon. H. deB. (Christ Church West) GREENBDGE, Hon. R. N. (St. Philip North) KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy) MARSHALL, His Honour R. D. (St. Michael West Central)
MILLER, Hon. Miss B. A. (City of Bridgetown)
PAYNE, Hon. G. W. (St. Andrew)
SANDIFORD, Rt. Hon. L. E. (St. Michael South)
St. JOHN, Sir Harold (Christ Church South)
TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St. Michael West) TOPPIN, Hon. R. St. C. (St. Michael North) TUDOR, Mr. J. O. (St. Michael East) THOMPSON, Hon. D. J. H. (St. John) THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South)