

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 1994 - 99

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th July, 1998

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 11.20 a.m. on Tuesday, 28th July, 1998.

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. Sir HENRY FORDE, K.A., 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)

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

Hon. Sir HAROLD St. JOHN, K.A. 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)

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. D. CARTER (Chairman of Committees)

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

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

Mr. J. M. EDGHILL

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

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

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 Tuesday, July 7th, 1998.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minutes of the proceedings of the Honourable the House of Assembly for its meeting of Tuesday, 7th day of July, 1998 which minutes have been circulated, I beg to move 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

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am commanded to lay the Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1998.1 am also commanded to lay the Report of the Public Enterprise Investment Fund for the quarter ending March 31, 1998.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the Foreign Policy for the Twenty-first Century - Barbados and a Changing World.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to lay the Annual Reports of Audited Statements of the National Conservation Commission for the Financial Years 1993-94 and 1994-95.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to give notice of the Final Appropriation (1997- 98) Bill, 1998.

I further beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of land at Hillaby in the parish of St. Andrew.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the first reading of the Final Appropriation (1997- 98) Bill, 1998.

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

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

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the first reading of the Coastal Zone Management Bill, 1998; the Marine Areas (Preservation and Enhancement) (Amendment) Bill, 1998; and the Marine Pollution Control Bill, 1998.

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

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

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the first reading of a Bill to amend the Housing Act, Cap. 226.

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

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

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Registered Sugar Factories Smoke Control (Amendment) Bill, 1998 be read a first time.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the order of the day. Order No. 17.

ORDER NO. 17- COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT BILL, 1998

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before this Honourable Chamber today this administration brings 3 pieces of marine legislation which legislation will redefine how the Government and people of Barbados relate to the marine environment, the extent to which there is a regulatory framework in place for that environment and the extent to which we move even now to protect what is really the greatest economic frontier for Barbados, that of the marine environment.

It is important, Sir, that we bring these pieces of legislation before the Parliament in a year that has been designated international year of the oceans by the United Nations system because it shows Government's good faith, not only with the commitments it made in the Manifesto but it shows the extent to which we recognise the importance of the marine environment for the social, economic, cultural preservation and enhancement of the quality of life of the people of Barbados.

It shows a deep understanding and commitment to what the future of Barbados will hold in terms of economic activity and it seeks for the first time in our history, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to bring before this House a consolidated approach to marine environmental protection.

Prior to now we have approached coastal development, in a rather fragmented way. There has not been a growing work of legislation that seeks to give authority to Government and to its regulatory bodies and agencies and its corporate members to protect that which is going to be the new economic frontier of the 21st century. So this legislation that I have the honour to bring to this Chamber today, Sir, really breaks new ground for Barbados and for the Caribbean because the pieces of legislation when pitted together will form what will constitute the greatest protection mechanism put in place for the marine environment anywhere in this part of the world, Sir.

People think of the marine environment as being only the beach water. They think of it as being a sea bath or the sand and the shore or the place where tourist lie and tan at great expense. In fact, the marine environment makes a contribution to the world environment, to the social, cultural and economic landscape that is totally unrivalled.

It is not widely known, Sir, that 71% of the earth is made up of water, nor do many people recognise that within Barbados, that 16% of our people live within 2 km. of the coast which is roughly 1.3 miles, Sir. When one goes into rural Barbados the extent to which there is population distribution is significantly less than when one drives along the coast line of Barbados. There is high population density. It is also the place in which a lot of our infrastructural development has been sited and invested. All of the hotels occupy either the main south coast or west coasts. 11.30a.m.

A lot of our major infrastructure has been sited on these coasts, the police stations, the newspaper, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, many of the geriatric facilities and polyclinics are within close proximity of the coast. Most of the Bridgetown Commercial Centre is sited within close proximity of the coast. We are really a people who live, work and enjoy our island largely around the coastal boundaries.

In terms of living organisms, nine out of every ten known organisms on earth live in the sea. The oceans are responsible for the temperature regulations. We tend to think of the waters off the coast of Barbados as just being beautiful. In fact, some 4 500 people in Barbados are employed in the fishing industry and that is part of the economic landscape of the coastal water. Sixty percent of the 4 500 people employed in fishing in Barbados are women.

But it is important not only in terms of the United Nations designation of 1998 as international year of the oceans, it is important when we consider the increasing demand for our coastal spaces, the increasing demand and interest in beach land and beach front property and when we are coming into a greater recognition of the economic potential of the marine environment. At a time when 50% of our reefing structure has been already destroyed by various uses of the water. At a time when only last year, Sir, as a result of joint initiatives with the private sector, as a result of the Clean Up and Adopt-Your-Beach campaigns in which the Barbados National Trust and the Future Centre Trust, the Professional Association Diving Operators and other entities were involved, 850 lbs. of garbage was removed from Carlisle Bay in one day. That is only a small section of Carlisle Bay. And five East Coast beaches when they too were subjected to the clean up, yielded 691 lbs. of garbage.

Over the course of this year a programme for involvement of Barbadians at every level in activities which will tend toward public education and which will increase their usage, but most of all their sensitive usage of the beaches and the marine environment will be developed. That programme involves water festivals, displays at the Museum and other historical displays. Exhibitions at BMEX, exhibitions in town, fishery bays activities and a marine film festival. The opening of a number of facilities along the coastline for the use by Barbadians with not only the

recreational component involved, but with the educational component involved. Each clean up will also continue. There will be dramatic presentations, theatrical presentations, literature, art and photography presentations. MFC A this year will have a water scene and a marine scene.

The Coastal Zone Management Unit is going to be mobilised in the community to sensitise the community as to the possible usage of the beaches that they are not now engaged in, but most of all what is going to be done is that there is going to be a level of teaching about the way in which we use our marine environment. This will ensure that the activities of single individuals do not so adversely impact on our marine environment that we endanger many of those rare species which in Barbados' waters, or many of the creatures that we tend to think of as being endemic to Barbados.

»Over the course of the year CBC will do various features on the marine environment and GIS will have the ocean related topics. There will be windsurfing and diving classes given to people, because many people in Barbados cannot swim. We will go to the beach, we will paddle, we do not want to go too far out. We will sit and we will enjoy picnics and excursions, but a lot of us do not like to swim. We say that the sea does not have any back door and therefore we stay close to the shore.

But part of what we are going to be attempting to do this year, is to ensure that a wide range of Barbados gets exposed to the skills of swimming, diving and windsurfing, so that the ranges of activities in which they can involve themselves are significantly increased. And, their levels of enjoyment of the beach and the marine water is not tinged by fear, but by respect given by these skills which will enhance their enjoyment of it.

The Coastal Zone Management Unit, which is the unit entrusted in Barbados for the protection of our marine environment and for work related, research, construction, regulation and operational activities were established in 1993. It was established as a temporary unit because there was perceived to be a need for it, but it was then at that time targeting a very narrowly defined area of marine protection.

Over the years, as we became more environmentally conscious, as we accepted the importance of the marine environment to our social and our economic existence, the scope of the work of the Unit has grown tremendously. Only last year, we had finally determined that what has come to be known in the Civil Service as the "Hollywood mode" could not be allowed to persist at that Unit and many of the posts were established. It is a Unit staffed by very highly trained scientists whose contributions to our economic protection, in terms of the work that they have done, has really been tremendous, has really in terms of its value gone unheralded and in many instances unnoticed by a majority of Barbadians.

And, I think that for them, today has got to be a most important day because these three pieces of legislation at which we will look at one by one, Sir, represents for them the birth of all which they have been seeking to create and do.

During the course of this debate as we review the legislation, we will see that Barbados and I have made the point in there, is a truly environmentally dependent society. I have already spoken to the economic dependence in terms of fishing. Barbadians eat twice as much fish, per person, per year, as the average person in the rest of the world. That is a reality. That is why we can see that an industry like fishing can employ 4 500 people. We have come to the point where we recognise part of the economic activity with cultural enjoyment as identified at the Oistins Fish Festival which gives vent to the spirit and a recognition of the labour of those who work in the industry. But that is only one component of the economic dependence that Barbados places on its marine environment. 11.40a.m.

Another obvious component of the economic dependence would be our tourism. Barbados is a tourism destination. We derive from tourism tremendous economic benefit. It has been debated that tourists no longer come solely for sand and sun but, certainly, they continue, even if not to come solely for sun and sand, to come for some sand and sea. Insofar as that is true and that tourism represents a major revenue earner for Barbados, then it is incumbent on us to ensure that the very environment for which these tourists come is protected.

It is even more important and more incumbent on us that we preserve the marine environment for our people that the citizens of Barbados can go to the beach and enjoy it, that they can have a stake in the development of this country. The Prime Minister has said in this House that under a Barbados Labour Party administration accesses will be maintained and that there will be no privatisation of beaches.

What this legislation now seeks to do is to put in place a regulatory framework for the protection of that beach environment. I make the point that 60% of Barbadians live within two kilometres of the coast and that is again another linkage to the environmental dependence in relation to Barbados. If we were to have a major hurricane or a major natural disaster which wipes out some of our coastal development, which changes the scope and the appearance of our landscape, Barbados will be a very different place without the same degree of enjoyment for us and for visitors. And it is therefore critical that, not only do we seek to make protection and anticipate natural disasters and put mechanisms to mitigate where possible, insofar as our own conduct impinges on the environment and its destruction, then we have to seek to put a pre-emptive order in place that will militate against that destruction.

Barbados is now becoming known as one of the most highly sought after dive sites in the Caribbean. Carlisle Bay,

for instance, that very small area - I know that Carlisle Bay is a broader area but I am speaking specifically to the very small area opposite Government Headquarters. Many people would be surprised to learn that that area alone has four wrecks in it, one of which was sunk recently but others have been there for some considerable time and these wrecks have become encrusted with the kind of coral formation for which fish and other marine species live which give rise to marine fauna of various varieties and in that specific area is so highly sought after as a dive site that every year as many as 100 000 dives are done in that very small geographical area.

It is a site where so many people bathe. It is a site where there is a lot of mooring activity that is partly related to the dive activity. The ships come down to bring out the divers and they anchor there. You have the glass bottomed boats coming through for those persons who do not actually want to do a dive but still want to be aware and be familiar with and to see the kinds of underwater beauty that that area characterises.

The marine environment has the potential for us. We think in a very narrow way of economic activity being land-based but really the marine environment represents what will be the new economic frontier of the 21st century. Already there are tremendous disputes over fishing lanes and fishing rights between Barbados and neighbouring Caribbean countries. It is in our interest to cast the limit or the delineation of our exclusive economic zone in the waters so wide that we can derive maximum benefit from all of the kinds of activity that the 21st century is going to bring: drilling for oil, harvesting from the sea, not just fish but various types of flora and various types of fauna and of other materials which will then be used in the industrialisation process.

There is the need to have that broad delineation, the need to have that exclusive, economic zone cast very wide so that we can capture the maximum potential from the exploitation of the marine resources that is available to us. That is one of the strongest arguments for a closer relationship with the countries of the Eastern Caribbean.

Let us accept that an oil spill anywhere in the Caribbean is likely to affect Barbados and affect us adversely. An oil spill here is likely to affect the Eastern Caribbean adversely. None of us, as single small countries, as single small economies, many mono-crop economies to this day whether the crop is bananas or something else, very few of us, except perhaps Trinidad that has greater resources because of their oil industry, but very few of us, have the kind of resources to put in place a protection mechanism against oil spills, against exploitation by the industrialised societies. This is what part of this protection that we are bringing within this legislative framework is about.

Already the factors exist where industrialised societies run down to the Caribbean and put to sit in our waters what

are called fishing factories, mammoth ships that sit there for months and do nothing but fish in the Caribbean sea. Feeder ships come down to them, pick up cargoes of fish and take those cargoes back to the mother country, whoever they are, some many miles away. I was going to identify some of the countries which are involved in this kind of exploitation of our resources.

We do not have now any mechanism which guards against that and we have so narrowly defined the boundaries of our exclusive economic zone that we cannot say to these countries they are in Barbados or St. Lucia waters or Vincentian or Dominican waters. Therefore, a relationship with a centre of cooperation and collaboration in the Eastern Caribbean will ensure that we pool resources, that we have a broad delineation of our exclusive economic zone, and that we will together fight the kind of assault that is being made on our marine environment by the industrialised societies which have the resources, financial and otherwise, to do exactly the kind of factory fishing that a small fisherman from Paynes Bay in my constituency, or from St. Lucy, or from Six Men's, or from Skeetes Bay, is unable to do. The kind of potential that we will be able to explore and exploit as a result of that collaborative arrangement can do us nothing but good. 11.50a.m.

It is not only in respect of fishing that the need for such collaboration exists. It also exists for activities to which I alluded earlier, protection against oil spills. We have put in place a Caribbean Plan for oil spill protection which involves a pooling of resources. Those persons who follow environmental development with keen interest will recall the Exxon Valdez spill off Alaska and the extent to which the oil spill travelled within the space of a week in the process wiping out the fishing industry, killing and wiping off for many, many years to come all of the breeding sites for many marine species and killing 500 000 birds.

We cannot in the Caribbean guard against that kind of environmental disaster unless we pool our resources and unless we put in place exactly the kind of legislative framework which I am bringing to this Honourable Chamber today. But we must not feel what is being done to guard us in terms of harvesting of marine resources, in terms of viewing the sea as our next economic frontier - We tend to think of Barbados as ending at the end of the beach but, in fact, we have to start to think of Barbados as continuing way out into the sea and recognise that ownership of that part of our environment, and control of that part of our environment, is going to provide us with the mechanism for protection of our economy into the next century.

Out of the SIDS Programme of Action, Mr. Speaker, Barbados has identified itself and has given itself leadership in the world in the protection of small island developing states. It is this kind of legislative framework which will

allow us to stamp our name on the international arena. We do not have a lot of resources to do it, but the name of Barbados has to stand tall in relation to certain types of activity, and if we are to give leadership and to continue to give leadership to the SIDS Programme of Action, if Barbados is to be recognised as the gatekeepers for small island developing states, then it is this kind of legislation we must bring to Parliament, that we must seek to have our people understand with which Barbados must be identified in the international arena.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that we are able today, when we go back next year for the SIDS review meeting at the United Nations, to say that part of our achievement will have been the first country in the Caribbean to establish this kind of marine protection legislation. It is not, Mr. Speaker, a small thing.

It helps to distinguish us as being the model for sustainable development among small island developing states. It is now the nature of the work that we are doing in relation to our environmental initiative. It is being so widely recognised that there are countries that are seeking to get on the SIDS bandwagon or, perhaps, I should frame it in language that is used in a different colour because when people speak of jumping on bandwagons it is normally used pejoratively. But there are a number of developing states all across the world who now seek shelter under the SIDS umbrella because of what it has the potential to do for the protection of small economies, for the protection of small developing states whether they are islands or not. And increasingly states like Bhutan which are completely landlocked by land masses like India, are seeking to follow the Barbados model and are speaking of the Barbados model, and are asking us what we are doing in relation to legislation for the protection of our environment. It is that kind of leadership which Barbados will be able to give to the SIDS programme of action. I think it is to our credit that all small developing states have come to the point where they recognise the benefits to be derived from being part of this agenda and framework and are coming under the SIDS umbrella.

We must not see the legislation which comes before this Parliament today through only a model focus. We must see it in the context of the work that the Environment Division is doing generally, and we must see it in the context of the work that is being done by the Coastal Zone Management Unit.

We have, and we will get to debate the South Coast Sewerage Project next week, but we must see what is being done to protect the marine environment here as being an extension of activities for marine protection which are land based, and I will elaborate, Sir.

It is a fact that the greatest sources of marine pollution originate on land. You only have to drive along Barbados anywhere and see it, industrial sites, commercial sites

discharging into the marine environment, households discharging kitchen waste and laundry waste into the marine environment. And so, very often a lot of the things which threaten our marine environment, which threaten our marine ' species, which endanger our reefs and I made the point earlier that already 50% of our fringing reefs have been destroyed, really originate not in the water but on the land and any attempt to provide effective control of the marine environment has to deal with what takes place on the land.

It is for that reason that joint successive Administrations worked on a Bridgetown Sewerage Project, and successive Administrations worked on a South Coast Sewerage Project. The next Sewerage Project which is to be put in place is the West Coast Sewerage Project but given the fact, Sir, that we expect that this Government will have another term or the people who sit on that side will not get the opportunity to work on the West Coast Sewerage Project... 12 noon.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House, Sir. The Honourable Member is saying that Members of this Side will not get a chance to be in administration and the whole of Barbados know that the people are simply waiting for these people to vacate office. The Honourable Member cannot mislead the House like that.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Michael East confuses the view of the rest of Barbados with those of St. Michael East. I beg your pardon, I meant St. Michael West.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am not surprised that the Honourable Member cannot understand east from west. I am not surprised because she is reeling under the realities of the facts, Sir.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, both east and west, the Honourable Member from St. Michael East and the Honourable Member from St. Michael West seem to feel that it is their role to give me trouble. It is not surprising that I might use the two interchangeably but I was referring in my comments to the Honourable Member for St. Michael East who confuses what may happen in St. Michael East with what might happen in the rest of Barbados. Time is going to reveal this.

Mr. Speaker, these projects and by extension the new expansion to the Bridgetown Sewerage Project are going to ensure that our near shore waters on the west coast and on the south and out of Bridgetown are so protected that the beach water quality is maintained at the highest possible standard. We have also to see what we are doing today against the background of our international efforts, our efforts at the regional level and how they fit into the international arena and agenda. We have to see how it will span out at the national level.

Sir, let me turn therefore to what we are working on at the international level. There are a number of international agreements to which Barbados is signatory and which together ensure that the marine environment is protected at a certain level. I am going to refer to these. Barbados is signatory to the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Waste and Other Matter. We are signatories to the United Nations Law of the Seas, to the International Convention or the Prevention of Pollution from Ships and the 1978 Protocol or Marpol as it is more widely known, the UN Law of the Sea Provision (1982) Act. The Convention of the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean 1983 or the Cartagena Convention as it is known is part of how we seek to regulate our business with our other Caribbean brothers and sisters. The Protocol concerning co-operation in combating oil spills in the wider Caribbean, the Basel Convention on the control of trans-boundary movement of hazardous waste and their disposal is another international convention to which we are signatory. You will note that the London Convention goes back to 1972 but the others are concentrated in the 1976 to 1986 period and then more recently.

It stems from the recognition, and it is not an accident, that the Coastal Zone Management Unit was established in 1983 out of a recognition of the need for marine protection. That kind of effort continues with the initiatives which are coming before the House today. One of the further international initiatives on which we have been working is called the PIC for Prior Informed Consent. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the PIC in detail I would wish to make the point that part of what we are working on in Barbados and collaborating on with our Caribbean brothers and sisters particularly the Eastern Caribbean is having the Caribbean Sea designated as a protected area for several reasons. You have numerous sovereign states within close proximity to one another. You have great potential for damage from hazards of various types. You have the Caribbean Sea not only being used by pleasure craft and fishing fleets, some large fishing fleets in a detrimental way as I spoke to earlier. You see the Caribbean Sea being used as a channel for shipment of waste of various types.

There is a lot of trans-boundary movement of hazardous waste, of dangerous chemicals, of materials, which, if they were to spill in our waters we could forget the Caribbean as we know it. The landscape would be so dramatically and adversely altered if there were ever to be spillage of hazardous waste, of nuclear waste as it passes through our waters that we are working together with our Caribbean colleagues to have the Caribbean Sea declared internationally a protected area.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Let us continue orderly please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: We have to work in a more collaborative way to protect that precious resource, the Caribbean Sea not only from the economic perspective as I have been speaking to it but in terms of the beauty of the Caribbean.

I have spoken of Exxon Valdez who actually saw what Alaska looked like after the spill. It was a horrible sight. It really transformed Alaska from landscape and seascape to what, if I may, Mr. Speaker, define as a death scape. The loss of marine life, dead fish and animals floating on the water, birds dying, the sands and the shores of beaches coated in oil and wherever you stood, masses and masses of black. 12.10p.m.

Now, the Caribbean really is a very small area and I have already made the point that 60% of our population live on the coast. Imagine for one moment, as the old people would say, God forbid, a spill of that sort anywhere in the Caribbean and what it would do to us. We really would be wiped out economically in terms of the potential of exploiting the marine resources from a tourism perspective, from just the simple pleasure of getting up, all of those Barbadians who do it and I know that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West does get up early, walk the beach, have an early morning dip and so on.

Those of us who have constituencies on the coast know the tremendous enjoyment that people derive from going out and breathing that early morning air. All of that would be destroyed and wiped out in the event of a major spill of waste of any sort being transported through our boundaries and that is in fact what these pieces of legislation will seek to protect.

The prior informed consent, the PIC, and I will now explain what the PIC is. Essentially the PIC is an international mechanism which will allow states, whether island states or not, to be informed of ships, where they are registered, the names of the ships, the cargo they are carrying, the nature of the cargo, the quantum of the cargo and other potential impacts of the cargo where ships are carrying nuclear waste, dangerous chemicals and hazardous waste. When the PIC is finally agreed comprehensively at the international level, and not every country of the world ever signs to all agreements but we expect that we can get substantial agreement, under the PIC Caribbean States and Barbados in particular would have a right to know what ships are coming through our channels but more importantly, Sir, what is on them. And that is critical to our protection because as shipping lines increase, as commercial activity in trade, in tourist cruising, and you know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that cruise liners are getting bigger and bigger. They now have cruise liners that are carrying thousands of people. Already the Port is in the process of starting the plans for building a new berthing site for these very large ships.

It is absolutely critical that as that kind of economic activity of movement of ships, including pleasure craft

through our waters increases that we have a very clear understanding of what is on those ships so that we can develop a register of who is coming through, what they are bringing, how it is likely to affect us in order that we may put in place pre-emptive mechanisms for our protection and establish framework for our own marine enhancement and protection and to put in place the kind of equipment and initiative and trained personnel who can respond in a timely manner in the event of the kind of spillage or disaster of which I speak.

I am happy to report to this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that since these negotiations have been under way that we have been informed by the United Kingdom of ships belonging to them that were coming through our waters with hazardous waste and with dangerous substances. So already our negotiations, at the international level, are bearing fruit when we can have the United Kingdom inform us that ships are coming through with particular cargoes which could be of potentially harmful effect to Barbados and its people and to the Caribbean and its people.

There are times, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that our people, not fully appreciating the nature of the work of Ministers and civil servants that goes on at the international level, may quarrel and say you are overseas frequently or you are not in the country or they call you and heard you were away, and you are spending taxpayers money to go. The reality, Sir, is that very often when Ministers travel, when civil servants travel, it is this kind of negotiation and work that is going on. You go, you sit at the table and essentially you are fighting to ensure that Barbados is protected or helped in a particular way.

Part of the marine species protection that we are seeking to put in place will be registered in Barbados under the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. It is well known that there are species, marine and otherwise, which are like canaries to miners. They signal. They are the first line of defense and signal when something in the environment has gone or is going wrong.

We are seeking to put in place in Barbados a register of all our animal species so that we will know what we have, so that we will be able to determine how species are dependent on one another, where they are located in relation to the overall environment, but most of all where they are located in relation to the protection of people and our well-being. That action plan is currently being worked on by the environmental division.

You may wish, Sir, to be informed that this action plan will register marine species as well. It will have its cultural component. Therefore, Sir, it is by knowing what species we have, how they impact on us and the environment and how in turn we impact on our environment that we are also working out registers for what is abbreviated in the international community as POPs, persistent organic pollutants.

There are many things in our environment that we use, whether it is chemicals in agriculture, whether it is pesticides in agriculture, that impact on our environment whether it is our land environment or whether it is our marine environment and we are also actively developing a register of these pollutants, the ones which last in the environment and the atmosphere the longest, the ones which are the most common, which we can use then as a means of protection of ourselves.

Part of all of this work relates to the SIDS programme of action which has as its focus - you will see how we are going to date - and looks back into the SIDS programme of action. The SIDS programme of action has as its focus climate change and sea level rise, natural and environmental disasters and I have spoken about them and how the legislation deals with them, the management of waste and I have spoken to that. Coastal and marine resources and I am speaking to that. Fresh water resources and I have spoken to that. Land resources and I will show the linkage between the land and the marine environment. I have not specifically spoken to energy but certainly wave energy is used for various types of activity elsewhere and that is an option which we can certainly explore. Tourism resources, and I have spoken to that. Bio-diversity resources, flora and fauna, both marine and land based I have spoken to that. National institutions and administrative capacity, regional institutions and technical cooperation, transport and communication, science and technology, human resource development, implementation, monitoring and review. And I took the opportunity, Sir, to specifically recite those because not everybody is aware of how comprehensive the SIDS programme of action and the extent to which all of its tentacles reach into our cultural and economic life, our daily life and activity. Earlier I had been talking about cultural activity and the extent to which single individual conduct impacts on the environment. 12.20p.m.

Education therefore is a major part of the activities for International Year of the Ocean. It is a substantial part of the activities which will come with this legislation and it is a significant part of the thrust of the programme of the environment for this financial year, 1998 - 1999. I have made the point in this Chamber before that all of the turtles which are endemic to Barbados are now endangered species. Many a species of turtles have in fact died out. With the destruction of our mangroves, we used to have twelve coastal mangrove sites and the importance of the mangrove sites was the sand and soil retention at the coastline. People talked about coastal erosion at the Crane and coastal erosion in various parts of St. Philip, Christ Church and the West Coast, but you have to understand the link between infrastructural development, the destruction of the mangrove sites and the coastal erosion. And simple things like somebody going to the beach and taking a plastic bag with golden apples or mangoes impacts on the marine environment. Turtles eat jelly fish. Plastic bags opened in

the water look like jelly fish. They bite them and they die. They choke on the plastic bag.

So that this is why public education is important because it will help to sensitise individuals as to how their conduct can contribute to marine protection and environmental protection. There is a lot of coastal activity. Whether, it has to do with sand mining, whether it has to do with illegal grinding, whether it has to do with pollution and discharge of commercial entities, whether there are hotels or otherwise, the removal of stabilising coastal vegetation, and I have spoken about the mangroves, all of these acts which offend against marine protection are now captured by the legislation which this House will have the opportunity to speak on and review today.

Along the West Coast and South Coast, buildings were put up and development was done before we had the scientific knowledge and skill that would allow us to determine where in fact physical construction should and should not take place. The extent to which activity along the coast, that kind of economic activity will impact on sand movement and beach movement. There are generations of Barbadians who can tell you that over time, they can see how the landscape has changed and how beaches have either grown or diminished as a result of construction along the coast.

Now, we have the Coastal Zone Management Unit with the expertise and the skills to give us direction in this regard. We are now embarking on a review and analysis of the southern and eastern coastlines of Barbados that will allow us to make clear, definitive decisions about what kinds of infrastructural development is permissible, which must never happen, where development is not allowed to take place, if in fact there is to be development and what kind of development should characterise the investments that people are seeking to make.

We must ensure that there is no *ad hoc* development. I use *ad hoc* in this context to mean, unplanned and unstructured development, without full appreciation for the potential impact on our coastal and marine reserves and resources. We must ensure that that kind of development does not take place. The area now under study runs from Maycocks Bay to South Point. It involves the communities that live on the sea side and the Coastal Zone Management Unit, the Fisheries Division. And the consultants who are involved in that process are actually going out there and indicating to people who live along the coast, with how to fish, where to fish and how fishing of different kinds affects potential catches down the road.

We lament the fact that our sea eggs have been over fished. But it is our education of the persons working in that sector along the coastlines and living along the coastlines that will allow them to fully appreciate the extent to which these activities impact on future development and their own economic activity.

The Coastal Zone Management Unit, Sir, is also in the process and I want to share with you some of the initiatives which they now have under way. I have already spoken of the activities for International Year of the Oceans. I have spoken to the development on the south and east coasts and I would wish to inform the House that essentially there are other projects being executed at this time. They are currently under way or just about to start at Paynes Bay, a project for the shoring up of the Paynes Bay road and the protection of that beach. The Ministry of Agriculture has given me a commitment to put a new fish landing site at Paynes Bay and that will be complemented by the work of the Coastal Zone Management Unit which is going to be executed at Paynes Bay.

The pilot work on engineering at Paynes Bay, another set going on at Rockley and the work that has already been completed at Weston. I am speaking in terms of the coastal work, not to the construction of the fishing market, but the extent to which infrastructure is being put in to reinforce and protect the coast. The work done at the West coast between 1991 and 1995 came to US\$7.3 million. Along the West coast and the North and South East coast the work that is being done is valued at US\$4.5 million. 12.30p.m.

We are also collaborating with entities such as McGill University and the Belairs Research Institute, so that there is a broad spectrum of assistance in this regard and that the Government is working with all of the interest groups in this particular area to ensure that we get the best possible results.

Part of this initiative of collaboration also involves the private sector and I spoke to the Professional Association of Divers Operators and the mooring buoys which they will be placing all around the South and West coasts in order to moor and to prevent unsafe anchorage of ships, unsafe to the reefs, that is.

In the first phase, the mooring buoys will be for fishing boats and small vessels. In the second phase, a set will be put up for larger pleasure craft including catamarans and for a set which will be related to the Deep Water Harbour for even larger vessels.

The Adopt a Beach initiative under which clean up of the marine environment is executed will continue. The Coastal Zone Management Unit is also as a result of the South and East Coast project, the one from Maycocks that I have spoken about, will look at terrestrial and marine geological forms, terrestrial and marine ecological studies, terrestrial and marine water quality studies, land use studies, social economic studies, natural resource economic studies, substrates and bathymetric studies, ocean surface current patterns, legislation review, legislative review will be part of it, review of investment, work now going on along the South and West coast. The development of a coastal management plan for the Atlantic coast is underway. The development of

various demonstration projects within communities that link along the coast, that is, that we are seeking to work on at this time. The protection work at Paynes Bay has already gone out to tender and work should commence by September. We expect that the work to be done at Welches in Christ Church will go out to tender by September.

One needs to think of these projects not only as shoring up of the coastline and to work with the marine environment the sea and land coast and beach and shoring up of the road but one needs to see why that is important if development and development infrastructure are to take place.

Let me remind this Honourable Chamber of the Weston flood. After Weston, the Coastal Zone Management Unit, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Public Works and other government institutions went to Weston and developed and integrated a protection plan for that area. The Coastal Zone Management Unit shored the area up. The Chief Environmental Engineer did relevant work in that area. The public health inspectors did work in that area. The Ministry of Public Transport put in certain infrastructure and road works. I am seeking to explain because quite often you hear that Government has spent a lot of money on projects but you do not necessarily see where the benefit of those projects are.

It is that kind of infrastructure, growth and development which really stopped Weston from collapsing. People know that parts of the Paynes Bay road are in danger of collapse. When there is heavy rainfall at Welches in Christ Church you can actually see damage to the undersurface of the road and it is that which we are seeking to guard against. You take the pre-emptive action of putting infrastructure in place that will allow the protection of the road and the infrastructure and then you can add to what exists.

A simple example is Weston where after all the infrastructural development was put in place then an improved facility out of which people can work which then became a site for recreation, a fishing and multi-purpose facility, was built to replace the old fishing market. That is the kind of linkage that the Coastal Zone Management Unit and this legislation will allow us to act as a pivot to and as a nucleus.

There are vertical dimensions to what it is we are seeking to do. There is the policy formulation and I have spoken today to the policy initiatives that are underway, the extent to which at the international level we are working to protect Barbados. At the regional level we are working towards collaboration that protects us in Barbados. At the local level, we are also seeking to put a number of initiatives in place. I have concentrated largely on marine environmental protection because if I seek today to give what we are doing in terms of the land based policy we would be here for an extremely long time. So I am going to focus only on the marine.

Part of what we are doing has a regulatory component. We are seeking to answer the question if in fact marine protection is to be put in place what kind of regulatory framework do we need to support it. How do we give that framework bite? What kinds of personnel do we need to recruit to give us the necessary support for the initiatives that are being put in place? How can we seek to train and retrain existing personnel so that they can effectively deliver to Barbadians that which the legislative drafters intend by bringing this legislation to Parliament.

There is a construction component of it in relation to the infrastructural development that is being put in place and I have spoken to that. There is the legislative framework and legislation in itself can be a mechanism for social engineering.

We are seeking to use by the legislation the carrot and stick kind of principle where you offer incentives on the one hand to get compliance with legislation but where in the event people effect breach of existing legislation then you use the stick. The penalties must be severe. People must understand that we are serious about our marine protection.

You will see as I go through the individual pieces of legislation that this also gives effect to the concept of another environmental principle, the principle that the polluter must pay. He who pollutes must bear the cost and the burden of paying for mitigative action that has to be taken in consequence of his conduct. The cost for that can be considerable. 12.40p.m.

That, Sir, is the broad framework and I have spent this morning or up to now focusing on the broad framework. I will, after lunch, deal with the specific provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Act and then I will do the other two pieces of legislation.

I felt I needed to give this Chamber the framework under which we are operating. I think the House can see that I have sought to speak in very broad terms, that I have not attempted at any stage to politicise this debate. I think it is an important one for the development of Barbados for what successive administrations will have to do if they are to achieve substantial and effective preservation of our environment.

We are going also to be putting up a number of beach facilities, one of them being at Rockley. I want to deal very briefly before lunch with the Rockley component of what we are doing. I have spoken of Weston. I have alluded to Paynes Bay. I have spoken about the infrastructural work in terms of the protection of the road and sewerage system that exist. I have spoken to the fish landing site with upgraded facilities.

Paynes Bay is in the constituency of St. James South which I represent. One of the Honourable Members on the

Other Side was reminding me that it is not an area that is particularly kind to me at the polls but that does not matter. What is important is that we have to put in place facilities where people can work with a sense of pride and dignity, facilities that are properly outfitted.

It is not acceptable that at the existing facility at Paynes Bay there is no sink, something as basic as a sink is missing. Counters for people to work on do not exist. It is in bad disrepair. The new facility that will go there will not only enhance the aesthetics of the Paynes Bay area but really will bring to the fisherfolk of St. James a new set of working conditions and a new work environment, a place where they can be comfortable to go and not be ashamed to work in. Lots of pleasure and fishing craft are brought in and beach there at night. Already on the brow where Coastal Zone Management Unit has done some work, I have had benches placed and I am happy to see that the community is using those. People are having picnics around the benches. People come and sit on the benches and watch the sun set so already the way in which Paynes Bay is being used is being expanded. We have had at the constituency level an experimental project of a fish fry going there since either earlier this year or last year.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am very happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me that was a wonderful site. A lot of people in that area exist off the fishing industry. They work either in fishing directly or indirectly whether in sales or boning or cleaning. It seems to be that exactly what happens at Oistins, exactly what happens at Six Men's should take place there, that the people of Paynes Bay should enjoy it. I started an initiative which started that weekend fish fry and there are people who are unemployed who are now selling out there every week earning money. There are people who are doing it as a sideline earning money there and when the new Paynes Bay facility is completed, it will have in an area for vendors who will not only vend fish, fruit and vegetables during the day but where exactly the kind of activity that takes place at Oistins will be taking place there. That is the vision I have for that area. I have had meetings with the Minister of Agriculture under whose portfolio Fisheries fall and we have tied down the design and the details of what that new and upgraded facility will look like.

It will also have some historical and architectural interest because you will see that there is now a scaffolding up and construction is going on there. We will be locating at that site the memorial to those who lost their lives in the Cubana Airlines crash. So really that whole stretch of Paynes Bay, which is one of the few remaining windows to the sea on the West Coast, is going to be completely transformed. I move from West to South.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am being asked, Sir, *sotto voce* whether or not land will be reclaimed. At Rockley, there was no beach beyond a certain point. The Coastal Zone Management Unit came in, did rehabilitative and construction work and the beach at Rockley now goes beyond its previous limit to the extent that people in that area, or people who have businesses have expanded further on to the beach side.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I admit that was done during the 1986 - 94 period, but it was only done because we had the vision to establish a Coastal Zone Management Unit in the first place back in 1983. If there was not the organisation through which it could be done, you all would never have got around to that vision. In fact, it really was the vision of Dr. Leonard Nurse, and I do not know that he is in the Democratic Labour Party but if you now wish to adopt him that is a matter for him. I must pause, Sir, to give praise to that highly skilled officer and to the staff of the Coastal Zone Management Unit.

Before I resume, I am going to speak about Rockley in the 10 minutes remaining to me, Sir, before 1.00 o'clock. I will speak to Rockley and then I will come back to deal with officers of the Coastal Zone Management Unit.

At Rockley, I made the point that the kind of work they did really in essence caused the development of a new beach, and that is the kind of skill we have in Barbados. Essentially, that is what will happen. You have been asking me about whether we will reclaim land at Paynes Bay. Essentially the same kinds of principles and technical skills will be brought to bear.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: You all represented the people for years, would not do anything to upgrade the facility that existed there and now that I plan to do it you are vex.

Rockley Beach Park Development is going to have a facility for 50 cars. You have already seen that the NCC has been upgrading the kinds of vending units which people on that beach were using. Previously it had become a little rundown and that is a much used site. People surf there. A lot of tourists go there. A lot of people bathe there so at that site we have started to improve the kind of vending units and facilities for which people sell there.

It will have car park facilities for 50 cars, and we are talking about proper facilities. Right now people park out there day and night and they go under the trees and so but the point is that when you go across it, it is not a paved, or properly planned, or developed car park facility. Again, I must pay tribute to the vision of a previous Barbados Labour Party Government.

I had been talking earlier about the wrecks at Carlisle Bay but if we are talking about wrecks and the development of reefs on wrecks, and the development of reefs generally, then we would have to give our tribute to the Honourable Member for the City who in a previous Labour Party Administration took a lot of licks when she was determined to sink a ship to create an artificial reef site. People said it was not going to work. It would break up into old metal and we would have an environmental disaster. In fact not only has it worked but it has worked so well that it is now completely encrusted with coral formation bringing alive the reef area again and creating new environments for marine species. 12.50p.m.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Yes, I am talking about Rockley. During a Barbados Labour Party administration that came to an end in 1961 that land at Rockley was privately owned and the land was going to be sold and an acquisition was brought to this House with great urgency that allowed the then Government to buy that and keep it for the retention and use of the people of Barbados. Today, 48 years later we are seeing that that beach continues to be highly used by tourists and nationals for a wide range of activity both day and nocturnal.

As we move now to the next phase of its development the site will be visually improved. There have been difficulties there with drainage and we are going to deal with that. Then we are going to put in place a paved car park facility for 50 cars and a vendor's kiosk for 11 people, a taxi stand, resurfacing of the parking area using textured pavers as opposed to hard concrete or barbed green. Because, of course, if you are thinking about environmental enhancement and protection, the paver, particularly when you put grass in between tend to give you a softer, greener more pleasing aesthetically and environmentally a softer look. That is what we are going to use.

There will be public washrooms and change rooms because lots of people go to that beach and there is no public washroom if you have the urge to go to the bathroom. If you have been sitting in the sun perhaps drinking and you want to go to use bathroom facilities for whatever reason we need to have that there. There will be changing room facilities that will go in.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: We are going to put in place an ornamental pond to transform the existing stagnant pond. I was talking about the drainage difficulty and people who use that beach would be aware that from time to time you go and mosquitoes are breeding in some areas and there is a foul odour and it is overgrown and so on.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: There will be improvement and cleaning of the existing salt water channel will take place and there will be an enclosure for garbage collection and disposal. That is important. I was talking earlier about plastic bags at the sea and so on but we have not over time, for whatever reason, placed at beach facilities and at popular beaches a facility that allows us to collect garbage and dispose of it properly and that is critical if we are going to protect the areas and encourage people not to litter the beach. All of that will be there. Rockley will be visually transformed in terms of functionality. It is going to be completely upgraded and redesigned. This is a project that is being executed under the aegis of the National Conservation Commission with support from the private sector businesses which are found and located in that area.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a major property owner in that area so much so that he can be regarded as a commercial entity and since we are trying to get money from commercial entities to help to give some hope to this project, I would hope that the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central would wish to make a contribution to the development of this project.

Dr. R. C. HAYNES: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is mistaking me for the Honourable Member for Christ Church West.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I have sought, Sir, to set the background against which we will discuss the details of this legislation. I expect that I will resume after lunch and speak specifically to the individual Bills before this Chamber but it would be remiss of me, Sir, before I resume my speech if in this first half of the debate I did not take the opportunity to laud the work of the Coastal Zone Management Unit.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: They are, Mr. Speaker, in all earnestness an example of the best of the bureaucracy of what Barbados has to offer and the best of what the bureaucracy can be. They are in themselves a centre for excellence, each of them is committed, dedicated and they are serious professionals. You can call on them at any hour of the day or night with regard to anything that has anything to do with the marine environment. As we spoke only a few days ago, a year has passed since some young people drowned off Brandons and they were involved in diving and helping to search for the bodies. They are involved in a quality work that now has them recognised outside of Barbados as being the principal architects of coastal management and coastal preservation in the world. Their leader Dr. Leonard Nurse is in such great demand that often we have to lend him to countries and industrialised societies.

Generally, Sir, I really wish to close my comments by saluting that team and its leader, the quality work which they have done and by saying, Sir, that the people of Barbados

really are very much in their debt. They are in many respects the guardians of our marine heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I will resume after lunch.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. SPEAKER, Sir, I beg to move that this House be suspended until 2:00 p.m.

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

The question that the House be suspended until 2.00 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly. 1.00p.m.

RESUMPTION Mr.

SPEAKER: This Sitting is resumed.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of my comments this morning I set the general framework and skeleton on which the 3 pieces of legislation, the trilogy of Bills before this Chamber today will be hung.

I propose, Sir, during this section to look at the 3 pieces of legislation and to deal with their provisions and the implications of those provisions before I conclude.

The Coastal Zone Management Bill which is the short title, the long title being the Coastal Zone Management Plan and Management Area and Appeals Bill which will come to be known in our legislation, Sir as the Coastal Zone Management Act. It has been decided that I would just do a global presentation and then people can respond as they wish.

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: You can make whatever response you wish. You can either concentrate on one or all. I propose in the interest of time to take them individually but I will make a global presentation and you can make whatever response you wish.

Sir, they are so interlinked ...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I can understand that if debate is going to be held and debate would be related to all 3 Bills that is one thing. But we had an understanding before the luncheon interval and I presume by now that the Honourable Member who was speaking at the time and might not have been aware of the arrangements that were being made is now privy to those arrangements.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: My understanding of what we are going to do is that rather than us speak one after

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, there is a Resolution before the House and I would prefer that you address the Resolution. If by chance you have to make a reference to what you are saying, but that is not the substantive motion before the House.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member, as I understand it, Sir, this is the land at Lears.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, this is the land at Lears.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: And the Honourable Member is saying, as I understood him, that he is acquiring this land at Lears in order to remove persons who are now in Zone 1. Am I correct, Sir, that that is what he said? I am explaining that that is unnecessary. The acquisition is unnecessary in the face of the way they operate. First of all, Sir, this opposition had nothing to do with Zone 1 land. It had to do with the attempt which the Government intends to put poor people houses in front of a couple of other people and create a very serious attitudinal change in the price of the housing that now exists. I deplore that kind of attitude. I want to repeat, Sir. The Minister must get up and confirm. I do not accept that the reason for this acquisition is to move anybody from Zone 1 because the history of his Government is that if there are Zone 1 occupants they simply change the zone. They did it in Trents. They have subsequently done it and I have heard them in here during this session, this Parliament, quarrelling that we are always getting uptight about Zone 1 land. Zone 1 land, Sir, is around Codrington. Everybody knows that but there also is Zone 1 up in the St. Michael East area of a massive kind but it has always been accepted that certain kinds of institutions would be allowed to remain if they had been there for some considerable time.

The Honourable Member came in here, Sir, and we saw changes happen in Bennetts, so that the whole zone was changed to accommodate a certain kind of position but this acquisition, Sir, as we have been told by some residents who now live in Lears that this acquisition is to take a certain kind of house and put it in the area of Lears. The Honourable Member, Sir, should get up and explain that. The Chief Town Planner should not allow this to happen either.

There are some people who have been living in Lears for years. I am not discussing the Honourable Member's chairman and some others who have some massive houses up there, Sir. I am talking about ordinary Barbadians.

Sir, I stay with the Zone 1 argument that moving for Zone 1 cannot be the reason why he is moving them. The Barbados Water Authority should be ashamed of itself. I do not know why it has fallen to me today to attack the Water Authority, but, Sir, if I have to attack them every morning I will. The Honourable Member, the Minister should be ashamed that he can come in here and tell us about 25 people who could not get water, the Water Authority refused to send them water. The Honourable Member is fully aware that they could have sent some spider legs up through there, Sir. The

Honourable Member would not know what is a spider leg but we who have to represent people who live in St. Michael know what spider legs are and it has been agreed that you do not have to put down any 4 inch main where there is a small group like the people who live in that area. It serves them right. If they had proper representation this could never happen to them. Unlike the people who are represented on both sides of Westbury Road which brings me to the point, Sir...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We are talking about Zone 1 land.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Thomas Gap, if you do not fix Thomas Gap soon I will speak about that too. But, Sir, recently on a television programme where the Prime Minister was appearing apparently some caller set up by the Labour Party called in and gave the impression that he had a pit toilet somewhere in Westbury Road, Sir. Now I wish to make it clear that that is perfectly unlikely because there are no pit toilets in Westbury Road. If there is a pit toilet in Westbury Road it would be on the City side.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir. The electoral district known as BH which was formerly in St. Michael West and only just come over to the City of Bridgetown, I am trying to get natural gas for them now. They did not get any good servicing under their former representative and this person is trying to help them now. I am not aware of any pit toilets there.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am glad that the Honourable Member corroborates my position and I hope that to the extent that what we say in here gets to be publicised in whatever manner it is done that this would be corrected. To suggest that the Honourable Member had a pit toilet is incorrect. Secondly to suggest that the representative for St. Michael West or the Member for the City has not passed in Westbury Road is incorrect because even if I had not visited the constituency, Sir, I go to so many funerals in the Westbury Cemetery that anyone who had a difficulty on Westbury Road would be bound to see me and all the persons who are not at funerals are usually in the cemetery, Sir. So I concluded that it was a put up job and the Prime Minister should avoid going on these programmes and getting Barbados Labour Party supporters to call in to make him look good. The Honourable Member for Christ Church West would never do that, Sir, that is why I regret that he did not become Prime Minister.

Sir HENRY FORDE: The Honourable Member really is defending his constituency stoutly as he is entitled to do but to suggest that the Prime Minister has got on a programme to ask somebody to call in, Sir. To suggest that the Prime Minister has deliberately gone on a programme to

ask somebody to call in to make a misrepresentation is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is really an ambiguous statement. Could you say it to cut out the ambiguity?

Mr. B.M. TAITT: But I did not even realise that the possibility existed that I could have accused the Right Honourable Prime Minister of doing that. 5.30p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I realise that, but the way how it came out it sounded that way.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh. I am grateful to the Honourable Member that he has now made it clear to me. I ought to have been clear in my charge that the minions around the Right Honourable Prime Minister, obviously not to the Right Honourable Prime Minister's knowledge because he is too Honourable a man to have fallen for that, but in knowing that the Right Honourable Prime Minister was going on television they sent out a lot of lollypops and I was making the point that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West would not have allowed his minions to do that. But I do not know why he got up, Sir, because I was praising him.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have you concluded, Sir?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I think so, Sir, they are getting into an area now where I have no expertise.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would only be a few minutes on this Side. I would be very happy if it is in fact true that the purpose for which this land is going to be acquired by the Government will in fact be achieved. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this House has to be extremely scrupulous in the way in which it deals with these land acquisitions. I am not satisfied with the large number of acquisitions that we are doing when one compares them to the record of the Government both in relation to the provision of house spots, the building of new houses, its entire record on housing that we are doing anything more than simply acquiring land in this House, for which I assume we are paying the owners. I understand this particular owner is not owed a single cent by the Government, whereas there are many other owners of land in Barbados for which acquisitions have been done who have been waiting for ten and 15 years or more.

So we have to ask a parliamentary question to find out how it is that one particular landowner is not waiting for any large sums of money from the Government, but there are people from whom the Government has acquired small portions of land who for nearly 20 years have been waiting.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Yes, it is an ongoing thing, but why is this not an ongoing thing for this particular owner? This is a question that we have to ask, because when one looks at the interlocking relationship, I would be very unhappy, Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I discovered that the Government of Barbados is essentially engaging in speculation and using the Land Acquisition Act as a means of acquiring land from people, whose land would not normally be permitted for housing by the Town Planner to have that land designated for use in housing only to give it back to private developers ostensibly, to carry out that same private housing or for some other purposes.

We are going to be watching this very carefully because there is a piece of land next to this area in which the owner of the land is a black businessman who built his business from scratch on Swan Street, over twenty acres of land and had applied to the Chief Town Planner for permission to subdivide the land for housing development. The Town Planner has consistently refused his application to use that land for housing development. But the Government of Barbados, I do not wish to anticipate this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can only tell you based on what has been said to me and based on implications made to him the owner, is on the verge of acquiring that land for housing purposes. So he cannot realise the benefit of this small piece of land which he owns in that area because the Town Planner will not permit it for housing development.

He is a small black businessman, Mr. Speaker, Sir, who probably will have to wait years and years to be paid. He is not like this particular landowner, C.O. Williams Construction Limited.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I have not used the word, 'poor'. I know the one you are acquiring from now is not poor and has been enriched by a series of acquisitions which Government has done in respect of his land and paid him promptly.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I am talking about the present one, C.O. Williams Construction Limited, the company from which you are acquiring this piece of land. But I am saying that the Government has intimated that it is going to acquire land adjacent to this from a businessman, Mr. Speaker, Sir, who has applied consistently for that land to be used for housing. He had a whole development designed for that area and the Town Planner denied him that permission.

An emerging businessman, first generation, originated from St. Peter and Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government proposes to acquire that land to put it as I understand it, into low cost housing.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You can say where you want it to be because you operate on the basis of political spite. That is the problem. But I do not operate on that basis so I do not have to call names. I am talking about what is before this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Therefore, I want to ensure at the end of the day that this land that is being acquired from C.O. Williams and any other land that is being acquired in that area that the landowners are treated equally and fairly, that they are paid promptly, that if he had previously applied for the Town Planner's permission to develop the land, that they should be permitted as citizens of this country to have development carried out and to benefit from that development.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which compensation is calculated under the Land Acquisition Act in Barbados can be very disadvantageous in a situation like that. Because, the person who has invested money in having plans drawn, applying to the Town Planning Department for housing development, when the Government acquires that land, if such permission has not been granted, they are going to compensate him on the basis of its present use, agricultural use.

So that individual could stand to lose thousands of dollars at the end of the day and all we want on this Side is a guarantee or some kind of statement from the Minister that nothing will be done to disadvantage the owner of that land, since we know that the owner of this land, 3.187 hectares had been in substantial beneficiaries of the Land Acquisition Act since this Government came to office. Both in relation to new acquisitions and also in relation to its connection with a company to which land was given at Apes Hill in St. James to carry out housing development.

So we want a complete exposure and, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are watching this situation very carefully because statements have been made by members of the Barbados Labour Party and senior members that this land is being acquired for a certain reason. They may have their reasons for doing that because time is longer than twine and you cannot live forever and if you live by the sword you will die by the sword. You cannot be in office for ever.

But what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that at the end of the day all we are interested in doing is ensuring that this land acquisition process is not being used as a weapon against Barbadians and black Barbadians in particular who own land and have been seeking to develop that land and who have no other land available to them for these kinds of purposes.

There are some people in Barbados who own large tracts of land all over the country who could afford to have the Government come and acquire it.

Aside.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Well this is one here as you would know, substantial tracts. I can think of areas in St. John that they own which could be suitable for housing development and other parts in St. Joseph too that could be used for housing development. What I am saying is that where a man only owns one area of over 20 acres of land, next door to this major landowner's property that he should not be disadvantaged, that he should be entitled to realise it.

What we are speaking about, Sir, at a personal level is that no Member of this House could be comfortable if they had purchased a piece of land, made an application to the Town Planner to develop that land, looking for certain capital gain from that land, invested money in professional services only to find that the Town Planner declined the application and then the Government comes right after that and acquires that land for the same housing purposes and he is paid compensation at the rate at which the land was owned, agricultural land, even though it had the potential for housing. That, Mr. Speaker, is where our concern comes and we are not going to stand idly by while we have no opposition to this particular acquisition. I forewarn the Minister of Housing up front that we are not going to stand idly by and see the land of Barbadians being taken up by the Government under the heinous provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, under a compensation formula which is clearly unreasonable and unfair and as a political party not say something about it, as I say, particularly where we see it as an opportunity for a small businessman, first generation, to own land of that size being disadvantaged and where there is a seething undercurrent of unfairness and lack of justice in the way in which the Land Acquisition Act is being used. 5.40 p.m.

I issue the warning from now that we are going to be looking very carefully at this matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: The Honourable Member has made what we would call in law a pre speech when you come for an injunction on threatened or speculative conditions. While he spoke, I asked the Minister to let me see the survey and the land is as described in the Schedule because on one side it is bounded on Lears Plantation, on another side by Lears and on another side by Friendship and the only other persons are small tenantry lands right there. So there does not seem to be any land on this plan in proximity that falls within the description.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House because he has not said what kind of plan he is quoting from. He is quoting essentially from a site plan of the area. He has not said if he has looked at the entire plantation area of Lears, nothing like that. The facts can be given so we do not have to apply for any injunction. We are going to say what we have to say and none of those rules apply to us.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: I am dealing with a speech the Honourable Member made. The Honourable Member spoke and I would have been delighted to have had the details from him as to what he is referring so that the House could have the benefit of the matter in order to debate it. It makes this difference to me, Sir, that I have the experience as the records of this House would show of having seen the Democratic Labour Party acquire Graeme Hall Plantation and take the area which was known as Goodwood Park and sell it back to their friends, Moses and Bernstein, at the time, who speculated and made a fortune.

Now that is in the records of the House about which I have spoken. So if that has been happening in a Party to which I belong I would obviously be very concerned about it but until the Honourable Member gives me further and better particulars I would believe that my Party would have more sense than to fall into the same disastrous mistake which the Democratic Labour Party made and this is a fact. I have been in this House long enough to know.

If you go to Goodwood Park you would see how much money the Edghills - the same white people that I hear people beat in here - the Bernsteins - the same white people that I hear in here, and the whole troupe, made out of Graeme Hall which was acquired when I was calling for a part of Graeme Hall to be made available for the same "poor black man" that I hear so much in here about from Forde's Road.

Aside.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: Sir, I like to remind members of these things because the more things go around they come around. That history has been here. The Honourable Member was then at school so he cannot be held responsible for that.

Let me say, Sir, I believe that perhaps it would do Honourable Members and certainly would do me a lot of good if the acquisitions which have been made in the last 10 years, and Government has become perhaps one of the biggest land owners in the country now, were documented in easy form so that Honourable Members would see what land is now owned by Government and to what purposes.

I seriously believe that Government has to carry a land bank and a land bank that is geared to the long-term say, 20 years development strategy of the Government, and when I say the Government, I do not mean a particular political party of the people of Barbados, because obviously more and more we are going to have to be very rigid in how we allow acquisitions to continue into rural Barbados for various reasons.

One is that we cannot continuously take agricultural land that is of a good value out of agriculture. I believe that this generation of us has a duty to safeguard part of the agricultural belt for the legacy of the future. That is the first point I want to make. Whether or not we continue in sugar or

whether we continue in some other form of agriculture, agricultural land will have to be preserved, some of them even if only for the environmental preservation of Barbados as a whole. That is the substantive point I really want to make.

I think therefore that we have to be very careful how we are acquiring it. At the same time, I believe that one must make the best use of scarce resources. We have not so far got into the culture of Barbados the idea of going up in the air where people can share the space above us and have multiple units and what not. We would have to educate our people how we use those units and how we relate to each other living in such close proximity.

This is going to be necessary in Barbados because they tell me that our population is about 260 000. We are one of the most densely populated countries in the world and we cannot continually therefore just expand and expand and expand without paying some regard to that area.

Sir, I have seen some of the development that has taken place near to this if I am right as to where this spot is and I expect that if you go along the road from either the Belle and turn across Lears that you will get to it or if you go from Hothersal Turning and turn to the right you will get to it. Some of the land that is near to the Belle has gone out of cultivation into manufacturing purposes for office space and what not, some in housing. The rab land is housing. Some of it is now at present owned by the Government and I believe that is in the agricultural zone and cultivated by the prisoners and the prisoners have been doing an excellent job in growing vegetables in part of the area and as you go further up on the hill on the left some of that rab land has gone into housing. Then there is some marginal land, land which I understand is marginal land, which is at the foot of that hill. I do not know if that is the area to which the Honourable Member is referring. I am just trying to find out.

I also have a great fear and I have seen it in my own constituency and! have to say this. I very often speak to the Chief Town Planner when I see these things happening. For instance, in Golf Club Road, permission has been given for land to be taken out for housing. I warned then that that was not good housing land and they tried to build and could find no foundation. A lot of people are allowing some land that is swampy land to grow into weeds and what not and then coming for permission to subdivide and we have to warn some of our citizens, including returning nationals, about buying in certain areas. I do know that the area of the Belle and near to the Belle going towards Lears that that area is well-known as deep agricultural land and I would hope that acquisitions will not apply to that. We must find some other use for that kind of area.

I believe that we will have to do more acquisitions. I want to say that I understand near me and I have spoken to the Honourable Member for St. John before on this. In the parish of St. John although there is a lot of land a lot of it is

harvested. Those of us old enough in Barbados would have known about the days when sea-eggs represented a delicacy in this country and largely through wanton, indiscriminate plucking, largely through people taking sea-eggs in the off season, our sea-eggs stocks have gone down. We have information, Mr. Speaker, that in certain parts of Barbados sea-eggs are beginning to come back but we are concerned that unless the imposed restraint on those who would break the rules that we might never see our sea-egg stocks build back up to desirable quantities and we will therefore be taking moves to make sure that persons guilty of illegal fishing of sea-eggs be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be also imposing terms on persons landing yellow fin tuna or big-eyed tuna which are less than 3.2 kilogrammes in light weight because once small young fish are taken out of their habitat at such a tender age, in large enough quantities, we will see the stocks diminish or even disappear. We are also addressing the problem of the wanton, indiscriminate exploitation of the so-called ornamental fish and will be requiring people who want to take ornamental fish from our waters to get written permission from the Chief Fisheries Officer. Mr. Speaker, we are going to bring these regulations to complement and to lend support to this Bill which is before this Honourable House today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that during the course of his contributions, the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, though largely being supportive of the policy in the legislation, expressed some concern as to how powerful and how efficacious will be our system of enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members should refer to clause 37 and to clause 40 in the Bill because clause 37 sets out quite clearly the powers granted by those who are to enforce the Act, the limits of those powers, and then clause 40 sets out the offences and penalties which are to flow in the event of the fraction of these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, even though earlier in what I had to say today I indicated that some legislation had been passed by this Parliament piecemeal over time between 1890 and 1976, I still think that this particular piece of legislation that we have before us has been legislation that has been arrived at after careful consultation with a number of interest groups.

I also make bold to say that a lot of thought has gone into the policy considerations behind this particular Act. As we move out of the 1990s close to the year 2000 we have come to a situation where more than ever we need to be aware of our responsibility to posterity. Our children and their children must be assured that they have a wholesome, healthy environment to live in. Our children and their children must be able to make sure that the marine environment which a lot of us have been lucky to use for various reasons is still in a good enough condition so that future generations might be able to benefit from these resources in the way that we have benefited.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a good thing when a Government is able not just to take into account its responsibility to those who live in contemporary times but those who are to come, and I am of the view that this piece of legislation along with the other two pieces of companion legislation to come in the future, would have gone a long way towards ensuring that we have addressed a problem that has implications for the long-term safety and security of our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the general policy is to allow the director and other officers to recognise teams of management of our coastal resources subject to ministerial approval and to ensure that the measures that are contained in this important piece of legislation are so carried out that Barbados can be a better place in consequence of having had regulations and legislative measures like this.

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty whatever in lending my wholehearted support to the measures as proposed in this Bill. I am grateful to you.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I propose that this debate be postponed for further consideration and I so move.

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

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

ORDER NO. 21 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
THE VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING
CORPORATION OF LAND AT HOPE
PLANTATION AND ORANGE
HILL, ST. JAMES

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to vest in the National Housing Corporation parcels of land at Hope Plantation and Orange Hill, St. James for housing development. We have had a full debate in this House when these parcels of land were acquired and I do not intend to go over the debate in that respect.

I would just like to say that at the moment we have started the construction of terrace units at the Hope. This area is part of the Deane Town development and will be known as the Deane Town terrace units.

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

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

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit surprised that the Government would continue to vest this land at the Hope Plantation and Orange Hill, St. James in the National Housing Corporation for the simple reason

that Government has recently compulsorily acquired large parcels of land in the area of the Lancaster Plantation and one would have thought that the large acreage of land that Government has been acquiring at Lancaster Plantation that Government would have taken into consideration the suggestion given by myself that they would give back this land to the owners in Orange Hill and acquiring if possible more land at Lancaster. 5.00p.m.

Sir, this land at Orange Hill is next to a lot of small parcels of land which a lot of residents would prefer to keep. I am asking the Minister to reconsider this decision by taking this back to Cabinet and asking Cabinet to acquire over 30 - 50 acres of land between the Bennetts and Ridgeway Plantations which could easily be used for housing purposes instead of coming into Orange Hill and taking small parcels of land from poor people who might not get the opportunity again to own land in this country.

We are at a stage in our development, Sir, where we are about in this country to deprive poor people from the right of owning land. People who previously had the right to owning land we are at a stage now where we are going to deprive them owning land because the land market is such that the supply and demand is so great where people are outbidding people for parcels of land.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about, Sir. At Mangrove in St. Peter a plantation was up for sale for \$1 million, first bid, and it went as high as \$1.8 million which tells you that in Barbados now that people are quite prepared to outbid people just to get land. It is even worse, Sir, that if in that bidding process it so happens that some people looking like myself are in the bid, and some other people are in the bid, that they are prepared to pay any price to get that plantation.

An example, Sir. When the bids at Mangrove started, there were some gentlemen from the beautiful constituency of St. Lucy but because a particular land shark in this country believes he must own all the land, he could not give way to two black boys from St. Lucy. The bids went as high as \$1.8 million and it has not stopped. It has come to a stage now where it has moved from St. Peter and has gone as far as St. Philip. I am saying that Government must put a policy in place where they protect the interest of poor people and make sure that poor people have a right to land instead of depriving them.

It is regrettable, Sir, that in the 1990s that the Government is seen as the one that is depriving poor people of their own land. I thought that this Government would have been compulsorily acquiring land from plantation owners and giving it to poor people but it seems to me that we are getting the reverse trend.

I want to warn this country that we are at that stage now, Sir, where every piece of land that goes on the land

market that there is a possibility that the small man will be outbid. I am warning this Parliament that we must make sure that instead of depriving poor people of land that we must be the ones to protect their interest and we must be the ones to make sure that they get land.

I am calling on the Minister, Sir, because, as I have said before, he has the opportunity now where the Lancaster area stretching from Bennetts right out to Lancaster, that whole area along the Highway, can easily be compulsorily acquired for housing purposes. It is my opinion, Sir, there is no need to acquire this land in Orange Hill.

Sir, you would have seen the last acquisition at Deane Town, a lot of small names involved. We need to get away from that and we need, if anything, to acquire large parcels of land from plantation owners, and it appears to me they are the ones willing to sell. Small people are not interested in selling their lands. They are interested in keeping their lands and no Government should be seen as depriving small people of their land, if not, I would even accept the suggestion. If you are going to take land from small people be prepared to give them a piece the same size in exchange.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: And I agree with you because I cannot see how anybody can take any land from anybody in Deane Town because, in my opinion, that is one of the best pieces of land in Barbados that anybody could own.

I am not interested whether the Paynes used to own it or not. I believe if the Paynes used to own it they have a right to have it back too. I do not believe that we should be at a stage where the land sharks are walking around with big bags in this country where they could push down buildings and build new ones that we should be encouraging this type of behaviour in this country.

We are developing a banana republic in this country and Government must not be seen to be party to that. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious point. They can laugh at it if they like. They have people walking in here and destroying our history, yes, destroying the history of Barbados. They could just come, buy buildings and push them down and build new ones. And are we as a Government going to be party to that and want to do the same thing where we just walk in, take poor people's land and buy it out and move on?

I am saying, Sir, we are at a stage in this country where we seem to forget where we came from. We are not interested in where we came from anymore. We are interested in what people can give us and what they are prepared to leave in this country. So anybody can come in here and do what they like in it now once they have the money.

I am telling you, Sir, that our great grandparents would be ashamed of us to see what is going on in this country because they are just selling out everything in this country. I am going to warn this country. If this nonsense continues, the youngsters that are coming up are not going to react to those people who fly in here. They are going to react to the ones who sell out this country because the problem with some politicians in this Assembly, just because a lot of them have gotten over they feel that they have arrived and I think that is the failure of many politicians. They have arrived so they just do not care about poor people anymore. Once a man comes in here with a lot of money he can get whatever he likes and that is why despite the good ideas we had before we are prepared to allow people in and not care about the colour of the money anymore. We are quite prepared to accept any nonsense. Do not care what the person is offering, we are prepared to accept it.

I am saying this is a serious thing, Sir. This country belongs to the people who worked hard in the canefields to build it and overnight there are people walking in here with suitcases taking over this country and dictating to this country as they like. I am not happy with it, Sir. If you are, that is your giving and I know you cannot be happy because you are the one who will protect the interests of this Parliament and the people.

I am saying, Sir, that the people who have sent us here must start feeling proud of us. Let me tell you something Sir, those youngsters out there, they are not happy with us. Take it as a warning, they are not happy with us. They feel that they do not have a right in this country and I cannot get vex with them, Sir. Because tell me one thing that the youngsters have asked for and they have received. You cannot tell me one thing. I can tell you what a rich man coming in the country with a suitcase of money what he can get. Anything he wants he can get and we feel proud about it. We call ourselves Parliamentarians representing the interests of poor people. How long can we continue to try to fool poor people that we are representing their interests. They tell us that this is a country for the poor and the underprivileged. How long will you continue to fool the people that you are a Government for poor people, Sir? 5.10p.m.

Let me tell you something, that in this country if a poor man wants a road leading to his house, he cannot get it but if a rich man wants a road leading to his house Cabinet will approve it overnight. Don't challenge me on that.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. The Honourable Member was going very well and then he went off the rails. These generalisations, are misleading the House. These things do not happen here. Please, he has to withdraw those remarks that if a rich man wants a road outside of his house he can get one in Barbados.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is true. In St. Peter every road leading to plantation houses are paved whereas I cannot get one in my constituency done and you are going to challenge me on that. You are going to warm me up now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, before you get too warmed up, we are really looking at the vesting of this land. The Resolution is about the vesting of land at Hope Plantation and may I remind you, Sir, that there has been a full debate about the compulsory acquisition of this land. This Resolution is about the vesting of this same property to the National Housing Corporation. I have given you a lot of latitude but just focus a little more on the Resolution as it is.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, am I to believe, Sir, that discussing the interest of the poor as it relates to this and discussing the interest of roads...because you will realise that whenever you vest land to build houses that you have to build roads and the other infrastructure and I cannot reflect on that, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not what I am saying.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am just asking for guidance, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member you cannot take advantage of the opportunity to debate about every possible matter that relates to land and housing acquisition. That would not be fair to the Parliament. Just proceed, please.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will continue, Sir. It is important for us to talk about vesting lands and the rights of people. You must understand that whenever Government acquires land, whether it is in Greenwich Village or Padmore Village, one must understand why Government is acquiring land. I am saying that if we are going to widen the roads that we need to acquire the land and it so happens sometimes that when you are finished widening these roads that a particular owner turns up to be near to that land. Is there anything wrong with that, Sir.

I am saying, Sir, that we need as a Government to spend more money. I am telling the Cabinet that I am tired of driving around Barbados and seeing more roads leading to rich people than poor people. That we need to vest more land where poor people can get some roads.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: I am tired for the simple reason that I want to see land vested in a way that poor people can get roads to their houses. I have applied since 1994 for 40 roads in my constituency and I cannot get any land vested so that I can get a road into my constituency.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the problem with some of our Parliamentarians is that they do not know the history of Barbados. If there is one constituency that you can talk black and white in and do not worry, it is St. Lucy because you do not have too many of them so the roads cannot be for rich people. I do not know any rich black man in St. Lucy. I know of rich progressive people but not rich black people.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying about this affair at Orange Hill is that we need to be sure that at the end of the day these land owners, their interests are perfectly protected or not we will find ourselves in a situation where a grandparent had piece of land for a grandchild and that grandchild cannot own a piece of land in Barbados anymore. We must understand that this is not the Barbados we knew ten years ago where you could easily go and purchase a piece of land. Those days are over, Sir. We have to be very careful how we deprive people now of a piece of land. Any Government who can continue to acquire land and not worry about that fact is failing itself. It is not failing the people because the people will react in time. I can assure you that the people of Barbados are going to react to things like this because there is a general feeling in Barbados now that the only people that can get land as they like are the rich ones.

Look at it, Sir, every piece of land that is up for grabs is for the rich. You know what is fascinating, the same people that are buying land is the people that are selling Government the land. I want you to study that, Sir. How is it that the same people that are buying up all the land still have enough land to sell Government whenever they want it. I want you to study that.

Thank you very much.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member who just spoke did not raise any issues which I think I should respond to except that he did mention that Government should acquire land at Lancaster Plantation in order to provide housing for the poor people in St. Lucy. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when that Resolution comes to Parliament that the Honourable Member would give it the same support that he....

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: On a point of order. I never suggested that the Honourable Member should purchase land at Lancaster for people in St. Lucy. He know that I would not suggest that to him. The people of St. Lucy belong to St. Lucy.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would just hope that when this Resolution for the acquisition comes to Parliament, it is in excess of 50 acres, and I would hope that the Honourable Member would give it his support.

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

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

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

ORDER NO. 15 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT LEARS PLANTATION,
ST. MICHAEL FOR HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution for the acquisition of 3.875 hectares at Lears Plantation in St. Michael for housing development. This has become necessary, Mr. Speaker because of the fact that representations have been made to Government with respect to the failure of the Barbados Water Authority to supply water to some 25 houses in Lewis Gap in Green Hill. Our investigations have shown that that area is in the Zone 1 water protection area. These people have been without water for some time. 5.20 p.m.

You will recall that under a previous administration rather than relocating persons who were so affected the residents were encouraged to construct further housing in the area. The policy of this Government is to ensure that land is made available for these persons and that these persons are not denied the service that is available to the rest of Barbados. It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that when this land has been acquired that those 25 persons will be able to relocate subject to the relevant town and country planning regulations.

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

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

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can hardly believe my ears that it is that Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, the present Minister responsible for lands and water getting up and talking about the previous administration. The Honourable Minister only has to do with this people what he has done.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member need not get so angry. I never said anything about the previous administration. I said a previous administration and if he feels guilty well so be it.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I feel guilty, Sir, because I was in the previous administration. The NDP has not been an administration so it could only be us. The Honourable Member only has to remember that when he comes in here and talks in those terms he has forgotten that that administration has been changing zones right, left and centre. The first thing they did when they were the Government before they went into Trents and the whole zoning of water in this country went through the eddoes when for purposes of convenience the Barbados Labour Party administration of the day changed entirely a whole section of land ...

When we look at this legislation you will find creeping into it... What they call the policy of this legislation has some aspects in it which cause me to raise questions. When you examine the Town and Country Planning Act which was based almost exclusively on a mimicking of its English counterpart - and I am one of those persons who will boldly say that the English system still constitutes the better of the systems and even though they reinvent the wheel from time to time I think the system is not a bad one.

I notice, to give an example of what I am talking about, that under section 7(4):

"The Director shall make the management plan available for inspection by members of the public on the payment of a prescribed fee from the date of the publication of the order."

Now, Sir, as I said, we will discuss this and others like it when we go into Committee, but I just want to use that as an example of what I am concerned about in this very sudden shift which might come as a result of copying or taking advice on the kind of legislation one needs and so we are to make sure that we do not have legislation which mimics, which might apply in say, the coastal areas of California.

Sir, that legislation is proper for the coastal areas of California because the system of government which it has and which obtains in California allows for a series of hearings which will give everyone the opportunity to sound off rightly or wrongly on the proposal which is coming for enactment. Here in Barbados we do not have such a system and we must be extremely careful therefore not to mimic legislation as it has been applied elsewhere if that legislation does not serve the same purpose for us as it does for wherever it was introduced.

The concept of a person having to have a fee in order to inspect whether a regime is acceptable...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The concept of having to pay a fee introduces an element that is unacceptable and I would wish to suggest to the Minister that an examination of this is warranted because as long as a fee has to be paid there has been imported into the concept some aspect of discrimination. I believe that somebody from the Honourable Member's constituency in the City who would have grown up in the area where the reef used to be and who would know more, and this is a very interesting thing, about how coastal pollution affects the coastal waters because - the Honourable Member was kind enough to say that I go every morning to a part of a beach which Your Honour is familiar with - one can see the coastal changes as they occur literally every day and there are persons who have grown up near the reefs who can give chapter and verse and would be able to tell any director what ought to be but who might not be able

to pay the fee. We must be careful not to have this kind of import but I want to go on to another aspect of the legislation. 3.20 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. For the Honourable Member's information, this is not a Californian import. It already exists within the ambit of our legislation under the Town and Country Planning Act where if you want a copy you will have to pay whatever is the copying fee. It is not a large amount but it is just a way of offsetting some of the costs. This already exists within the scope at the periphery of local legislation. I assure you it is not a Californian or any other import.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is right in what she has said but she is wrong in understanding what I have said. The fact is that the Town and Country Planning legislation makes provision for a hearing. It is only after the hearing that if people like Mr. St. Hill and others wish to get the full panoply of what has gone on so they can study it in great detail, they have to pay for the cost of producing it.

This, however perhaps, attempting to mimic that, suggests that you will have to pay a fee. If you look at 7(4) the actual words are:-

"The Director shall make the management plan available for inspection by members of the public on the payment of a prescribed fee."

My argument is that you ought to be able to go to the Public Library, as many of the citizens of Barbados do, and go through that plan without having to pay anything to inspect it, but let us not spend time on that. We will get an opportunity in the Committee to examine this in detail.

I want to move to what to me is an expansion of that concept. Now, Sir, not long ago I heard official utterance which suggested that the office of Chief Town Planner was about to be abolished. This was public information put out that the office of Town Planner was about to be abolished and that the whole concept of Town Planning as understood by us under the Chief Town Planning Act was to be rearranged. I go no higher than that.

Indeed, some of us raised questions when the then Chief Town Planner, who arguably was the best qualified person in this field, was promoted to a position of Permanent Secretary. There were some of us who felt that the office of Chief Town Planner itself ought to have been raised to the level of Permanent Secretary so as to retain that quality of expertise which, if it were not retained, would put a holder of that office at a disadvantage. We were led to feel, based on what was said in official circles, that following the advice of one of the international agencies, that the concept of the Chief Town Planner would be done away with and a whole new set of arrangements would come in place.

Now, Sir, this legislation, coming subsequent to that, now speaks of a Director, and if one goes through this legislation, one sees that the Director is going to have a focal position that is, at least, at the level of Chief Town Planner, given what the Director will be required to do, and what the Director will have jurisdiction over. The Director, in fact, will be in a pivotal position where he, having listened to observations made by the public can determine whether amendments ought to be made and if he, according to my understanding of this legislation, deemed that those observations were worthwhile, would, in fact, be the one who determines the new draft order, as they call it. 3.30p.m.

Sir, it seems to me that the Director is going to become a Czar. I want to know what it is because the Minister did not address this as part of the policy presentation and I am now saying that it ought not to be so. I am merely saying that we need to have a clear explanation as to what manner of position the Director is going to have given the information which was given to us in the past not so long ago in relation to the Chief Town Planner. Because this new Czar is going to be subject to the Chief Town Planner. One is left bereft of clear ideas of what exactly we are going to have in terms of the Coastal Management and other such matters.

Another aspect that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that included in the terms which this legislation will be concerned with, is the public access to beaches.

Sir, I feel very strongly that the public access to beaches requires a higher authority than any Director under this legislation. I do not wish to see public access to beaches included in this legislation. I wish to see it at a higher level because the public access to beaches falls above any coastal management. That has nothing to do with coastal management at all. I understand that the public access to beaches, Mr. Speaker, unless I misread this legislation includes in the terms which the Bill will take under its ambit, the public access to beaches.

Sir, I want to talk about public access in section 4(1):

"The management plan shall comprise policies, strategies and standards that provide for the management and conservation of coastal resources and may include

- (a) policies, strategies and standards for the development and the maintenance of structures in the coastal zone management area or the proposed coastal zone management area."

If you look at sectioned) it says:

"Provision for public access through and to the beach and other natural areas of the coastal zone".

Sir, I wish that to remain firmly within the ambit of the Chief Town Planner and the Minister responsible for Town Planning.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I know you will agree. These are not matters to be left to any question.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that I have no doubt that they are arranging the law as they wish to arrange it and I have no quarrel with that. I am saying what our position is. The question of public access to beaches is not something that is to be left to chance. There must be no doubt whatsoever about it. This should not be part of any plan prepared by anybody. The access to public beaches is* one of the first, one of the primary, one of the only reasons for our existence because the beaches in Barbados belong to the people of Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Must, not should. They must belong to the people of Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Of course, you cannot put any Director to put in a plan for public access to beaches. If they are dealing with coastal management let them deal with coastal management. I submit that coastal management is coastal management and public access is public access. Do not get the two confused. Do not get any civil servant believing that he has responsibility for access to public beaches. That is a political issue. It is a political matter, it is not for anybody, no Czar, do not create anybody now to work out who is going to give access to public beaches. The people must decide that.

If it is that you wish to have a plan posted in which you say these are the public accesses in Barbados, then put it in the map of Barbados. Let there be no doubt about it. A blind man on a trotting horse must know where the public accesses are. You do not have to read any plan or get any approval from any Minister. Let us make it clear that that is not to be the subject of any plan. Let us organise ourselves and understand where we are.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I notice Sir, on Brandons Beach that very slowly now all kinds of operatives with new equipment, sand moving and all kinds of things are coming in.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it in the records the people in the area of Brandons Beach are a very peaceful people. We built or they build a highway that stopped the people from

going into the sea and those who had to go into the sea on mornings had to be dodging. If you do not make the sea by 7:30 you then have a running battle with the people who have to get to work early coming from the north. We have this wonderful highway that comes from the ABC, comes down the University Hill and heads to Bridgetown. The people who are in the cars are intent on getting to work on time and that is fair enough. The people who are going to the beach are interested only in getting to the beach. So far so good. Only five people have been killed so far. Five people, a couple of dogs, regular cats and a lot of wood-ants and the odd donkey. All were killed.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: We have been very peaceful. We have asked for an overpath. We have asked for an underpath.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the Honourable Member on the Highway but in the interest of setting the record straight. At Part II 4(1) speaks of:

"The management plan shall comprise policies, strategies and standards that provide for the management and conservation of coastal resources and may include:

- (d) provision for public access through and to the beach and other natural areas of the coastal zone".

What the section is speaking to goes to the preservation of public access, not in this administration are you going to have any prevention to public access. This administration is even as we speak, in the process of enhancing public access to the beaches. That cannot be a question, it cannot be questioned.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have no doubt that the distinguished Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House will have an opportunity to speak and the Honourable Member will be able to speak to the issue and I know she will speak passionately to the issue. So that there will be no doubt to what I am saying, I am saying that what occurs in section 4 comes out of what begins at Part II, III and IV and all that follows will be dependent on what the Director proposes. I just wish to make my position clear about this. But I was making the point and I am not going to be diverted. I have nothing but time this evening and I have no problem.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for the City has already made the point that the Honourable Member, in framing his comments in this way, is seeking to mislead the House and is not acknowledging the fact that this legislation

really serves to enhance what already exists and to ensure that people do not arbitrarily block out beach access where sometimes these very accesses are in dispute. There are people saying there was always an access and other people saying not and people seeking to close them off. This Act helps to control and prevent that very thing.

In addition, Sir, the Honourable Member well knows that the Director of the Coastal Zone Management Unit is not an independent republic. He cannot develop this plan without reference to the Minister. Our policy is given birth to by the Minister and therefore this policy can only operate with the approval of the Minister so that the people's representatives are not being deprived of the opportunity to give direction to their businesses.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, it is precisely because the Minister might be a Minister like the Honourable Member that I have to make sure that the legislation protect me from Ministers like the Honourable Member. I wish to be protected from the Honourable Member and I wish the legislation to be certain that no Director can mislead the Minister like how Directors have misled this Minister. I do not want to go there, Sir. I want to stay where I was.

I was making the point that we have been very peaceful in that area and we have had a few deaths, albeit the odd fowl, the odd cat but we have also had a few people who died on that highway. We have not had the underpath and it is now many years since the highway was built there and for what I can see, it is not likely that we are going to have an overpath or underpath in a hurry. I remember when Vic Johnson was the Minister they said it would cost \$300 000 and \$300 000 at the time was considered to be much more important than the life of an ordinary person from up in the area where we represent. The Honourable Member here should have an interest in this too. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central should have an interest in that because his people go down there with me on mornings. That is a small point to the point that I was going on to.

I have noticed that all of a sudden we have all kinds of equipment on the beach. We have people riding horses at speed, we have people driving vehicles on Brandons beach to move boats up and down and a big lot of noise. A few mornings ago I had to go and speak to somebody who said they were testing equipment for the tourist. People were swimming on the beach but they were hoping that the tourist would hear the music because the tourist ship was coming in and this is why they put on the music so loud.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I had to go and tell them. Listen, you see us who come here on mornings. Do not turn on that rubbish with that noise. It is too much noise for us.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I spoke very politely and explained that it was very early.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member wishes me to give a history of my nocturnal habits. What I can say is that the average age on the Other Side precludes any possibility of my seeing any of them down there at night. They are past that stage. There was a stage when the Honourable Member for the City would be down there but she cannot be bothered with that now.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Since the Honourable Member for St. James South is driving a BMW she does not want any sand to get in the trunk so you will not see her down there.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I will give way if you wish to get up and give an account of your activity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, let us proceed.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The point I am making is that we must be very careful....Talking about that, Mr. Speaker, I feel bound to tell you this. I was trying my best to avoid this.

At my beach Brandons I really hope that the Coastal Management Division would understand that it is no credit to the Honourable Member to bring a big rock and put it on the beach. What is happening now is that everybody who comes and reads the long quotation from Kamau Brathwaite and Frank Collymore, when they get to the bottom they have on it the sobriquet for earth day by the Hon. H. Elizabeth Thompson. And then the people suck their teeth. Now that is not fair to the Honourable Member. They ought not to have done that. Everybody who comes to the beach can go and read the thing. Fortunately they are not from St. James South, and this is what they say on the beach, Sir. Imagine that after taking all of that VAT all the Government can do is give us a big rock to hold. 3.40p.m.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am going to refer them to the cart roads, Sir. From tomorrow morning I will be telling them if they want to see the Honourable Member go to the cart roads.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make that is very germane here is that that area which stretches from the Flour Mill to just about Pile Bay, if one

observes it on a daily basis one sees coastal changes occurring, but at the same time one cannot help recognising that because of the attitude which the various governments have taken to pollutants into the coastal area around the Bridgetown Harbour and the same new area about the Flour Mill that we are now beginning to see the return of moss. We are beginning to see the return of moss in the Brandons area and I hope this is the beginning of a new sign that there is a resurgence of the coastal development of the country. It is for that reason that I put in the record and raise the question about the use of vehicles.

I think that we should ban vehicular movement on the sands of our shores. I cannot imagine why anybody needs to have a tractor to drag a boat for pleasure cruises on a little beach like the one at Brandons. A jet ski is now being hauled by some kind of vehicle. I think that the legislation needs to take account of that. The fishermen get 12 people to come and haul up their boats. That is part of our culture, although if you do that now the next thing you know the Minister of Education will have a class in the primary school to haul up boats. You have got to be careful. You cannot push too many things because the poor little children will have to do it. They have stiltmen. I am sorry she is not in her seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right, proceed. Come back to the coast, please.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I never left it, Sir. When we examine the position we find that those areas, now when that area came into this House to be discussed in the past and I did not raise the matter because I feel that there are certain decencies which are required but when you do not have indigenous ownership of these beach facilities then the people who are in charge do not understand the culture of these beaches and hence they do not have any problem with driving a tractor or driving a jeep on Brandons Beach because they come from places where they are no beaches and that is one of the problems that we have in this country. That is why it is so important that the land committee speaks very clearly to this House when the report comes back.

It is very important that those who run the beaches in this country, who get to do the commercial activities on these beaches understand that the beaches are first and foremost for the nationals of this country. It really does not matter if it is a BLP or DLP or NDP, what is important is that we must understand that when we make regulations for the beach, we come first. One of the terrible things that is happening now is that language is being twisted in such a way that if you say you are for some thing it means that you are against everything else. That is not so. To say that we are for our people is not saying that we are against visitors but I tell you the truth, Sir, if to be for my people is to be against visitors well so be it. My position is that I come from Fairfield.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Of course, I am not. I have spent most of my life with visitors but I know that the visitors who come here have a lot of interest in helping us to preserve our own society. Our people must therefore have enough pride in our own society and must want to preserve it for us so that visitors who come here, come to see what glorious works we have wrought. People do not come here because they do not have anywhere else to go. People come here because they see that this is a black country that is run at the highest possible level by black people. A lot of people come here and they go back and tell their people wherever they came from, we have seen something that we did not know could exist. This is no Nigeria, Sir. This is Barbados and what we have here therefore must be preserved for us because we know that if it is good enough for us it would be good enough for anybody else. Mr. Speaker, that is my position.

.When I talk to the people who come here and invest freely on the lands on the west coast, starting from up by where we live, I talk to them and say to them, look if you do not have respect for those old ladies who trundle across the road, trundle down to the beach and try to get their little bath and go back up, you cannot have respect for your patrons who come later.

The Honourable Members here are questioning where I live but what they will admit, each of them, is that wherever I live, I live on the West Coast. Honourable Members are raising questions about what I mean when I say, where we live. Well, Sir, being a person of high morality, Sir, I feel bound to point out to them that I live at Stanmore Crescent and spend a lot of time at Appleby, both on the West Coast and all in St. Michael North West according to what I hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: You seem to be there early in the mornings.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Early in the mornings I am in Stanmore Crescent and Brandons. Appleby comes up to Brandons.

I do not understand why, where I live is suddenly so important. I do not ask the Honourable Member for St. James South which cart road she is in. The Honourable Member for the City spends more time in New York than she spends on the West Coast. I pass by the Honourable Member for the City every day. I pass by the residence of the Honourable Member every day but the Honourable Member is not there most of the time. I do not come in here and say that the Honourable Member is not at her house on the West Coast.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I walk every morning at a quarter past 6 on my beach.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I agree with the Honourable Member when she says she walks every morning. I do not see her. Before the Honourable Member had a private beach

I used to see her. Anyhow, Sir, the levity is desirable too because it is important but, Mr. Speaker, I come now to another aspect of this Bill. 3.50p.m.

One of the things which the Government needs to address is the whole question of the allocation of environment socio cultural and institutional resources. It is all well for the Minister to indicate that this legislation is going to have a police power. It makes no sense to have a police power unless the Minister is able to say to us now that it is the broad intention of the authority that is going to administer this to have the necessary resources.

In the same way that we are unable at the moment for reasons which are not always apparent, because sometimes we have been offered during my time, when we were offered resources and assistance, the structure which we have made it so difficult to accept the resources that by the time one got around to accepting the resources, they were no longer available.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the Coast Guard has for some considerable time had equipment that has been down. The Coast Guard has found itself unable to pursue the policies which have been outlined and identified because the necessary resources had not been made available. The National Conservation Commission in some instances, and one is not here discussing the large quantity of persons who necessarily have to come on to assist in various things. One is talking about the broader structural arrangements. Unless the Government of the day is prepared to put its resources where its mouth is, coming to this House and bringing legislation is merely, pardon the expression, Sir, "spinning top in mud." Because, what we are able to say to the rest of the world is that we have the correct legislation but it is in the implementation of the legislation that we have the breakdown. Unless the resources to implement the policies that are going to be outlined in the plan can be made a part of the programme, then all we will have is much ado about nothing.

This legislation suggests that we are going to have need of special kinds of resources. It seems to me that the training of the people who will be participating as part of the resources base, the allocation of those persons and the qualifications of those persons, all of these are matters which must form part of public policy. When that policy is enunciated, the persons who are being called upon to be educated to the requirements of this Act, ought to be able to assign to themselves at the same time an understanding that the resources will be available. What is the point of saying that there will be a fine of \$100 000 for polluting and then there is no serious attempt to police the polluting?

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have always found fascinating when I had responsibility for the Ministry of Health is how in all the time of the Minister before me, and

the Minister before him and the Minister before, I think the Minister before her, that we were never able apparently to prosecute anyone in the hotel circuit for violation of any of the myriad number of infractions which were possible.

And to this day, we have had situations where the fish in Holetown just died, not just yesterday, they died. They upped and died. We had fish in the area of Graeme Hall Swamp and they just died. We had a company here that used to exit some of the material that in the United States they would have been prosecuted instantly. They used to exit it into the land in Christ Church. They left and went away from here and nobody ever prosecuted them. There are many people, including your humble servant, who believe that the fish killed in Graeme Hall Swamp was not unconnected to the pollutants that came out of a factory not far from there.

In this country, Sir, we do not get explanations. It does not matter if you are in the Government or out and we have to train our enforcers beyond the level of their original inspector. We have to make it clear that polluting the environment and especially the marine environment in Barbados is as deadly as killing people on the highway. In fact it is more deadly, because the pollution is more subtle and hence more dangerous. And unless there is going to be serious enforcement, then we can pass as much legislation as we like, they will be hardly any change, because the perpetrators will know that they are beyond the reach of the meagre resources which have been made available to the particular agency that is responsible for enforcement.

I wish the Minister, when she is responding to allude to this aspect. I wish the Minister to be able to say that the Prime Minister is on board in this regard. Because, unless the hierarchy of the Government is going to put its full weight behind its attempts to change the pattern of marine environment management, then marine environment will be nothing more than another catch phrase which would have been properly recorded by the newspapers after proper utterance by the Members of the House and then we would move on to the next phase.

Mr. Speaker, you could observe in any two-mile stretch of beach in Barbados, the changes that occur on a daily basis and how rapidly they occur. There is a man who has been walking the beach for the last 30 years, two weeks ago he said to me,

"For 30 years I had tried to tell them that effluent coming out of a certain institution on Black Rock killed off the fish and nobody would listen to me."

He said that,

"Whenever you get a chance next time, I want you to say that there is effluent coming out of two of the institutions along that beach that kill off the fish."

Well, I have said it. I have said it in the House of Assembly. I told him I would. But, Sir, my saying it is not sufficient. There has to be an understanding. It is like in basketball you have to have a hard court press. We have to show a movement toward changing the attitudes and changing the understanding. And I think there are some of us who have spent a fair amount of our time trying to do that. But we need more people on board who are going to be able and who are going to be willing to be alone from time to time in the fight to save the environment and more particularly, the marine environment of Barbados, because, in a sense that is all we have.

The Honourable Member said that not long from now we will talk about the sewerage project on the South Coast. Now, Sir, if there is anything that I wish to be remembered and take the credit for is that having acceded to the concept of the south coast after we had the Bridgetown sewerage situation, which in some ways was a fiasco, but it was a learning experience as well in some ways because it took a longer time than anticipated. I am not being critical. When one realised that the South coast project took so long to come on stream for a number of reasons that had nothing to do with the reality that I was able to tack on the West Coast Sewerage Project, the pre-feasibility study as part of the South Coast Sewerage Project so that the smooth movement from the sewerage of the south coast to the west coast would happen without any great pain in the arrangements. 4.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important to us that we sewer the West coast as quickly as possible and there can be no hiatus between the time of the finishing of the South Coast Sewerage Project and the continuation of the west coast. This country cannot afford not to have sewerage on the respective coasts of Barbados, South and West. I really feel comfortable taking the credit for insisting that the pre-feasibility study on the west coast would form part of the feasibility study on the south coast.

The IDB was kind enough to ensure that we get enough funding and so the US\$74 million - well, the Honourable Member may have taken it beyond that now, but the funds which came with the South Coast Sewerage Project will form part of the west coast feasibility study.

I am also going to have to repeat something that concerns me and will concern me in the context of this discussion we are having. We cannot have the Barbados Water Authority announcing that they are going to have a desalinisation plant and at the same time we are discussing coastal management. The director had better be appointed or the coastal unit had better tell the Barbados Water Authority that the disposal of the brine from water desalination is one of the most destructive aspects of lime.

I do not understand why the people in the Barbados Water Authority assume that all of the people in Barbados are asleep and stupid and putting out a lot of propaganda. It

is a fact that the residue from desalination has presented tremendous problems. It is a fact that the cost of desalination is the highest per capita they have found anywhere in the world for the production of water. No amount of propagandising by the public relations people in the Barbados Water Authority can change that fact. That is a fact and as soon as this country comes to grips with the dangers inherent in desalination to provide such a small percentage of the water of this country the better off we will be. I will never be in favour of it, Sir. My colleagues on this Side cannot even persuade me to consider that it is possibly right.

The cost is too high. The environmental risks are too high and this country does not need to take that risk for 4% of its water. Government needs to tell the people at the Barbados Water Authority that they cannot run this country. I assume that the Government is not familiar with all the facts. The Water Authority says that the Cabinet agreed, so I am speaking to the Cabinet now. This is the only place I can get to speak to them where they have to listen. Well, they do not have to listen but that is their problem.

It is a dangerous thing that is happening and I invite all the citizens in this country to rise up against the Water Authority. They cannot cut off my water because I pay. I invite the citizens of this country to rise up against the Water Authority and stop this rubbish. Thirty-million dollars is too much money for us to play games with. Thirty three million dollars for the civil servants put us in deep economic trouble. They think that \$30 million is just a washpan, you don't have to be too serious about it, that you just call a number. Then the kind of contract that they are talking about bringing into this country, Mr. Speaker, it is abominable.

I feel very strongly about it. I feel so not as a politician. I feel so as a citizen and especially since they say they are going to put this plant at Spring Garden. No way! Mr. Speaker, Spring Garden in terms of its ecological construction is the youngest part of Barbados, the Rock. Spring Garden is like a baby's head. When a baby is first born you are taught, if you have any knowledge of how you operate at the nursery level, they teach you that you have to be extremely careful because the baby's head although it seems so is not properly formulated. When you come to a head like the Honourable Member for Christ Church East you can take chances with that head; but a baby's head you have to be extremely delicate. Spring Garden and that area around Spring Garden is exactly like a baby's head. It is very, very fragile. It is economically fragile but more particularly it is environmentally fragile.

If the coastal management people are doing their job as they should be doing and I believe they are doing, they have to put in a separate report to the Water Authority, via their Minister, of course, because if they go past the Minister they will only get into bare trouble. Send one to the Minister but make sure that the Water Authority gets a studied report because you know, Sir, Cabinet Ministers get information of

all types every day, all the time, and unless it is a Cabinet Minister's special responsibility they do not apply any attention to the myriad pieces of paper that come to them except somebody draws it to their attention.

So when I hear that the Cabinet approves, I understand how these things are done. But when I see the Water Authority coming out now and trying to give the impression that they have studied this matter and that they have taken advice and that they know that what other people who are at least as knowledgeable as they are saying is invalid, I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that that is an assault on our collective intelligence.

The Manager of the Water Authority is a very bright person as far as I know but managers do not make policy decisions. Mr. Speaker, if we are not careful a whole host of people will come from overseas and mislead us to the point where when we are old and grey people will put us out in the road and the children who come will have every reason to be contemptuous of us because we stood by and allowed decisions that robbed them of their heritage and we said nothing. Let the records show that I said something. I feel very strongly about that because it is not only economic madness, it is environmental condemnation of a whole area for 4% of the water or 5% of the water - suppose it was even 10% of the water.... They do not even understand the inherent foolishness of what they are saying.

They are saying that it is brackish water. Well, the brackish water has a salt content. Of course it could not have the same as sea water. Even the Honourable Member for the City knows that.

In terms of the kind of equipment that has to be used and re-used they could check with the CERES in California who have done massive studies of this. The only place that desalination can be economic is in the Far East, Saudi Arabia and company because they have enough money that it will not make a difference to them but we cannot afford it. In California, every time people have applied for desalination when there is a shortage of rain so long as rain comes the applications have been withdrawn. The Authority which determines whether they should give them approval usually would withdraw the approval if the water levels rise even 5%. That is simple studying. 4.10p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I do not normally make these kinds of comments but when I was at New York University in 1970 doing a Masters Degree, Environmental Studies was one of the subjects which I did and even as early as 1970 it was being recommended that desalination would require a lot of study before it could be used. Even the Israelis have shied away from desalination because of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, whether they are using nylon, plastic or metal, the fact is that the salt going through the pipes which

it has to go through, the cost is extremely high and the energy requirement is 20 times higher than the energy requirement to send water through the PVC which is used in Barbados now. The information which they are putting out is not valid. Tell Mr. Inniss or whoever writes it in the paper that I said that it is not valid and whoever is advising them is giving them advice like how you do one side of an equation. Those who did equations know that you have to do both sides of an equation.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government changes tomorrow and I became the Minister responsible for Communications and Works then if I spoke I would have authority on the matter. Suddenly I would be invested with knowledge because once you become a Minister in the country, you have knowledge of that subject. You can say anything. You can talk any foolishness. If the Minister has spoken, he or she is presumed to have been properly advised and therefore what the Minister says is valid.

The least you would expect from a Minister, Sir, is that the Minister responsible for water should, at least, have the courage to put the issue out for further discussion. He should not allow the fact that a decision has been made to fox or box him into a position where he feels he must go forward at all cost. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I feel very strongly about the question of the desalination plant.

Now, Sir, I have no objection to Sandy Lane having their own desalination plant as long as they can satisfy the Coastal Management Director, or Unit, or whomever of their capacity to dispose of the residue, and I have my doubts whether they will be able to. But it is perfectly acceptable, it seems to me, that we can say, especially to those institutions that will be using the water for sanitation purposes and golf course purposes, that once you satisfy certain very strong criteria then you will be able to build your own desalination plant because you are discussing a relatively small unit in all respects.

When, however, you are discussing a desalination plant in the context of the supply of drinking water, and Mr. Speaker, I live in Stanmore Crescent so I would have to be drinking the water that comes out of the desalination plant. I have a very serious view of that.

I have studied the matter. I have re-examined it. I have spent some more time on it and I will appeal to the Minister of Health and the Environment to prevail on her colleagues to re-examine the issue. I do not criticise the Minister. I recognise that the Minister is not responsible for the matter but she is responsible for preservation of the environment, and it is no point to bring this legislation here and tell me that this legislation is in pursuit of the preservation of our environment unless there is a vigorous protest against the abomination which is about to occur with the Water Authority bringing in a \$30 million plant to do desalination which is not perfected, which has not been tried anywhere in

the Caribbean, which has not been tried anywhere else except in the Far East, which is hardly tried in California and then say that it is not going to cost anything. They stretch the imagination. They stretch one's credulity when they say it is not going to cost anything.

They stretch the credulity to the breaking point when they say it is not going to cost anything and based on some new foolish American concept of build, own and operate. You know what build, own and operate means? Bare bull. That is all it could mean because the \$30 million will not be paid by Trinidad & Tobago citizens. The \$30 million in a captivated situation will not be paid by the people from Antigua & Barbuda. It is not going to be paid by any of the sugar daddies that come and live down on the West coast. It is going to be paid by the citizens of this country and you mean because it is not us we are not to be concerned about it? My children are young enough that they will have to pay.

I think that the Water Authority should be dismissed. I think the Board should be dismissed. They are the authority, you know. If the Board refuses to pay attention to the advice which it gets from its experts on the environment, it should be disbanded. After all, Sir, if CBC can function with no board the Water Authority should be able to function with no board.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are coming far inland now.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Oh yes, but they use water up there, Sir. At least I hope so. You know that I am not going to touch CBC although if I was pushed I could point out to you that CBC started just up the hill from Paradise and that their key antenna still forms part of the coast that we are now discussing. If I had to, Sir, I could go down that road.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure why the coral reef protection would require the Authority to be responsible for imports of coral into Barbados. I am sure the Minister when she is not being distracted will be able to tell us exactly why the coral reef protection would require us to be concerned with the imports of coral. 4.20 p.m.

I looked at Section 22(1) and it says:

"From the date of commencement of this Act and subject to section 23, any person who

- (a) harvests any coral in Barbados, its territorial waters or its exclusive economic zone; and
- (b) for the purposes of trade, imports into Barbados or exports from Barbados any coral or any item manufactured in whole or in part from coral,

is guilty of an offence."

Hon. Miss H.E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. It is with a view to recognising that coral reef has an international and regional role and not just for our local preservation and that the damage to coral reef anywhere represents a damage to the environment and that we ourselves would not want to be party to that general destruction of the marine environment. That is my understanding of the thinking which informed that provision. I know the Honourable Member will say anything he likes about it.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: I have no difficulty with the decision on the policy that we try to protect coral reefs everywhere but it seems to me that it would be misplaced for the legislation which is dealing with the protection of our reefs to include imports. This should probably fall within the ambit of the Ministry responsible for imports into Barbados. I am putting it to you that you may wish to review that because the Ministry that issues licenses for importation is the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce. I cannot think of why the Division that is responsible for preservation of our beach would be involved in who imports coral into Barbados.

Asides.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: The Minister of Agriculture is oblivious to any of this. Do not put him in it at all.

This means that the unit that is responsible for preserving the beach now has to become involved like in Gabby's song running people up and down the beach with coral. If somebody imports coral from St. Vincent that is a matter for the Customs and the Ministry dealing with importation and that sort of thing. It has nothing to do with regulation of the beach. If you are an expert on protection of beach coral in Barbados, that is what you are an expert in.

Sir, I really believe that the coral reef protection section would be strengthened if the responsibility for imports were removed from it to allow them the full responsibility of preserving the beach and policing the beach. They hardly have enough resources now to be running up and down looking to see who imports coral from somewhere.

I think that you need to be very careful and make regulations to deal with this question of the harvesting of coral for scientific purposes. I am not going to spend a lot of time on it but it is an area in which I want to put out a warning to the Ministry that the harvesting, importing or exporting for trade of, or the buying, selling or trading in coral for purposes of scientific study and research is a matter that is better left to whichever Ministry is responsible for preserving the overall importation into Barbados or if there is a Ministry that will be looking after the protection of cultural objects in the country.

I think that whoever was copying the legislation from wherever it was being copied may have gotten carried away

and I think that this may have been put into the legislation by accident. I am not very happy about the powers of the Director. It seems to me that as one reads them they have been copied from a document that is more relevant in a jurisdiction that had a different kind of system than the one which we have the honour to operate in. We will deal with those when we come into Committee and we can find out further and better particulars from the Minister.

It is very interesting that Section 34.(1) says:

"The Director shall be assisted by such number of public officers as may be designated by the Minister to discharge the functions of the coastal zone inspectors under this Act".

Then it says:

"The Director may seek the assistance of the Barbados Defence Force and the Coast Guard where he deems it necessary for the management of coastal resources and the Defence Force shall assist when called upon to do so."

Well, Sir, if ever there was something to open up conflict, if ever you started out to create some conflict and you create a Director who is going to be Czar and you say that he may consult the Defence Force but once he consults the Defence Force, the Defence Force shall assist when called upon to do so, you are opening up Pandora's Box. Because you are not aware of how Defence Forces operate. The Coast Guard either has the responsibility or it does not have the responsibility but no one can tell the Coast Guard that because it is consulted by some other person in the Public Service that it shall act.

This legislation will need to be revisited and when we come into the Committee we will spend a little time examining it in a little more detail. I feel bound...

Asides.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: I am being reminded by a past member of the Defence Board that in fact under the Defence Act the only body who can demand that the Coast Guard acts would be the Defence Force. This Act would be in conflict with the Defence Act.

Asides.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, protect me from the Honourable Member for St. Andrew, Sir. He wishes me to divert from this very serious matter which I am speaking about because if he had been paying attention to his responsibility at the Water Board he would be able to shed some serious light on how he can sit down as a Minister and accept the kind of advice that has been given to him but I am not going to deal with him at this point, Sir.

Sir, some of the legislation as it is set out here would probably have been better found in regulations which can be made. It is saying under Miscellaneous for example:

"That the Director, and Inspector or a Member of the Police Force may in respect of the offence institute proceedings in a court".

It means therefore that the Inspectors will have to be trained and what I said earlier will apply that the Environmental Officers in the Ministry of Health have had tremendous difficulty proceeding in the courts and I hope that this new set of Inspectors will be better equipped to take matters into the courts because this will not be a woman with a pig pen entering in the back of somewhere. These would be serious matters by Mount Gay or Malibu or whoever. And instituting proceedings in the court will require a level of training and capacity to take and leave evidence that would allow us to demonstrate beyond the slightest shadow of doubt that if a Malibu or Mount Gay or somebody else had been brought to the courts for polluting that there would not be any question of some Q.C. coming in and demonstrating with a swift movement of the hand that the document has not been properly drawn *etcetera, etcetera*.

I am saying these things, Sir, not to make mischief but to draw to the attention of this House that these matters are very serious matters that we are attempting to legislate and, as I have said, much of this work began in 1972. The Honourable Member got mixed up with time just now earlier and said that this matter started in 1983. As far back as 1972 the Government of the day set in place the framework which has culminated in this legislation today.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, this legislation we should try to make it the best it can be so that when it is implemented all of Barbados can be proud that we now have in place the arrangements to bring Barbados, as it comes to the 21st century, nearer and nearer to a position where the people who use our marine environment will come to appreciate that it is every much a part of our heritage as anything else in Barbados. 4.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a few other things to say when we come to the Committee stage but I would hope that the Minister, when she gets up to respond, will be able to shed some light on this Side so that we will be able to join wholeheartedly in support of this legislation which we initiated such a long time ago.

I am grateful to Your Honour.

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the purposes of the Bill before us are aimed at better managing the coastal resources of Barbados, at conserving such resources and at enhancing the said resources. The

question arises naturally, Mr. Speaker, as to why the need for legislation like this.

Mr. Speaker, in recent times a lot of persons have correctly said that we need to preserve our environment and in particular our marine environment. Mr. Speaker, in so far as there is a need to preserve the marine environment it would be necessary for me to say that such a policy would naturally protect our ecology and would, once properly executed, ensure that posterity after us would be able to enjoy such resources to the same extent as we have.

Mr. Speaker, it is very well known and I want to draw an analogy from the world of technology. It is very well known that machines and equipment are exposed in their use to wear and tear and no doubt the environment, including the marine environment, once used and used and exploited over time would also be exposed to some form of wear and tear. I am using that analogy, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that throughout Barbados' history, as we have sought to benefit from our resources, at various times we have employed different methods in our exploitation of the resources but sometimes we have not often stopped to consider and to ponder seriously what could be the negative outcome of our actions.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, within the legislation before us there are provisions in various clauses indicating that this legislation is aiming to put curbs on such things as the wanton use of explosives in the sea, as the wanton use of dangerous chemicals and hazardous materials in the sea, and such like.

I want too, Mr. Speaker, as I make this modest contribution, to indicate that this Parliament has for years been taken up, at different points in its history, with measures to better manage and better ensure that our environment does not go into degradation.

As far back, Mr. Speaker, as the year 1890, Cap. 389, of the Laws of Barbados was passed in the form of a Beach Protection Act which was designed to prevent the wanton removal of sand and materials from the coasts for commercial exploitation. Indeed, of significance, Mr. Speaker, is that today's clauses 28-32 modernise the provisions of the Beach Protection Act to such a degree and in such a way that I am sure that clauses 28-32 will now render obsolete the provisions of Cap. 389 as it was in 1890. Put another way, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that my interpretation of Clauses 28-32 of the instant piece of legislation indicates that this legislation now before this Parliament is taking us considerably further than what the ancient Beach Protection Act had aimed to do way back in time.

As I mentioned, efforts by this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, over time to do its best to preserve the environment, I should also mention that in the year 1950 this Parliament

passed the Cultivation of Trees Act, Cap. 390 of the Laws of Barbados which set out to offer incentives to growers of trees especially casuarinas and mahogany so that they, as they plant these trees, would lend a measure of enhancement to our environment.

I should also mention too, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1976 this Parliament passed the Marine Areas Preservation Enhancement Act, Cap. 392 which is now going to be overtaken by this piece of legislation here that we are looking at. Clause 45 of the legislation before us effectively abolishes the old Cap. 392.

I should also mention though, Mr. Speaker, that we passed Cap. 393 of the Laws of Barbados in the form of the National Conservation Commission Act which also set up a body that would have done its utmost to make sure that policies dear to the preservation and the upliftment of the environment could be pursued.

I should also mention too, Mr. Speaker, that Cap. 397, the Trees Preservation Act by Section 4 requires that persons who desire to kill a particular type of tree should first seek the consent of the Chief Town Planner.

As I reflect on these pieces of legislation overtime, Mr. Speaker, I am impressed that this Parliament has kept closely to its mandate to act responsibly in the interest of ensuring that our environment does not deteriorate.

I should also mention before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, that this Parliament passed Cap. 398, the Wild Birds Protection Act, perhaps a piece of legislation that the Honourable Member for St. Michael West should look at closely if for no other reason than that such a piece of legislation, the Wild Birds Protection Act, ensures that natural species that parade the environment in the form that some of us parade the environment, are not put at risk.

But getting back to the instant piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, why is the Minister of Agriculture attacking the Minister of Health?

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, there is no attack on the Minister or on the Member for St. Michael West. I said that perhaps the Member for St. Michael West should remember that there is a piece of legislation called the Wild Birds Protection Act, designed to preserve particular species and to prevent them from being at risk and to allow them to parade our country in the same way that some of us parade the country. That is all I said, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact when the Honourable Member for St. Michael West spoke I did not find it necessary to intervene or to stop him because some of the things he said seemed to be lending support to programmes designed to ensure that we in this

Parliament do our utmost to ensure that we not only respond to this very intense awareness that we recognise in Barbados on matters to do with the environment but that we also take steps to make sure that we, as the highest body of decision makers, certainly at the level of passing legislation, are apt to do what lies within our powers to make sure that we pass laws for the good governance of this island.

I was about, Mr. Speaker, to say that within recent times two things have struck the eye and have struck the imagination in this country.

Firstly, several Barbadians have responded to the drive and the educational programmes launched by environmentalists in a way to show that they really want to truly care for the environment including the seas around our island. 4.40 p.m.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we are also seeing instances of patterns of conduct in Barbados that show that some of our people engage in practices that harm the environment. There is definitely now in Barbados, considerable evidence of deterioration of water quality, not the ordinary water that we use as potable water, but there is enough evidence that the water in the seas around us is under threat.

We know of instances in this country, Mr. Speaker, where there have been indiscriminate discharges of effluent. As you know, indiscriminate discharges of anything are always likely to cause particular problems, but the indiscriminate discharge of effluent can definitely go a considerable way into polluting our oceans, polluting our seas, giving our country a bad name. Also, influencing tourists and locals alike who use the waters in the sea to lose confidence in those who manage the country, impacting short-term, medium-term and long-term on tourism, injuring the ecology and also affecting fishing in a negative way.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we in the Government, welcome this effort to make sure that we set about on a programme of the management of our coastal resources that would ensure that we have avoided the negative consequences of pollution, while at the same time, we encourage people to practice behaviours that are healthy, that are wholesome and that are good for our country.

Earlier today, in her remarkably brilliant contribution, my colleague the Honourable Member for St. James South and Minister of Health had mentioned a couple of things. She made reference to the fact that in her view this piece of legislation was some form of social engineering. She also mentioned the importance of fishing to Barbados. Insofar as the point about social engineering is concerned, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of it is that social engineering is about passing measures, programmes and policies that would impact positively on society considering the various interests in the society and often balancing those interests.

In relation to the aspect, Mr. Speaker, about the balancing of interests, clearly this piece of legislation empowers the state with a stronger arm to deal with those acts which are undesirable and harmful to the environment. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence of the balancing of interests from the point of view that a Tribunal has been set up which permits the aggrieved a say. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this point is worth mentioning. There might be those who say that the particular measures in the legislation may be harsh on them. Two things stand out here.

When the director, as defined in the Act, is about to implement or recommend his programme of management, he is more or less under a duty to engage in consultation with the public. Even after his consultation and his proposals are put to the Minister and the Minister has approved, the legislation says quite clearly that aggrieved persons can approach a Tribunal which is set up by this particular Act to make sure that if they allege injustice, they do have an opportunity to be heard and to have their cases brought up in a way that if clearly there is injustice, they will be able to have their concerns addressed.

There are other things, Mr. Speaker, that are also pertinent to what we are looking at in this legislation. The Government is very deeply conscious of the importance, as the Honourable Minister of Health said, of fishing to Barbados and of the need to regulate and manage fisheries in Barbados. Shortly, the Government will be introducing the Fisheries Management Regulations which will complement the measures outlined in this piece of legislation before us.

The Fisheries Management Regulations will be introduced, Mr. Speaker, against a background where we in Barbados have seen the virtual disappearance of sea eggs. Marine turtles are at such a considerable risk as to be classified an endangered species. Lobsters are also under threat. We also have the very real problem of some irresponsible persons landing juvenile and baby fish which clearly are nowhere close to maturity and which should not be made available on the market. We have had the problem too, of interfacing with the environment as regards people plucking coral and such a practice in relation to the indiscriminate plucking of coral is being dealt with in this legislation.

Getting back, Mr. Speaker, to what I am suggesting that Government proposes to do, in respect of making sure that there are better fisheries and a better programme for fisheries management, we will be shortly, Mr. Speaker, be passing regulations to better regulate the methods by which fish will be caught.

For example, we are proposing that no person shall use for fishing a sea net the small mesh of which when stretched is less than 3.81 centimetres in dimension or polyergic gill net of 2.5 kilometres in length or fish strap, the mesh of which is less than 3.18 centimetres in dimension. As

unimportant as these might seem to the uninformed, Mr. Speaker, bad methods of fishing can interfere with future fish breeding and with the spoiling offish. Bad methods of fishing can also make sure that it can be forms of environmental degradation resulting in consequence.

I was heartened, Mr. Speaker, that the piece of legislation, which I said compliments what we propose to do in the fisheries management regulations, which is the piece of legislation before us in the form that the Minister has introduced, through its clause 27 has had the courage to tackle the problem of illegal fishing.

Before I get back, Mr. Speaker, to methods of fishing I want to refer Honourable Members to clause 29 in the Bill before and it merely sets out to deal with specific forms of bad, irregular and undesirable forms of fishing.

Clause 29, Mr. Speaker, says, that any person who uses any explosive, or permits any explosives or other noxious substance to be used for the purpose of harvesting coral or catching, killing or harvesting fish; carries or has in his possession or control, is found in any boat carrying any explosives, poisons or other noxious substance is punishable by law.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we in the Department of Fisheries, a department for which I have responsibility, agree and accept that section 29 is keeping in line with our wishes to make sure that people use harmless forms and harmless methods of fishing. But I earlier mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is concerned with the diminution in stocks of lobster, the virtual disappearance of turtles, the shortage of sea eggs and such like. 4.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we propose in relation to these particular problems to make sure that persons fishing through the use of offish traps, get permission from the Chief Fisheries Officer and then once permission is granted such traps should be identified under the regulations. Expressly in relation to a problem that we have with lobsters, we shall be outlawing any tendency or behaviour by which people catch lobsters that are carrying eggs. We shall definitely be banning the fishing of lobsters that are carrying eggs.

We are not going to be curbing the fishing of lobsters but lobsters that are carrying eggs are carrying future lobsters and to curb this tendency to destroy young ones we are going to prevent persons from fishing lobsters carrying eggs.

Mr. Speaker, we should also be looking closely at this problem of turtles being an endangered species and we shall be moving to make sure that the stocks of turtles are not fully endangered by putting a curb on fishing and catching of turtles.

We should also be moving to permit the authorities to close periods of time during which the sea-eggs can be

Environmental Engineer, the Director of the Coastal Zone Management Unit to a judge in Chambers where one thinks that one has been aggrieved.

Finally, Sir, the Marine Areas, Preservation and Enhancement (Amendment) Bill. Essentially, Sir, this amends one piece of legislation that already exists, a 1981 Act, and where the power was given to the Minister of Housing it now gives that power to the Minister of the Environment. Then it identifies those special coordinates for the two areas which are now going to be designated as special protected areas, that is Carlisle Bay and...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. In view of what the Honourable Member said about an hour ago about the possibility of having a single debate to take care of these Bills but the intrinsic value of each of these Bills before us is apparently different and I suspect that Honourable Members who would wish to allude to certain aspects on one of them, without reference to the generality of the original Bill which the Honourable Member raised, I respectfully submit that the pre-arrangement of which Your Honour would not be obviously aware, that we debate the original Bill and after that Bill we postpone so Honourable Members can get their collective thoughts together be adhered to less we leave some of the important aspects of these other Bills unattended and unaddressed.

Certainly, the substantive Shadow Minister on this Side is under the impression given earlier that we will be able to address these issues substantively. I respectfully suggest to the Honourable Member that to begin to open what, in essence, is a second chapter might take us into confusion.

The importance of this first Bill which the Honourable Member has so well debated so far requires us to be able to address this Bill without prejudice and without reference to the others. I really wish to appeal to the Honourable Member that we do them sequentially so we can get the best of the debate of all of the Bills otherwise we are going to end up being in a quagmire intellectual and otherwise. 2.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, how do you plan to approach it.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: This morning I merely sought to set the background against which the legislation came.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has made a suggestion. Do you think it would make things a little easier for us.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am going to conclude my remarks in about five minutes time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is suggesting that we take them in sequence. Your remarks would have related to the first Bill. Would you be prepared to come back and speak again on the other two Bills? Is this what would be happening? Will you be returning to speak on the other two Bills or would your remarks have covered everything?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Sir, I covered all three of the Bills very comprehensively in detail. I will only return to them in reply depending on what other Members have to say.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that is the Honourable Member's privilege and with the House's permission we could move on after the second reading.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I intend to present them separately for the second reading at which stage I imagine that Members will want to make various comments.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us proceed please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir. There are, we estimate off the shores of Barbados 350 different species of marine flora. The legislation which comes before this Chamber today for the first time in the history of Barbados gives a comprehensive framework for policy formulation, regulation, legislative protection and control of our marine environment.

I commend the legislation to the House. I imagine that it will have in one way or another the support on both Sides because it seeks to do something that is truly necessary. I am very grateful to the House for having listened to the scope of the legislation.

I now beg that the Coastal Zone Management Bill be read a second time.

Hon. R. N. GREENIDGE: I beg to second that.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Member for St. Philip North, his activity is very steady and you cannot tell when he is moving.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member, Sir, seems to be upset because I paid him a compliment and I withdraw the compliment. The Honourable Member wishes me to speak of him as I know and I will do so in due course, but not now.

Sir, the Honourable Member, who just sat down and took us from this morning until the present, end by suggesting that this is the first time we are having comprehensive legislation dealing with these matters. I fear that if that were taken abroad it might lead to a misunderstanding and

a misapprehension as to what it is that the Honourable Member through this legislation is seeking to do. This is more a continuation of a process which started some time ago. The Honourable Member must be aware that as early as 1979 there was brought to this Honourable House a Marine Boundaries and Jurisdiction Act.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: During that time, according to the education that was available at that time the Government of the day sought to put in place legislation that would take account of the new thinking which has been brought about under the aegis of what has come to be called the Law of the Sea. The 1978 legislation gave Barbados for the first time jurisdiction over a substantial area of waters surrounding the coast of Barbados, far beyond the size of the land area of Barbados. 2.50 p.m.

It was at that time a very fashionable thing to have the economic zone recognised as part of the new approaches that especially small island states would be able to use for the economic and other development. Put* very neatly, Sir, the 1979 Marine Boundaries and Jurisdiction Act of Barbados is not one that any one should need to resile from. It sought then, successfully I think, to put an economic zone on to the coast of Barbados. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, at that time the debate made similar claims as may be made today and have been made today by the Minister that it was a comprehensive fact.

Mr. Speaker, it was a small state, the State of Malta, that brought to the attention of the world, the necessity for small countries to take charge of, to take hold of and to exploit the benefits of the surrounding seas which they contended successfully constituted part of the hegemony and the patrimony of the inhabitants of small states. The name that is revered in this field is an Ambassador Pardo who will go down in history as having pioneered the concept of small states taking control of recognising and accepting that their economic influence went beyond the mere geographical confines of the land area which they occupied.

After much discussion and a tremendous amount of debate in the United Nations and beyond, it was accepted that an economic zone of 200 miles was not unreasonable. For countries like Barbados, falling as they do in an archipelago of islands that concept needed some amendment, some variation and eventually it came to be accepted that all of them can declare their economic zone of 200 miles or whatever they would want because the traditional zone was a territorial sea of 12 miles and they came to the concept of the exclusive economic zone which allowed for 200 miles and allowed countries like ours to work out methodologies for determining what constituted the proper demarcation of the exclusive economic zone.

In the case of Barbados and St. Vincent, for example, which are separated by only 100 miles approximately, of water there came the concept of the equidistant arrangement so that the economic zone for purposes of St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Barbados would be a distance as divided between the two equally. So that the economic zone between St. Vincent and Barbados, for example, is 50 miles on either side since there is only 100 miles between us.

It is accepted that the distance between the 2 territories is only 100 miles and the exclusive economic zone between let us say, Venezuela and Trinidad and Tobago would be considerably less because the point of division is smaller than between Barbados and St. Vincent. But that notwithstanding and those variations notwithstanding what is important and what we need to acknowledge is that for the first time it was agreed that the fauna and flora and fisheries and whatever existed in the waters surrounding territories such as our own fell to the territorial jurisdiction for economic purposes of the countries concerned.

Now, Sir, that led to Barbados joining a large number of countries in creating the appropriate legislation to provide a jurisdiction to manage this concept. One of the major difficulties of countries like Barbados however is that to pass legislation is one thing to be able to police the legislation is another thing.

We have been plagued in this part of the world by the same kind of economic exploitation which had occurred in a different form in the past where although we have pronounced to the world that we have an economic zone of 200 miles and certainly when heading east of Barbados there can be no doubt that there is a 200-mile economic zone because there are as many as 5000 miles between Barbados and the next stop which is Dakar somewhere in Africa. But even so, because of our economic circumstances, we are unable to police that area of our economic zone. And so although we have established in 1978 the jurisdiction over these matters, we have still been the victims of the exploitation of certain developed countries who on discovering, many years ago, that because of their capacity they could proceed in the same way as had occurred in the 19th Century and the early 20th Century to exploit other people's resources. Hence we have had two levels of attack in Barbados.

We have had the attack of Japanese and Korean and other vessels which come into our territorial waters with impunity, they reap from our economic zonal resources with impunity and what is more they pollute with impunity as they wash the holes of their respective vessels at sea, whether those vessels were carrying cargo of one kind or another. And we have been the recipients, not the beneficiaries, of such charlatan behaviour when we have found on our eastern coast, for example, globs of tar, globs of the results of petroleum waste that has been washed out in the waters to the east of Barbados which has landed on our shores, which has polluted our sea shores in such a way as to

make them sometimes unacceptably intolerable for the nationals of this country.

Sir, the story must always be repeated especially as we are in the week of national significance, that first and foremost whatever we have in this small country is for the people of this small country to enjoy and for our visitors to share. And so when we quarrel about the tar on the beaches of the east coast we are complaining primarily about the inability of our own nationals to enjoy the heritage and by extension, the inability of our visitors, commonly called tourists to share in the joys which we inherit. These are some of the background materials and information which we must have as we examine this legislation which has taken some time to come, but which is now before us. 3.00p.m.

I have no quarrel if the Minister chooses to take the approbation for having brought the legislation, I think that is proper. That is a system which we have. It is her watch and if she happens to be the Honourable Member who brings the legislation to the House, she should rejoice in any approbation which comes from bringing that legislation. I hope, Sir, in passing that she will also recognise that to the extent that if there are any shortcomings falling within the ambit of her portfolio that she should be happy to gather in the annoyances which we will pass from time to time to signal that she is not executing her responsibility with the sagacity which we expect of people who hold that position. But to the extent that this legislation redounds to the fact that she has brought it, I think that it is fine. I just wish that the record will not be kept illusive so that anyone who hears the Honourable Member would not believe that this is a matter which was brought from gestation a couple weeks ago, or even months ago, or even a short three years ago. In fact it has its genesis more than a decade ago. It has its genesis in an attempt by those of us who live in this society to ensure that we preserve the environment not only for us but for generations to come.

To the extent therefore to help the Honourable Member's presentation to fall properly in perspective that is my major task. That is my foremost task, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the historical perspective is clear and that there is no doubt whatsoever that this is a culmination rather than an initiative. This legislation which comes before us, therefore, will not find any particular negative response from this Side, except to assist in allowing those who now are responsible for implementing it, to enhance it by constructive recommendations which we might make.

For make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the aims of those who have been praised by the Minister for bringing this legislation to fruition coincide with the aims of the Democratic Labour Party to ensure that this environment which is ours remains as pristine as is humanly possible.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is saying from her seat that we did not bring it. I thought I was making it clear that we acknowledge that she had brought it. But, Sir, we do not ourselves believe in premature births. We believe that a child that gets the opportunity to go to full term is likely to be more susceptible to learning and opportunity than one that is born prematurely.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Honourable Member is now saying that...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The Deputy Prime Minister is suggesting that I ignore her.

The fact is that our aims and objectives continue to be the same no matter who holds the responsibility for administering the affairs of this country, we feel that there are certain things that we ought to have commonalty. We feel that they are certain things which do not permit politicisation of those matters. And that is why you will find that this Side will have no difficulty with the principle of this legislation even though as we go into Committee there are certain...

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to crave your protection. They are alluding to times when the Honourable Member for the City and myself and others might have been in a place removed from here and they find that the debate is now harping back to those times. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, Your Honour knows better than that, we are moving forward. Quite seriously, Sir, the Marine Boundaries and Jurisdiction Act gave way in 1993 to a Fisheries Act which sought to move the concepts in a different direction while going forward.

We understood that the coastal management and the whole question of coastal zonal management, as it is called, is still relatively new. It is not something that has been with us as other aspects of administration in our society. This is still relatively new and while in the United States they have had elements of coastal zonal management for some time, it is a relatively new concept to us. Barbados has been in the forefront from the days when we created the coastal unit when we made the decision after the IDB's funds had ran out after the Canadian study that had been done when we made the decision to maintain our own unit and pay for it out of our own funds. Until now, we in Barbados have led the way. We have led the way within this region in providing coastal zonal management.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 when we brought the Fisheries Act, we sought thereby to give some direction to the

exploitation of the economic zone. Now, it is instructive that in this legislation which comes before us today, that a section takes careful note to say that to the extent that there is a clash between this legislation and the Fisheries Act, that the Fisheries Act should take precedence. The reason for that is that the Fisheries Act was very carefully crafted to ensure that the exploitation of the economic zone by the people of Barbados should be done in a systematic manner. It also takes care to ensure that, in this legislation which comes before us, there is no conflict in its approach to managing the zone and the approach that had been worked out in 1993 to allow for certain exploitation of the economic resources of the coastal zone.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we recognise that IDB and the other international agencies have praised Barbados and have put forward Barbados as a model for consideration by other territories not only in the Caribbean but elsewhere for the singular approach which we have taken toward this kind of management.

Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of courage sometimes to make decisions which are not popular at the time they are made, but one believes to be right and the governments of Barbados over time, have been singularly successful in this regard. Whether the Government was composed of Members of the Other Side or Members of this Side, I think that we can look back, all of us, from time to time with pride at the courage which respective Governments have had in making certain decisions when our national heritage was at stake. It is fair to say that each Government has successfully followed the other in ensuring that the coastal management of Barbados would retain an element of independence. 3.10p.m.

I think that the professionals who work for us in this country can take a bow when these things happen because they take a beating when things do not go right. I think that the professionals on all sides, under all circumstances, can take credit but one of the advantages of the political system which we have is that because our society is relatively small, we do not fail to recognise the inherent quality of the professional advice which Government A has received when Government B succeeds Government A.

The fact that that advice has been taken on all sides is a credit to the quality of the advice which has been given. I say that, Sir, to lead into an aspect of this legislation which disturbs me a little bit. We must be very careful not to follow blindly the recommendations which come from outside agencies as to what ought to constitute the proper framework within which we put our legislation in place. Ours is a system that has borrowed generously from the British system in the past. The advice which comes through the international agencies to which the World Bank, the IADB and, to a lesser extent, the International Monetary Fund, has tended to be advice given by professionals who come from a country that has a different political framework from the one which we enjoy.

When we go into Committee there are certain aspects of this legislation which we would wish to allude to as it seeks to change the direction of ministerial responsibility as I perceive it. Now ministerial responsibility as perceived by a number of the people who advise the international agencies is sometimes contemptuously contemplated. Very often, Sir, as we can remember in the Tourism Authority, that is one piece of legislation which I remember the advice which was given seems constantly to be contemptuous of the Minister and even more contemptuous of the Parliament. There seems to be a feeling that some small cadre of people chosen from particular professions or particular strata of the society would be better able to dictate the arrangements for governance in the society than the people properly elected in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, that is a dangerous position which we must guard against each time. Every time we see legislation which comes to this House which smacks of an attempt to remove the legitimately elected people from the decision making in these processes we must stand against it. Because at the end of the day it does not matter how others perceive that the way the administration is doing its job is incorrect. If the administration is answerable to the people and if the people will have an opportunity to address the administration, as it were, then that is the system which is preferable, because the only answerable people in this society who are part of the Government are the ones who are elected. Only the elected people are the ones who can make decisions about what happens to this society and how it happens.

The elected people constitute the epitome of the aspirations of the whole people. It is true from time to time as I look at my colleagues on the Other Side I wonder about the judgement of the people but I cannot hold that against the people. That may be a flaw of my own.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to our Rules when you wonder about the judgement you wonder about the good judgement because you would not wonder anything else.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, had I been in your position I could not have said it better. From your position, I can understand that. It is not likely that I would get the opportunity to observe on that as you have done. Be that as it may, every time I have such a consideration I then reflect that it would not be long before, if I am right, the people make a judgement that makes what an old parliamentarian used to say something about imbalance. We will press on.

Notwithstanding, it is very crucial that we do not allow anybody to suggest that there is some cadre of persons somewhere who can better make decisions than those who represent the people, the ones who make the decisions, because it is true it is only every five years or so but at least during that five years the people get an opportunity to cast their decision in one way or the other.

the other on each individual Bill we would speak on them all together. Persons can speak on an individual piece of legislation or to the trilogy in terms of their comments. Then I think you are going to speak. The Honourable Member for St. James North will speak and we will adjourn for today, after which we will come back and other persons ...

Aside.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: That is what I am told is the agreement.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Am I to understand, Sir, of the Honourable Member for St. Michael West, that I have been able to make him happy? Is this too much to contemplate?

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, if my happiness is now the subject of the debate, the Honourable Member would know that there are much more stringent requirements for my happiness than merely speaking. But, Sir, the substantive Shadow Minister will wish to address this issue in due course.

We understood that whereas I would lead on this debate ...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Therefore I do not think it is necessary to make the point about the subsequent Bills because to make that point might technically put us in breach of the rules. I do not think it is necessary to make that point. We understand that reference to any of the matters in all of these Bills would be reasonable and acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could we proceed please?

Hon. Miss H.E. THOMPSON: I turn to the specific legislative framework which is today under contemplation and debate.

In essence, Sir, the Coastal Zone Management Act defines in law the high water mark. It establishes the specific areas for the coastal zone management and coastal zone planning. It establishes for the first time in the history of Barbados a coastal zone management plan which will be of binding authority. It will have therefore a weight equal to legislation relating to Town Planning because it is regarded that this legislation is so important to our overall development, is of such tremendous importance to our future economic, cultural, social and aesthetic preservation and well being that we must give binding authority to the plan which is brought before the Chamber under the aegis of this Act.

Specifically it determines those areas for which effective management and conservation of coastal resources will be subjected to specific action, directive, planning policy or legislative framework. It requires that all coastal activity of an economic nature, of a developmental nature or of a construction type or in that general ilk should be a subject to a standardised, environmental impact assessment.

We have for some considerable time toyed with the notion of making development along the coast or generally development in Barbados subject to this kind of evaluation.

It is well known, Sir, that in our haste to build the Harbour, in our haste to do certain types of development, to annex Pelican Island that we lost the national bird of Barbados, the pelican. We know that we have destroyed in our haste to develop in a particular way the mangrove swamps and the mangroves of Barbados. We know that in terms of the development that we can put in place or that we have put in place that there has been serious adverse environmental consequences and what this legislation therefore seeks to establish for the first time in our history, is to ensure that wherever there is to be coastal development in the future or development of a nature and kind which can impact on the marine environment, that it must go through, not that it should, that it must go through the Environmental Impact Assessment Process and be subject to that. And that prior to the construction and a part of the process of construction, such mitigative measures as are necessary will have to be put in place if in fact it is determined consequent to the environmental impact assessment, that that development should go ahead. Or the impact may be such that it determined that there should be no construction of the type which is considered. 2.10p.m.

It establishes a framework for the maintenance of coastal structures, whether these structures are naturally forming, whether it is accredited beaches or whether it is constructed, or whether it is artificially placed there for the protection and preservation of the marine environment. It speaks to the rehabilitation and enhancement of the coastal and marine habitat of various species. It deals with the issue of sand mining and constitutes a serious threat to our marine environment. It deals, Sir, with the issue of dredging. It deals with beach rock and coral rubble removal and in fact says, it actually specifies that except in the case of scientific evaluation, subject to the Minister, the only coral and beach rubble which can be removed can be done by owners of beach front property but that that removal cannot exceed five kilograms.

So that there is no way under this legislation that there could be any opening of the flood gates that would tend toward a massive exacerbation of dangerous practices which already exist or which tend toward large scale coral or beach rock removal. It is clear that the property owner has very limited scope for the removal of that kind of material from the foreshore. It requires that where the draft plan has been established or pronounced that where there is objection to

any component of the plan, where individuals, private citizens, commercial interests or NGO's perceive themselves as being aggrieved, or that some section of the public is aggrieved by the establishment and the provisions of that plan, that there should be a public inquiry. Not only for the purpose of education and dissemination of information, but for the purpose of enquiring into the wrong being alleged, the injustice being alleged and the nature of the challenge and the subject of the challenge made by the individual or entity who think that they have been aggrieved.

Cognisant of the fact that development cannot be stagnant that in fact it is a dynamic process and that if we are to change policy and legislative provision so that they adequately meet the developmental and social needs and the changing social dynamic in a society, there is provision that every five years the legislation or the coastal zone management plan should be reviewed.

Where an individual is unhappy with the outcome of the public inquiry, there will be an establishment for him or her to appeal to, the Coastal Zone Management Appeals Tribunal where persons can challenge the validity of the plan, any aspect of its provisions, any decision relating to the plan, its provisions or where in fact they can raise the specific issue about which they are aggrieved. From the Tribunal there is a further appeal to the Supreme Court.

So that one sees here a broad framework and several stages which allow for public challenge, public involvement and public ventilation of what could become serious social decisions and social problems at every stage. This plan will not be something that the Government can do in secret. It is this kind of legislative provision which gives credence to the whole idea of participated democracy and open Government. It will present an opportunity for involvement of all citizens and for each of us via the public hearing to be aware of how decisions of the Government will impact on us and indeed on future generations. It represents a departure from previous thinking where Governments took decisions that people heard about a long time after and where people have very little or no scope or opportunity for challenge.

It not only identifies, and I pause to make the point, Sir, that there is an evolution happening here in which the NCC will continue to have responsibility for the beach, the shore and the sand, using their rangers and other staff to patrol and protect that area, but we are seeing now the development of new agencies, new individuals and new mechanisms for the protection of the marine environment generally.

It can designate in consultation with the NCC under water parks and restricted areas. It can have responsibilities for making provisions for marine flora and fauna, for the protection of wrecks and underwater sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interests and value. It will have responsibility for the preservation of natural beauty of the marine environment and it will have responsibility for promoting the enjoyment of the marine environment as well

as for regulating and controlling scientific study and research. I wish to pause here. Because of our lack of resources and an absence of legislation, we have no clear idea of who comes into our marine environment to do scientific research, what is the nature of the data they collect, how we can use that data beneficially or to prevent harmful consequences, or in fact what they extract from our marine environment and with what consequences for us. This provision which will ensure the regulation of scientific activity study and research really speaks to that, because it is a fact that we have our resources exploited in this way.

Our coral reef structure. We know that Barbados is an island of coral formation and limestone. The reefs which exist around Barbados play an important role in our marine protection and environment in several respects:

First of all these reefs constitute a habitat for marine flora and fauna, some of which are very rare. I spoke earlier of the porcelain frog fish and Carlisle Bay. I spoke about it being a highly used dive site, but there is also a tremendous amount of historical bottles, some dating back to the 18th century which people are removing from Carlisle Bay, but which could constitute part of our cultural heritage and which is, in fact, part of our cultural heritage. When one travels sometimes one pays lots of money to walk by a piece of wall that people tell you was part of a ruin from a fort and all kinds of tourists pay money to see when they travel from shore to shore. These bottles chronicle part of the history of the world in terms of the way bottles were made, in terms of how we preserved materials, in terms of how we did storage, in terms of things that were transported in and out of Barbados, whether for economic activity, whether to perfume or for whatever reason. It is all lying on the sand of Carlisle Bay. 2.20 p.m.

It is significant that now that those persons who have been collecting bottles indiscriminately, taking them overseas, mounting them at their homes, getting money from selling them to museums and otherwise that we now have a stake in ensuring that those bottles stay here and we can use them to earn revenue for Barbados. This legislation will do that.

Our coral reefs are important because of the preservation of marine flora and fauna. They act as a barrier in respect of wave action during times of natural activities - high seas and so. If, in fact, the reefs were not there, the reefs act as a barrier as the waves come into shore, the waves would knock against the shores and there would be a higher degree of soil erosion and beach and coastal erosion if not for the reefs. Again they contribute to beach nourishment and sand nourishment so the preservation of our reefing structure is important.

There are species of coral that grow at one-eighth of an inch per year. That is the rate of growth of coral. Where individuals come along and break them off for decorative

purposes to trade, to export, to sell, to use as jewelry, to use as ornamentation for homes or for the body or for building or for whatever purpose, we are in fact putting at risk our coastal preservation, our marine habitat and our preservation mechanism.

This legislation therefore seeks to stop persons from harvesting coral in our waters, from mining coral in the waters, from exporting, importing or trading in coral. It becomes under this legislation an offence to kill, injure, use explosives on coral or on the marine environment or to put any noxious substance or poison into the water. So the Act deals with coral reef protection.

It has a specific section which deals with beach and water protection, the removal of sand and gravel. It is an offence under this Act to foul or to befoul the beach and it establishes in this legislation for the first time a category of officer who will hereafter be called coastal zone inspector. Various civil servants can be designated or such an officer under the Act or police officers can be designated an inspector for the purposes of the Act and it allows a collaborative arrangement between the Defence Force, the Director of the Coastal Zone Management Unit, the Coast Guard, the Royal Barbados Police Force and persons who have been designated as these coastal zone inspectors.

It also gives technical guidelines for the use, allocation and management of marine resources. Previously, prior to this legislation coming before the House, it was possible to determine that one would breach existing laws or insist in some instances that there were no laws. That one could engage in activity which would harm the marine environment from which one could profit substantially.

This Act ensures that that no longer takes place since it creates a fine. It allows for summary convictions on summary trial and indictable trial either in the magistrate's court or in the High Court for offences against the Act. It allows in a situation where the person is carrying on particular kinds of activity or for a first offence a fine of \$100 000 or two years in prison. Where the person repeats the offence the fine goes to \$200 000 with five years in prison.

If one assaults or obstructs a member of the Defence Force, a member of the Police Force, a member of the Coastal Zone Management Unit, the Coast Guard or any person designated as a coastal zone inspector - that is the expression used in this Act, one can also be subjected to similar fines and penalties. It makes provision that where one acts in such a way that one assesses that the profit one can make from the activity is less than the fine one would receive and therefore one would persist with the activity, the Act gives power to assess either over the last income tax period or the quantum of profit that you would have made from the conduct of that activity and then to levy that amount on you as a fine. So it is

not profitable to try to beat the provisions of this legislation and that is what is so new and dynamic about this.

For the first time we have such a comprehensive legal framework in place and penalties are so stiff that it signals to the public the nature of our seriousness about protecting the environment and makes it unprofitable and not worthwhile for persons to attempt to flout the legislation.

The provision relates to persons who have interests in companies, persons who are working for companies and engaged in activities of various types. So it is really very wide-ranging. A coastal zone inspector or police officer may arrest without a warrant any person found removing, aiding or assisting in removing anything which it is contrary to this Act to remove, any flora, fauna, or other items of archaeological or historic interest from a restricted area. It gives authority without warrant for a coastal zone inspector to search and seize any vehicle or other means of conveyance reasonably suspected by the inspector or police to have been used in the commission of what would be an offence under this Act.

It protects diving, fishing, navigation and anchoring of vessels, flora, fauna and wreck, the use of guides, the seizure and confiscation of flora and fauna, the care, control and management of the restricted areas and the protection of coral reefs.

For the first time it gives clear definition of the roles, powers and functions of the Coastal Zone Management Unit in relation to legislation and regulation and other officers of the law, military and para-military organisations that have a role in seeing that the provisions of this piece of legislation are kept. 2.30 p.m.

It will impact on various pieces of legislation, the Town Planning Act, Law of Property Act, the Prevention of Floods Act, the Barbados Port Authority Act, the National Conservation Commission Act, the Soil Conservation (Scotland District) Act are all affected by the enactment of this legislation in one way or another.

I was making the point earlier, Sir, that it then becomes the umbrella legislation under which marine protection and environment will take place and that is why there will have to be repeals of other bits of legislation or certain parts of those Acts.

The Marine Pollution and Control Act, Sir, is aimed at preventing, reducing and controlling pollution to the marine environment from whatever source. I have spoken at length this morning in relation to the quantum and sources of pollution. I will not seek to retread that ground, Sir, though I know you are most patient, I will not seek to do it.

It seeks to ensure that we have high quality beach water for the use of our citizens and for our tourists. It gives responsibility to the Chief Environmental Engineer, Mr. Geoffrey Headley, another officer whose work we must commend, for the policing of the source and extent of the marine pollution. For the first time it establishes a register of pollutants, and this is important. There are a lot of people in Barbados engaged in various types of industrial activity the consequences of which end up in the marine environment.

Essentially what we are seeking to do is to determine how the sea is polluted in Barbados, from what sources, what is the quantum of the pollution, where does it originate, what can we do to mitigate it so that a register of pollutants of the marine environment will be maintained so that we can better develop planning and protection of the marine environment.

This register must be published and subject to public enquiry for dissemination to persons affected and to interest groups who might have an objection to the list of pollutants that we will put in place. Again, Marine Pollution Inspectors will be established to ensure that the provisions of this Act are complied with.

Then the Act really does a very novel and interesting thing. It says that the Chief Environmental Engineer can require that the person who is discharging, releasing or causing pollutants or handling these pollutants to go into the environment, that person can be required to buy equipment, to set up equipment to monitor, to maintain this equipment, to install it for use, to prepare a record of the pollutants that they have put into the atmosphere and we can, under the legislation, compel them to take mitigative action. In that way the cost of mitigation does not fall on the Government, but on the pollutant, and where the onus to clean up is placed on him, but more so where the cost of that clean-up is placed on him, then we believe this will act as a restraint mechanism and make him less likely to pollute.

If he fails to comply with the directives of the Chief Environmental Engineer, the Chief Environmental Engineer can enter on any property and put mitigative measures in place to ensure that the marine environment is not polluted and where the Chief Environmental Engineer is obliged because of lack of compliance, and that often happens in Government - you send people notices out about debushing their land, about moving a derelict vehicle, about licensing dogs, whatever, and they say: "Well it is Government. I do not have to worry. Nothing is going to happen to me" and they do absolutely nothing about it.

Under this legislation, where persons do not comply with the notice or directive given by the Chief Environmental Engineer, he can execute such works as are necessary for marine protection and preservation and charge the cost of those works to the property owner or the person responsible and that charge will then become a debt owed to the Crown which they must pay, Sir.

I also wish to make the point before I go on that very often legislation of this sort which seeks to give wide policing and regulatory powers do not apply to the Government. Often the Government is the greatest offender in relation to certain issues. That is a reality. It is a fact that for the first time in its operation Harrison's Cave has met international standards and has passed the Government's Electrical Engineering Division requirements, for the first time in all its operation. That never happened before now.

It is also a fact that very often a lot of the Government's kitchens could not be licensed by the Ministry of Health because they did not meet certain standards but these pieces of legislation will bind the Crown and that is significant. The Government itself must comply. It must conduct itself as a model citizen, must show that it is a role model for citizens to follow and cannot have the double standard of saying to people: "You cannot pollute the marine atmosphere. We will prosecute you for it but we are exempt from that rule and we can pollute as much as we wish." That will be brought to an end by the enactment of this legislation.

Where marine inspectors are deployed, there will be vested with authority analogous to that or equal to that of police officer or members of the Royal Barbados Police Force. They will have the same power as a policeman. Similarly, the authority of marine inspectors will be invested in the Royal Barbados Police Force when they are deployed on joint operations of this sort.

This Act gives authority to enter and search any property which the Marine Pollution Inspector reasonably believes has infringed the Act. To enter or search areas where he believes there is likely to be an infringement, and that is important because it gives the power of pre-emptive strike to the law enforcement officers that where you know, for instance, that a cruise liner is about to bilge out at sea and throw off something into our environment that would be harmful, you have the authority to stop any vessel, any vehicle, to go onto any property where an infringement is likely to be committed and stop it before it happens.

You can seize documents which will give evidence of the wrong-doing. Where the property onto which the officers are seeking to come is a dwelling house, then before that entry takes place, a Magistrate must give permission on an application made before him for entry into that dwelling house to take place. The offences and fine and confine are the same and the profit element exists.

The Act will deal with land based sources of pollution, seabed activity causing pollution, dumping activities causing pollution and airborne activities causing pollution. Once the Act has commenced, it gives power to investigate the environment generally and to examine premises that might be a source of pollution. It allows the authorities to define pollution, what constitutes pollution and its nature. There can be an appeal against the order of the Chief

not suitable for building purposes. Some of it is in the water zone. A lot of it in fact is in zone one water and therefore there is not a lot of area that you can find for needed housing in St. John as you cannot find in Christ Church West. 5.50p.m.

The only large area in Christ Church West that I can say to the Minister that he could acquire is along Club Morgan Road going to Rendezvous but that when you get a flood, you would not even want it for a sports field. So I hope if it is acquired that it is acquired for a gorgeous park. But we are running out of land and therefore I think it is a sensible governmental policy to have a land bank for that best land that is going to be available for the needs of the country during the next 20 to 50 years. I am assured by the Minister, he has showed me the plan, that this land is suitable for housing.

The Honourable Member made another point I want to speak on very briefly, payment for acquisitions. Once again the statement made by the Honourable Member for St. John about the payment for acquisitions is a statement I have heard all my life in this House. For some reason people are slow in paying for acquisitions. The Minister, no doubt, will refer to the specific charge that this land has been paid for before.

I would say this, Sir. I would welcome the position where when Government comes in for an acquisition, if they have not been able to agree with the landowner before, or if they come in to get a good title, that payment is prompt because I remember when the Constitutional Conference took place in 1966 we tried to alter the provision in the Basic Rights clause to say that in compulsory acquisition prompt payment must be prompt and adequate. We could not agree on those words, one of the reasons being that even in 1966 the Government was saying that the process took a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been in a case in which the Government acquired a place in 1983, Turners Hall Plantation, and we only just got a decision from the Court a couple weeks ago. As a matter of fact, Sir, the amount paid for interest is going to be more than was granted for the acquisition price. This is adjudicated by the court. It seems to me that we have to be in a position as a bureaucracy to make sure that when we acquire property that there is money there voted for paying, that we pay promptly and that the officials deal with it.

Now, I am not laying the charge at the door of any Minister of any Government past or present. I never did. I always argued the principle because I realize that when you get down in the line you find that there are a lot of administrative slips in why payment is not made. There have been a few occasions in which the Government has not had the money available both under the Democratic Labour Party and ourselves, enough has not been granted, but I do not believe the same is true now.

I believe that some years that what is happening is that the vote under acquisition is slipping and sometimes the lawyers, sometimes the surveyors, sometimes the bureaucracy is not going about dealing adequately with pay. I have cited the case of Turners Hall Plantation. I think it took a long time to be settled and even now the mortgagee will probably get back some of its money, not all of its money because of the time it has taken, but whatever little surplus there may have been, and which would have gone to the benefit of the other creditors or to the owners of the plantation, interest has gone at that.

Sir, the reason for this is that under the law, the court can only award interest at either 6% in certain circumstances or 8% at the most in its discretion in other circumstances. But if I have a bit of land and I have a mortgage on this land and the Government acquires it and I am paying interest on my loan at 10% compounded, if it takes the Government X years before that matter is settled, whether through payment from the Ministry or through the law court, the position is that the mortgagee is going to still demand from me his 10% per annum compounded whereas I am only getting from the Government simple interest at between 6% and 8%. That is a matter which, I think, we lawmakers must look at and I believe we must look at the Act concerning compulsory Acquisition to amend it in order to bring about equity in these circumstances or our procedures must be such that they must be much quicker than they have been.

There are other aspects of the Land Acquisition Act that will have to be revisited as well, Sir. I believe that one has got to the stage in Barbados where without betraying our socialist philosophies we must take into account potentiality. It is very difficult to say. The Honourable Member has cited this piece of land that he is talking about which is not before us. But let us assume that that piece of land has the potential for development as housing. When Government acquires it, it is acquired at its current use which is normally agriculture so that the potential aspect of it cannot be compensated for because of the existing law.

I think that, given the importance of land and its significance as an instrument of investment for people, that one needs to put in place a change in the Land Acquisition Act, and I do not think it would take one bit away from either the democratic socialism of the DLP or the democratic socialism of the BLP. I cannot say the democratic socialism of the NDP because I do not believe that the NDP believes in democratic socialism in that sense.

I think we have to revise the way we approached these issues in the past because, make no mistake about it, Sir, despite whatever we may for the political fray be tossing one against the other, the truth is that we have seen a widening of land ownership in Barbados in the last 50 years. We have seen it. A lot of the land has been cut up and gone to the growing and expanding middle-class.

Sunday last I was in the parish of St. Philip and I was pleased to see that that is one of the fastest developing areas where land is still at a reasonable cost. I hope they will preserve some of their wide expanses of open spaces and do not let everything go into housing, but if you were in my constituency, you could not find that and the land values have gone up because of the shortage. Everybody wants to be in the urban areas.

Now I see that a condominium on Hastings of 1 800 or 1 200 square feet could cost you as much as \$700 000 for a condominium in a development being planned in Hastings in my constituency. My friend the Honourable Member for St. Michael South is reminding me that my adopted mother had the foresight to pay \$2 880 in 1928 for three acres of land and a house on it. That would now have increased considerably. When I say that land for the Barbadian is a symbol of independence and it is also an instrument of investment for the biggest and the smallest of us. And as more and more Barbadians in the last two years have acquired part of Barbados there will be the pressure for more and more to acquire another part of Barbados but we are going to have to do this as well by channelling some of that building upwards rather than outwards in the interest of the country as a whole. 6:00 p.m.

Sir, the Government has laid on the Table of this House a provisional physical development plan. I would hope that the Leader of the House would find some time for us to debate that physical development plan. I think that it is one of the most important bits of information that has come down to the House and I believe that it desires the input of Members of this House before a final change is made to the plan required under the Town Planning Act. Since I have been in the House only two plans have been laid as required by the Town & Country Planning Act. This one is an attempt to lay the third one. I believe we ought to comply with the law and get that done and the opportunity is here. I hope that even if we are going to recess some time when we resume that one of the first debates that should be initiated is the physical development plan so that before it is finalised we would have the considered input of every member. Not merely to score political points, you can do that too because obviously Members are thinking that some of us may only be in here for another year at the most, some of us may be back, we do not ever know those things. Not only for that purpose....

Asides.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: You are beginning to find a fighting mood, Sir. There are two Members who are sure to be back one by you over there and one over here.

Asides.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: If you want to find out ask the Honourable Member for St. Michael South who are those

two who are sure to be back. If the Honourable Member for St. Michael West was here he would say there are three.

Sir, despite the House is going to move into a very contentious mood and perhaps a very partisan mood as we go on, I understand that is the nature of politics and there is no blame on either Side. I believe that we are capable even in that context of giving some guidance to the planners to ensure that the land of Barbados is so dealt with that we are not betraying the heritage and legacy which was given to us.

I am much indebted to you.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this land acquisition goes much further than re-siting 25 houses from Friendship to Lears. This land acquisition is now being asked* to be placed on a parcel of land in the area of St. Michael, namely Lears Plantation which is considered to be one of the best agricultural plantations in this country. One must ask what is the input of the Minister of Agriculture in this debate because we had a situation previously where Farmers in St. Thomas was allowed to come out of agriculture. Then we had Constant and now we are at Lears. We must find out whether the Government has taken the decision to do away with agriculture or whether they have enough land to make sure that they can provide the 54 000 tons of sugar that is required on a yearly basis.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Lears land as everybody would know is in a high rainfall area not like at Lancaster. Everybody in Barbados knows that you do not touch Farmers, you do not touch Constant neither do you touch Lears. We have seen in less than one year that three good agriculture plantations have been given permission for change of use. We must ask ourselves whether there is an agricultural policy or whether there is a conflict between the agricultural Ministry and the housing Ministry because soon we will be in a position in this country where we will not be able to supply our European commitment. We have to ask ourselves whether the Barbados Labour Party have a plan to destroy agriculture or not or whether they are blindly following the IADB's policy that land must fetch its highest value. It is clear to me that the policies of the Barbados Labour Party are policies that have been given to them by the IADB and they cannot change them. I am making this challenge that the Barbados Labour Party cannot change the policies given to them by the IADB and that we are being run today by the IADB. There is no way that you can get a country where we have invested millions of dollars to diversify and to upgrade our sugar industry now to see a situation that month after month we are taking good agriculture land out of agriculture and putting it into housing

when there is a lot of rab land in this country that can easily be used for housing purposes. I am also concerned about the Honourable Member for Christ Church West because what we are actually doing today is totally destroying agriculture. This particular land owner at Lears knows well how to take land out of agriculture into housing because he knows that once you take one parcel of land out of agriculture to housing all you do is go back the next time and tell the Chief Town planner that you have to protect the houses on that piece of land and that you have to give another piece permission for housing. It is like a cancer. Soon you will say that Lears Plantation in total will not be in sugar production anymore and it will go to housing because cane fires will be the example used to protect the investment in housing and to make sure that the whole of the plantation is removed from agriculture into housing. The argument that will be used is that you allow housing to be next to agriculture land that cane fires will burn down the houses. I have seen it happened at Warrens where there is not one single piece of agricultural land at Warrens anymore and that excuse was used and it was used by the same land owner.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Yes, I am talking about Warrens which was good agriculture land and not one single field now stands.

Asides.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: It happened in 1981. Check and see when Simpson Motors went there. I am telling you because I had just moved to the sugar industries headquarters. I am saying, Sir, that we have seen it happening at Farmers, at Constant and now at Lears. And you know what is disgraceful, Sir? The same thing I told the people in St. George North two months ago that the excuse will be used that this land is being taken out of agriculture for poor people and less than two months after I told them so I have seen it happening. They cannot purchase land any other way because if the land developer were to go in and do a development there would be a human cry but what happens, they get Government to come and do it. Once Government is doing it everything will be all right and the myth is given that the development is for poor people. Foolishness! 6.10p.m.

Let me tell you something, the excuse used by rich people could destroy agricultural land where they use Government to go and compulsorily acquire land in the name of the poor people. Later you will find that all of that land will go into housing and it would not be for the poor people.

I am saying to you, Sir, that agriculture will be destroyed in Barbados as from today because of this land acquisition and you yourself, Sir, will have to ask how you could be party to this.

I would like to know, Sir, if the Government is building up a land bank why would they have to go to Lears to acquire 50 hectares of land which is 125 acres to put 25 houses? I want to know that. That is a serious question.

Aside.

Mr. D. ST. E. KELLMAN: No. The Minister said 50 hectares. I have the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West to back me on that. He said 50 hectares. Call for the record. I am talking about what the Minister said. I want to know why you would acquire all this land just for 25 houses. There has got to be something wrong in here. I am smelling a rat and I want to know what is wrong.

In a previous speech, Sir, I said that it is clear to me that whenever Government wants land they buy it from one person and whenever they want to sell land they sell it to the same person. I want to know, Sir, what is the relationship between Government and when I talk about the Government, it is the Cabinet that would have to take the responsibility because people like blaming one Minister and I am not blaming the Minister. This would have to be a Cabinet decision. Whenever Government wants land, Eastern Land Development or C.O. Williams, the same thing. Whenever they are selling land the same people buying. I want to know what is the relationship, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that whenever they want land they buy from C.O. Williams or Eastern Land Development and whenever they have large parcels of land to sell the same people know to buy. I want to know what is the relationship between Government and this group, Sir? What is also amazing, Sir, is that wherever this company has land there is road improvement. I want to know what is the relationship between Government and this company? And I want to know, Sir, why 25 houses would take 125 acres and I want to know why these people could not go to Orange Hill or why they could not go to Lancaster.

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no Resolution before this House for the acquisition of 125 acres. The Honourable Member has obviously got this wrong. He needs to look and see how many hectares are being acquired if he reads his Resolution. There is no point making a speech based on misinformation or pure speculation on a matter before the House. It does not help the House. In my view it does not help the country either because we really must have some sensible and rational debate in here that is not just throwing up smoke and screens that people are shooting at and has no relevance to the matter.

Mr. D. ST. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we need to call for the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you go on, the Member was talking about 50 hectares that you said the Minister said and the Resolution is asking for 3.8 hectares. There seems to be some confusion. Do you have a copy of the Resolution?

Mr. D. ST. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am interested in what was said by the spokesman, not the Resolution. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West was here. He would agree with me because we worked out the acreage and we found it to be rather high for 25 people. Well, if an error was made on his part...

Hon. Sir HENRY FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the House cannot be debating two different things. I have a Resolution before me, Sir, which says, Resolved that Parliament approve the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of parcels of land situated at Lears Plantation in the parish of St. Michael in this island, more particularly described in the Schedule to the Resolution and the Resolution speaks of a specific piece of land that is by admeasurement 3.875 hectares or thereabouts inclusive of 0.165 hectares of road and it is shown on a plan by Mr. Andrew Bourne of Lands and Survey and recorded in the Lands and Survey Department on the 27th of May 1998 as Plan No. 468 of 1998. I asked to see the plan. The plan is here and that is what the plan says. Therefore it is about 8 acres of land being acquired.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy, the Resolution seems to say that we are talking about 3.8 hectares of land and let us continue on that.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad it is only 3.8 hectares which makes it more disgraceful. Here the Government is taking up 8 acres of agricultural land just to resite 25 people when they have land otherwise. Here they are going to destroy a whole plantation just because of 8 acres of land which shows that whatever I said before is correct, that this has nothing to do with those 25 people but it has something to do with the changing of the whole plantation into housing.

The Honourable Member for Christ Church West must be congratulated for correcting me there because it is clear that once they are starting housing at Lears it is the beginning of the end because you have a good reason now, Sir, to submit a claim for more land to be subdivided for housing.

I am grateful to the Honourable Member for Christ Church West for correcting me because if it was 125 acres it would be a wide scale housing project by Government. But now it is clear, Sir, that 8 acres of land was taken from this large plantation so that it could come later and create a precedent so that they could come with a reason for dividing this land for housing purposes. 6.20 p.m.

I am saying, Sir, that the houses at Friendship could easily have gone somewhere else. Why Lears? I want to know why you are going to move houses from Friendship to Lears, Sir. I want to know if they are doing that for tax evasion because if you know where Lears is and where Friendship is I want to know why you would want to move

from Friendship to Lears. I want to know what is so special about Lears. I want to find out from the Minister today, why he would want to move houses from Friendship on the highway to put them at Lears. I want to know the reason behind it, Sir. And I am looking forward to getting that answered this afternoon.

I have said already, Sir, that in this House, we must be careful how we use the Land Acquisition Act, because it is clear to me that the Land Acquisition Act is being used as a tool against the people and not for the people. It is clear that the Land Acquisition Act in this Parliament has been used to protect the interest of rich people and to deprive the poor people of what they have. And I know, Sir, that I will not see any development at Friendship when the people move and I can count on the support of the Honourable Member for Christ Church West that no development will go on where these people have been removed from and I know I can count on his support, because he is a defender of poor people like myself. He has said that years ago he had been doing the same thing and I congratulate him and I want him to continue. I know his heart is in the right place and I want him to continue like that.

I expect that if development goes on at Friendship that I would hear your voice to be the first. And I expect if there is an expansion of the housing stock at Lears, I would hear your voice too.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am saying that if it is only eight acres and I want to find out from the Minister before I sit whether it is eight acres or 15 hectares.

Aside.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: So I am saying, Sir, that with the small amount of land that according to the new figures that is being acquired at Lears that there is no need for that, Sir, and those people could easily be resited somewhere else. I am calling on the Minister, Sir, to think about this because there is no need to compulsorily acquire that land at Lears. It is too small a portion of land, Sir, and that land could easily be found somewhere else in the land bank that the Government has been building up over the years.

Thank you.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy has constantly misled this House. In fact, I must say that he deliberately misleads this House whenever he speaks because the resolution says, the acquisition of 3.875 hectares, which is about eight acres of land at Lears. And he is confusing himself with 15 square metres still that was discussed a while ago at Hope, St. James. That was the only 15 that was discussed in here for the whole day, 15.274 square metres of land that was vested at Hope Plantation in St. James.

But nevertheless, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point must be made clear that the 25 homes that he is talking about, the resiting the homes of 25 poor people who cannot get water, who cannot get the basic facilities and in order to facilitate these 25 people, we have to acquire this parcel of land. And again, he does not understand the relationship between Friendship and Hothersal Turning or Lears because they are all within one proximity within a mile radius.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I have never mentioned anything about Friendship or Hothersal Turning. So I do not know how I could mix up myself with the relationship.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he was asking about the relationship between Friendship and Lears. Those of us who know the area will agree that Lears is less than a quarter mile from Friendship and it is part of the Government's policy to keep people in the community to which they have belonged for all the years. Therefore, I believe that keeping these people within that geographical location is in order with the Government's policy and with what the people want.

It is important for us as legislators to understand that the demand for housing and lots is very elastic that people are demanding house spots and will speak to you. There is a lady in St. James who has just gotten put off a house spot less than two hours ago by a Marshal and the Government has to find a house spot for that lady. We have been constantly bombarded by people who are seeking lots and the more land we have is better for the people and better for the Government.

So when we talk about taking land out of agriculture, we have to take land out of agriculture in order to provide house spots for people. It is not true to say that Government is taking the prime agricultural land. He talks about prime agricultural land at Constant. The land at Constant is rab land. If you look at this land here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it adjoins an existing community. Here you see, if you look at the plan, the plan suggests that there are a number of small holders of land and a lot adjoins these people. So this is right in a community in itself.

Aside.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: Yes. The land adjoins an existing community. And the eight acres would provide about approximately 60 house spots and a small recreation area for the new community. It does not mean that only 25 lots will be created and the Government has some sinister way of doing things. We are not going to give it back to the landlords, but more house spots will be provided. Why should the Government provide or take up only 25 house spots? The same Member has been on record as saying that the Government should take up more land than we need.

Earlier today he said that the Government should take up the entire Lancaster, so the Member is not consistent at all

in his presentation. I would like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government has been acquiring land for the development of housing. We have been doing this in order to deliver. Clearly the 25 homes which have been disadvantaged will have to be resited and it is better to resite them in the same constituency and in the same geographical location than putting them somewhere else. And, all Honourable Members have subscribed to that view of putting people in their same location.

The other point that was made today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is about the acquisition process. The Government as a matter of record has been paying its bills. They have not been paying to one landowner and not another. The records will show that last year alone, over \$4 million were paid out to persons whom the Government has acquired land from. I am not aware that the Government has been saying to any landowner,

"We are not going to pay you and pay the other landowner upfront."

It does not happen this way.

In fact, I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the Government acquires land, the Minister does not get involved in the payment. We have a process. The Chief Legal Officer and the Civil Service are involved in paying the bills. So the records will show that last year a lot of bills were paid. A number of bills that were owed in the previous administration and from years ago, even from the previous Barbados Labour Party administration were paid in this current administration. I am not aware of many landlords whose payment is still outstanding.

Mr. B.M. TAITT: On a point of order. Will the Honourable Member undertake to bring down to the House a list of outstanding payments?

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: How do you mean, "no" I am not addressing the Minister from his chair. I am addressing the Honourable Member who is speaking, Sir, who is bringing a measure of fresh air from the Ministry. I was asking if the Honourable Member would undertake to endeavour to bring a list down so that we will be able to answer them for your constituents and mine who have been waiting for a long time. 6.30 p.m.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: I am sure the Honourable Member is aware that the Ministry is run by a Minister and the Minister is in his chair. I am saying that the records have shown that a lot of money has been paid out to persons from whom we have bought land. We are very timely. If Government has missed, or if something has happened that we are not aware of, then members should let us know but I am aware that Government has been paying its bills in a timely manner.

With that remark, I want to reassure members that we do not have any sinister motives. Thank you.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I will be only five minutes. I was very pleased to hear the Honourable Member who just sat down who is the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry and who has been striving from almost the first day he went into that Ministry to bring some measure of honour in its commitments. We have a display of what he is up against. I really wish that the Prime Minister were in here so that we could advise the Prime Minister properly on what ought to be done for a Parliamentary Secretary of that quality.

He has said that attempts are being made to recompense people for lands acquired. Now, I happen to know that there is no evidence that the Anglican Church has received a cent as yet for large quantities of land which they have been negotiating. I understand that the Minister has some kind of relationship going by which they are going to do some kind of *quid pro quo* and he is holding that close for some time. I hope that we can look forward to that.

There was a piece of land in Deacons Road 17 years outstanding to the estate and I wonder if the Minister when he gets up since he was shouting "no" from his chair and I know in your constituency, Sir, there are some people who have been waiting for years to get paid for land that was acquired. I feel the Minister owes it to this House to give us some information, not a comment, because the Minister's comments can be very caustic but we would like to get some evidence that there is an equitable arrangement for the payment of people in the Ministry.

This business that there is a process. You have people outstanding for 10 years plus and I remember the people from Speightstown and I do not believe that estate has been paid. It would really be helpful. The Minister cannot lose anything by getting up and telling us whether what the Honourable Member for St. John said earlier is valid. I wish him to be wrong. I would like to know the Honourable Member for St. John is wrong. It cannot be that some citizen or some entity in this country can get paid every time land is acquired from them and then we have other citizens who have to wait 15 and 20 years.

What is more, the Minister is so contemptuous that he is acquiring land one week and two weeks later vesting it before paying for it. That is not fair. You know, Sir, what needs to be pointed out in this country and is not fully recognised by Ministers in this country that they are personally responsible in law for certain maladministrations. Now maladministration does not mean misfeasance. Maladministration does not necessarily mean that somebody has committed a criminal offence and if you say maladministration it might be misunderstood, but I know the Minister knows what I mean and he knows that I am not accusing him of any malfeasance but I am saying that

maladministration is failure to do that administratively which ought to be done. The Honourable Member for St. George North while with the best intentions is trying to suggest that they have a procedure and that it is the Permanent Secretary and others but it is the Minister who is personally responsible for the administrative acts in his Ministry. That is the law.

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: If I had the opportunity I would have fired Murrell on the spot. That is the truth because Murrell could not even write a letter. Do not bring that to me. I told you before. If I have a man who is at the level of Chief whatever it is in a Ministry and he cannot write a simple letter I have the right as Minister to say that I do not wish him in my Ministry. Whether his name is Murrell or George Payne. Do not think that I would be embarrassed because you say that I fired somebody although it is not true.

That is not the point. The point is...

Aside.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: He does not work in any Ministry so I do not understand why you would need to bring that up. We can bring you chapter and verse of the ones that work in the Ministry that fall in the same category. You all do not pick them on the basis of qualification necessarily. Yvonne Wood's letters are written by the Prime Minister's personal aide. Yvonne Wood is the only person who is a public officer and can write letters of that kind who has not been disciplined by anybody. So don't start on me! Don't raise these questions when I am speaking. This Yvonne Wood... What is more a Minister can be defending. I just want the Honourable Member for St. Andrew who recently had a \$50 a plate dinner at which there were 500 people according to him to understand that the basis on which you get fairness in this country has nothing to do with whether you attend a \$50 a plate dinner or not.

Asides.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: The food was catered, Sir. Were you there?

I just wish the Minister not to make the error of assuming that because we do not speak to these matters we are not aware of them. We are very grateful to the Parliamentary Secretary for bringing a breath of fresh air to these matters so we expect the Minister when he gets up to tell us who is getting paid and who is not getting paid and why. 6.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to set the record straight to say how much we appreciate what the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Housing has been

trying to do. I know he is held back by the Minister constantly and if the Parliamentary Secretary had the courage of his convictions he should have walked away from that Minister ever since. He should tell the Prime Minister like a man: "I have nothing to do with, do not wish anything to do with that Minister anymore because he is holding me back." But the Parliamentary Secretary understands that doing these things can be detrimental because he is no Melba. The Parliamentary Secretary is probably playing with his bat close to the pad and properly so.

There was an open aperture for just a moment before the voice cried: "No". The last time a voice cried "No", Sir, was when the Minister responsible for Health cried "No" on an occasion when the hospital head was about to be cut off and a voice said: "No".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael West...

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Get back to the 3.8 hectares.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: I am coming back to the Resolution, Sir. I just wish to be certain that the Honourable Member can let us know about the money, when the people whose lands are being acquired can expect to be paid and whether, in fact, they have been paid, or they are being paid, and if there are equitable arrangements for the payment of people.

Hon. G.W. PAYNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Honourable Member for St. John got up and started to speak about certain persons in a certain section of his constituency being unfaired I thought he meant constituency in terms of the election boundaries. I did not realise that he was speaking about another constituency because I would have thought that he would have been more interested in his own constituency, the constituency that he represents, than the other constituency and that he would be talking about Clifton Hall and would be telling Honourable Members that that development at St. John that he was speaking about for so long has finally started.

The contractor is in. The Honourable Member has been assured that all those persons whose names he submitted will get their lots. The General Manager of the National Housing Corporation has been instructed to work very closely with the Leader of the Opposition, it has never happened before, in keeping with the policy of Government to make sure that the parliamentary representative had been consulted. I thought he really would have been speaking about that constituency but I did not know that he was speculating as to what Government's next move would be with respect to an acquisition.

For the first time I am hearing about Government acquiring lands close to some members. I heard a whisper from somebody's seat about one Leroy Parris, land next to a

Mr. Leroy Parris that I have not even seen any file for acquiring that land but I know the Honourable Member visits in that area where we have, perhaps, I think it is the biggest house in Barbados and obviously the Honourable Member would not want to go by his friend and look down on any little people so he is assuming that Government intends to acquire this land and he wants to put Government on lands that if anybody touches his friend he will step in.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order, Sir. I have made no such assumption. The Honourable Member said that his next acquisition is some land belonging to a Mr. Toppin from Swan Street and he is going to acquire that land to put low-cost housing on it. He can get up and deny that, but he will be calling some of his own people liars if he denies it, and I will identify them.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not even know who is Mr. Toppin. We never had any intentions of acquiring any land from Mr. Toppin that he is referring to. I am not saying that there is not a possibility that if land is needed in the area close to his friend that that land would not be acquired but, certainly, we have not made any moves with respect to acquiring that land.

The Honourable Member knows that you do not actually come into this House and speak about Government's intention to acquire before the acquisition actually comes to Parliament. The acquisition must first go to Cabinet and, certainly, I have not even seen any plans with respect to the same application, so the Honourable Member can rest assured that if Government intends to acquire that land, I certainly will go from here and actually do an inspection myself to see if that land is suitable for acquisition. I do not know if he is trying to tell me something but we do not have any plans and if it is suitable on his recommendation, we will discuss it with him before it is brought to Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to speak too much on the question of persons awaiting compensation. Members are aware of the process. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West spoke to it. The Honourable Member for St. George North spoke to the process. Certainly since I was Minister of Housing we have tried our best to ensure that individuals whose lands are being acquired that the monies are paid promptly.

At the moment, with respect to those lands that have been acquired since September 6, 1994, prompt payment has been made. The Honourable Member for St. Michael West did mention the question of Turners Hall. That is a matter that was going on for some time and I do not think that you could lump Turners' Hall with the other acquisitions because that is a matter that was *subjudice* and it is now settled. As soon as the matter was settled, payment was effected but he did mention the need for certain amendments to the Land Acquisition Act and to that I concur. But until those amendments are made, there is a process which we must go through and it will take some time.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael West could rest assured that as far as I am aware, leaving out those persons who have refused, and there are many of them who have actually refused to collect that money, that we are current. We are current.

Aside.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: It is not necessary to bring a list.

Mr. B. M. TAITT: Sir, if the Honourable Member will give way. If he does not wish to bring a list and he says he is current, could he then bring a list of those who have refused to collect their money because the way how Government goes they might not even know that you are holding money for them.

I had \$250 down at the Treasury. I sent somebody to collect my money and they tell me that I have to come for it myself. My \$250 that I paid to run as a candidate they still have it in the Treasury, refused to give a bearer saying that I have to come for it myself, so you never can tell. They would not even allow me to send my constituency secretary to collect my \$250, but I am going to court for them.

Hon. G. W. PAYNE: All I can say to members is that if they are aware of any individual who has not been paid compensation, use their good offices to encourage them to go and accept the payment by the Ministry. What has happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there are many instances where land has been acquired and a number of individuals have gone to the Ministry claiming that they are the rightful owners, but they have not been able to present any proof. There are a number of those that are outstanding because the Ministry would have to be satisfied that the right person is paid.

Just one other point which was mentioned with respect to the cutting up of agricultural land. I think the Honourable Member for St. Michael West dealt with it very well in terms of what a previous Administration had done. You cannot come into this House week after week and criticise Government for acquiring lands for poor people.

They criticise Government's land bank. On the one hand you talk about the need to acquire large tracks of land

that would be suitable for good large-scale housing projects and then on the other hand you speak about Government encroaching on the land that has been put aside for agriculture because if you are going to do an acquisition of that magnitude, it is fairly obvious that agricultural land would be touched. 6.50 p.m.

I am particularly pleased that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy mentioned Lancaster because we will be coming back to this House for a fairly big acquisition with respect to the area that he has recommended. In the same way that he recommended to us the naming of Judge Gap, we will accept his recommendation for the acquisition of land at Lancaster, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House be adjourned to Friday, August 7, 1998 at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not imagine that after Emancipation Day festivities and Kadooment Day that Tuesday next would be a day when people would be as alert as they would wish to be. There is a lot of business on our Order Paper. Please take note that we will meet on Friday, August 7, 1998 at 11 o'clock in the morning. The Foreign Policy Debate is scheduled for August 11, 1998.

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

The question that the House be adjourned to Friday, August 7, 1998 at 11 o'clock in the morning was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 7.00 p.m.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER

Confirmation of Minutes of Tuesday, July 7, 1998.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR..... 1

1. Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1998.
2. Report of the Public Enterprise Investment Fund for the quarter ending March 31, 1998.

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

Foreign Policy for the 21st Century - Barbados and a Changing World.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON..... 2

The Annual Reports and Audited Statements of Accounts of the National Conservation Commission for the Financial Years 1993 to 1994 and 1994 to 1995.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER 2

1. Final Appropriation (1997- 98) Bill, 1998.
2. Resolution to approve the vesting in the National Housing Corporation of land at Hillaby, St. Andrew.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON 2

1. The Marine Areas (Preservation and Enhancement) (Amendment) Bill, 1998.
2. The Coastal Zone Management Bill, 1998.
3. The Marine Pollution Control Bill, 1998.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 17 - THE COASTAL ZONE

MANAGEMENT BILL, 1998 2

Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 2,12; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 17; Hon. R. C. Eastmond, 30.

ORDER NO. 21 - RESOLUTION VESTING IN THE NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION LAND SITUATE AT HOPE PLANTATION AND ORANGE HILL, ST. JAMES 33

Hon. G. W. Payne, 33; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 33.

ORDER NO. 15 - RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND SITUATE AT LEARS PLANTATION, ST. MICHAEL 36

Hon. G. W. Payne, 36; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 36; Mr. D. J. H. Thompson, 38; Hon. Sir Henry Forde, 39; Mr. D. St. E. Kellman, 42; Mr. G. A. Clarke, 44; Mr. B. M. Taitt, 45; Hon. G. W. Payne, 47.

SUSPENSION.....12

ADJOURNMENT.....48

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

CLARKE, Mr. G. A. (St. George North)
EASTMOND, Hon. R. C. (St. James North)
FORDE, Hon. Sir Henry (Christ Church West)
KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy) PAYNE,
Hon G. W. (St. Andrew) TAITT, Mr. B. M. (St. Michael West) THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John) THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South)