
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 2003 – 2008

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 29, 2004

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.15 a.m. on Tuesday, June 29, 2004.

PRESENT

His Honour I. A. ROETT, B.A., Dip. Ed., G.C.M. (Speaker)

His Honour J. M. EDGHILL, J.P. (Deputy Speaker)

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

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

Mr. L. R. TULL, Q.C., M.A. (Oxon.)

Hon. Dame Billie MILLER, D.A., B.C.H. (Senior Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade)

Hon. R. C. EASTMOND, B.A. (Hons.), Dip. Ed., LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C., J.P. (Minister of Labour and Social Security)

Hon. R. R. FARLEY, B.Sc., J.P. (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs and Sports)

Hon. G. A. CLARKE, B.Sc., Dip. Ed., J.P. (Minister of Public Works and Transport)

Mr. R. D. MARSHALL (Chairman of Committees)

Hon. H. F. LASHLEY (Minister of Social Transformation)

Mr. R. St. C. TOPPIN, LL.B. (Hons.)

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN

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

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY, Q.C., LL.B. (Deputy Prime Minister) (Attorney-General and Minister of Home Affairs) (Leader of the House)

Mr. T. A. PRESCOD, B.A.

Rev. J. J. S. ATHERLEY, B.A., B.Sc., J.P. (Parliamentary Secretary to the Attorney-General and Minister of Home Affairs)

Hon. N. A. LYNCH, B.Sc., M.B.A. (Minister of Tourism and International Transport)

Hon. A. P. Wood, B.Sc., M.Sc., M.Phil., J.P. (Minister of Energy and Public Utilities)

Hon. Miss C. Y. FORDE, L.C.P., J.P. (Minister of State, Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs and Sports)

Hon. J. X. WALCOTT, M.B., B.S., FRCS (Edin.), J.P. (Minister of Health)

Mr. R. D. JONES, B.A. (Hons.), M.A. (Ed.), J.P.

Dr. D.C. ESTWICK, B.Sc., M.B.B.S.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL, B.Sc. (Econ.) (Hons.), M.A. (Public Finance) (Leader of the Opposition)

Hon. D. D. MARSHALL, LL.B. (Hons.), L.E.C. (Minister of Industry and International Business)

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY, LL.B. (Hons.)

Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS, B.A., LL.B. (Minister of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade)

Dr. W. F. DUGUID, B.D.S. (Comm.), F.D.S., FDRCS, J.P.

Mr. R. L. SEALY, B.Sc., M.B.A.

Prayers were led by Rev. J. J. S. Atherley.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House is now in session.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Minutes of Tuesday, June 22, 2004.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minutes so cited be confirmed, subject to any omissions, observations and/or corrections.

Hon. Dame Billie MILLER: 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, I am commanded to lay the following:

1. Exchange Control (Authorised Dealers and Depositories) (Amendment) Order, 2004.
2. Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (Whitepark Development Limited) Order, 2004.
3. Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 2004.
4. The Annual Report of the Central Bank of Barbados for the Year 2003.

Hon. A. P. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Annual Report of the National Petroleum Corporation for the Year 2002.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42(5), 43 and 44.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I indicated that we would not be proceeding with any Government Business today because of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had filed a Resolution of No-Confidence in the Government. In the best tradition of parliamentary democracy, we have therefore given way for this Resolution to be heard expeditiously. Therefore, there would be no Government Business today, but instead the hearing of the Resolution of No-Confidence.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION THAT THIS HOUSE HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PRIME MINISTER AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PRIME MINISTER AND MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR ST. PETER RESIGN OFFICE IMMEDIATELY

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present an argument for the Opposition with respect to a Resolution that

was laid expressing no confidence in this current Administration.

Mr. Speaker, you well recall that on May 11, 2004 we debated a Resolution that sought to acquire two parcels of land at Queen Street, Speightstown in the parish of St. Peter for the purpose of providing an access road to the beach. Subsequent research on the part of the Opposition, revealed that the Resolution was incorrect.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West were ordered expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I expect this kind of thing to happen in here today because the Government is being prosecuted on the basis of facts and evidence provided over the last couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, just to correct, in the Ministerial Statement there was admission of an error on the part of the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member misrepresents the Ministerial Statement. The Ministerial Statement does not admit to an error on the part of the Minister.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: It does not? Well, the people of Barbados heard that in summary the Ministry acknowledges that an error was made in referring to the purpose of the acquisition as being the provision for an access to the beach and the public of Barbados would recognise that there was indeed admission of an error.

Mr. Speaker, that same Ministerial Statement said:

“An understanding of Queen Street makes it quite clear that the provision of a beach access at this location is unnecessary.”

These are the words of the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. Therefore, there needs to be clarity with respect to whether or not there is an understanding of Queen Street in relation to the intended acquisition of the two parcels of land. That is precisely the reason the Opposition, when it visited the location, recognised that a significant error was made and as a result of the disclosure by the Opposition in the Press, there was an apology.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain and put in context the reason why this Resolution was brought. Some have referred to it as frivolous, but this is the seventh time since Independence that a No-Confidence Motion was brought in this Chamber.

On previous occasions we have had No-Confidence Motions brought against the Prime Minister of Barbados. There was a No-Confidence Motion brought on cola syrup in 1995. There was a No-Confidence Motion brought against Minister Vic Johnson in 1985.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of discussion has taken place as to whether or not this No-Confidence Motion is simple. The reality of life is that the Government, in presenting the Resolution, had in fact misled the Honourable House because the intent of the original Resolution was for a public access to the beach.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the use of the word "mislead". The natural meaning of the word "mislead", if one checks a dictionary, carries an imputation of deceit and dishonesty. If that is in fact so, and it is if one checks the dictionary, one would find therefore that the Honourable Member is imputing dishonourable motives to Honourable Members on This Side by use of the word "mislead".

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, in the Resolution laid in this House there was deliberate reference to the word "misled". So I do not understand why the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment would have a problem with the word "mislead" because it is contained within the Resolution put to this House last week Tuesday.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I expect this kind of frivolity in today's debate. Certainly the question of being misled had to do with the fact that the original Resolution made reference to a public access to the beach. As I would describe in my presentation, it could not have been, as was the case when we went to Queen Street and had an understanding of what Queen Street is, that the Resolution could in fact have been stating the correct intent of the Government at that time. Mr. Speaker, I go on to answer the question why the Motion was brought against the Right Honourable Prime Minister and the Government, as opposed to a single Minister in the form of the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment?
10.30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the land acquisition is an issue of policy and according to the Constitution of Barbados, Section 64(2) states:

"The Cabinet shall be the principal instrument of policy and shall be charged with the general direction and control of the Government of Barbados, and shall be collectively responsible, therefore, to Parliament."

Mr. Speaker, it therefore, means that any policy enunciated by the Government, is, in fact, under the ambit of the Cabinet of Barbados, as stated in Section 64(2) of the Constitution.

Sir, I go further. According to E. C. Wade & A. W. Bradley in "Constitutional and Administrative Law", 11th edition:

"The doctrine of collective responsibility helps to reinforce the powers of the Prime Minister. The effect of the doctrine is that Ministers must not criticise Government's policy in public and if necessary, must be prepared to defend it".

This means that if the firm hand of the Prime Minister is guiding that policy, there will be no public criticism from the most influential and informed people in the Government.

"The importance of the doctrine for silencing potential criticism is underlined by the fact that many decisions of Government are not taken by the Cabinet as a whole but by the Prime Minister in consultation with a few key colleagues."

Mr. Speaker, therefore, in this issue the hands of the Right Honourable Prime Minister are firmly rested. Sir, not only did he second the Resolution but spoke immediately after the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment, which is not a typical move. Normally after a Resolution is laid, it is expected that the second speaker would come from the Opposition Benches.

Mr. Speaker, in that debate the Right Honourable Prime Minister seconded the Resolution, spoke very firmly in support of it and, indeed, lauded the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment most highly on that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, it is in accordance with Wade & Bradley that in our kind of Ministerial Government, the Right Honourable Prime Minister executes a very strong hand on policy decision and policy making. Therefore, in this instance, there can be no doubt that is what occurred on May 11, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to put this into context and to also state to the public of Barbados that the Democratic Labour Party is not on trial in this debate. We are not on trial because there are some commentators who have been seeking to influence public thinking in suggesting that the

Democratic Labour Party is on trial, but I wish the people of Barbados to remember that we have been in Opposition for the last 10 years, over which there were three elections, in 1994, 1999, and 2003, and the people of Barbados spoke against the Democratic Labour Party on those occasions. Therefore, it cannot be the case that in this debate the Democratic Labour Party is on trial.

Mr. Speaker, what is most important is that we in the Democratic Labour Party understand the thing that is most highly valued by the people as an asset by any Government. It is not the power that Government has but the trust that it can instil in itself and in the people of the country. Therefore, to speak only to the issue of power, to exercise and exert power in the way that we have seen over the last 10 years, has required us as a people to recognise that the time has come for us on This Side, to demonstrate that matters which might have been allowed to go unnoticed in previous years, cannot now be allowed to go unnoticed.

Therefore, when we investigated the matter at Queen Street, St. Peter, we, indeed, found just cause for bringing this No-Confidence Motion against not only the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment but the entire Cabinet of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, we have heard much discussion about the small, black man and in this instance, the issue truly is about the small, black man and black women in the area of Queen Street. We are dealing with a Resolution that was brought to the Honourable Chamber as far back as August 6, 2003, and nine months later it was debated. It, therefore, had a full gestation on the Order Paper. It was conceived, it was delivered, and we felt the need and saw the obvious evidence pointing against the Government on this occasion to ensure that a Resolution of this type was brought against the Government.

Mr. Speaker, there was, indeed, a subsequent apology by the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment, that the acquisition was not for the provision of an access to the beach but an access to Queen Street. I repeat the words of the Honourable Minister in her apology:

“An understanding of Queen Street makes it quite clear that the provision of a beach access at this location is unnecessary.”

Mr. Speaker, a true understanding of Queen Street, also makes it quite clear that the provision of an access to Queen Street is unnecessary, given that this access was in existence for well over 50 years. Therefore, the issue is truly one of trust because there is no way that one could have altered the intent of the Resolution to suggest that it was an access to Queen Street, when, in fact, persons had been living there for over 50 or 60 years and have always been able to get access to their residences and to the beaches.

Mr. Speaker, I expect all kinds of *ad hominem* attacks today. I expect all kinds of interruptions today but what I will do is to focus on the truth. Sir, the important thing to note in this debate is what is the public purpose for which the land is being acquired? According to the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, there must be a public purpose for any land acquisition, and we need to know precisely what is the public purpose for which the land is being acquired. If it is to be a public access to the beach, as is stated in the original Resolution, and a public road was to be placed at Queen Street, then one would expect that the Ministry of Public Works would have provided such a road and has been asked to seek permission from the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment, in order to put a public access at that area.
10.40 a.m.

Therefore, an understanding of land acquisition is important in this debate. Sir, there is no way in which the Ministry of Housing could put a road on any land in Barbados without the request having passed from the Minister of Public Works. Therefore, there should have been an intimate knowledge of provision of such a road in the area at Queen Street, and it is necessary for the Minister of Housing to show to this Honourable House that there are plans, documents and other maps which would demonstrate why and where the public access would have been placed at Queen Street.

Sir, we need to ask a larger question in this debate. Was the land acquisition part of a larger acquisition being contemplated by the Government of Barbados? If so, there has to be a larger plan for the area of Queen Street. Sir, what is the plan and can it be presented to the people of Barbados so as to justify the original intent of the Resolution?

Mr. Speaker, did the larger land include moving the Sanitation Authority from Fort Denmark? Did the plan also include moving two chattel houses from the car park at Fort Denmark? Sir, two chattel houses were recently moved, one to Lot 51, Mount Brevitor which was located at Fort Denmark next to Schooner Bay which was not part of the larger plan. We now know that the plan included approving the area of Fort Denmark for commercial development. This was stated quite clearly in a Cabinet Paper of 2002 and if the Honourable Member for St. Michael North is not telling the truth, then the Other Side has every opportunity to demonstrate otherwise.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member has asserted that it was written in a Cabinet Paper and the decent thing for him now to do is to make it a document of the House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I never quoted from a document.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never said he quoted from it. I said that he had asserted from a Cabinet Paper and the decent thing for the Honourable Member to do is to make it a document of the House as has been the case on ever other debate.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I never quoted from any document. I said that it is now in the public domain that this Administration has approved for commercial development the land at Fort Denmark. Therefore, I do not have to bring any evidence because I am not on trial. I do not plan to bring any evidence because, today, I am prosecuting the Government. Sir, the Government should bring the evidence and demonstrate that I am telling lies.

It is quite clear that the area of Fort Denmark has been approved for commercial development and this was stated in the public domain recently. I do not have to bring any such evidence because a leading newspaper in Barbados made it quite clear recently that the area of Fort Denmark was approved for commercial development.

Mr. Speaker, in carrying out the whole question of the acquisition in this area, we had to find the truth about the intended statement in the original Resolution. The Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment in her Ministerial Statement said that an understanding of Queen Street makes it quite clear that the provision of a beach access at this location is unnecessary. Sir, these are the words of the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment and are exceedingly critical to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I well recall when the Resolution was debated on May 11, 2004, that we were told that this was a refreshing departure from the way in which matters pertaining to access to the beach in the parish of St. Peter would have been dealt with by previous Administrations.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Yes, we were told that the way in which this land acquisition was gone about was a refreshing departure from what happened under any administration in the history of Barbados. This prompted us to go and visit the area of Queen Street to see what was so refreshing about this most recent land acquisition and why it departed so substantially from anything that was done in previous years under administrations that predated this Administration.

We were also told that a departure that was so refreshing still caused a public servant to be blamed. Sir, what a contradiction! How could this land acquisition be so refreshing and yet still a public servant was blamed for the acquisition?

Sir, I quote the Ministerial apology:

“Unfortunately an error was made in some of the records of the Ministry of Housing during the year 2002 when this process started. As a result of this error, the purpose of the acquisition was recorded in the Ministry’s file as being “to provide an access road to the beach”. This error of wording subsequently found its way into all the formal documentation of the matter including the Cabinet Papers, Resolution and Acquisition Notices.”

10.50 a.m.

Sir, here it is we had a most refreshing departure from the way in which land acquisitions were done in the past, but yet it was so refreshing as to cause a public servant to stand out as a sore thumb in this acquisition.

Sir, given that the error, so called, emanated in the Ministry of Housing, according to law, there is only one public servant who could be guilty of committing such an error. This error occurred in the Ministry of Housing and according to the Land Acquisition Act, there is only one public servant that could be guilty of such an error.

Mr. Speaker, at Cap. 228 of the Laws of Barbados, the Land Acquisition Act, an Act whose long title states that it is an act to authorise the acquisition of land for public purposes and the Chief Surveyor, in addition to others, has the following powers, only the Chief Surveyor has the following powers:

- (a) To enter upon and survey and take levels of any land in any locality to which the public purposes relate;
- (b) To do all acts necessary to ascertain whether the land is adapted to such purposes;
3. To do all such other acts that may be incidental to or necessary for any of the purposes aforesated.

Sir, in any land acquisition in Barbados it is the responsibility of the Chief Surveyor in the Ministry of Housing. He is who conducts land acquisitions in Barbados.

Therefore, I would like at this stage to recognise the consistency of the Honourable Member of Parliament for St. Lucy in agitating against the way in which land acquisitions were being done by this current Administration for the past 10 years.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The Honourable Member for St. Lucy on several occasions spoke to the issues pertaining to land acquisition done in this Parliament and was exceedingly critical of the way in which those acquisitions were done.

Mr. Speaker, let us outline the procedure for land acquisitions in Barbados. It must start with a policy position of the Government. Civil servants execute the policy of the Government of Barbados. Civil servants are not responsible for formulating policy, they simply execute policies so that any land acquisition has to start with the politicians. The technocrats are then called on-board to do the necessary things to execute the land acquisition. Sir, as was stated, they have to perform surveys, they are allowed to write letters indicating to residents that they are coming to have access so that they can encroach on lands in order to be able to conduct their duties.

Therefore, one would expect that the technocrats would have to do the kind of work that is necessary to be able to come back and inform the Minister of Housing and Lands with respect to the land acquisition. Sir, a report would have to be made by the technocrats to the Minister of Lands so that she would be, in fact, privy and be aware of the circumstances surrounding the potential or proposed land acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, I would then suspect that the Minister would have to carry such information to the Cabinet of Barbados and, therefore, would have to prepare a Cabinet Paper in order to be able to pursue the policy of the Government and that the Cabinet of Barbados would approve it. Then a Resolution would come to Parliament and certainly the Resolution has to be certified by the Attorney General.

Sir, one is expected to believe that a process that is so thorough, a process that had been entered into as far back as 2002 or before because it is truly unfortunate for the current Minister of Housing and Lands, it is the former Minister of Housing and Lands that would have been responsible for this land acquisition, the Honourable Member for St. George North, because this was entered into prior to the current Minister becoming Minister of Housing and Lands.

Sir, we were also told that the then Minister of Housing and Lands, the Honourable Member for St. George North, the Chief Town Planner and other Government officials, along with the Honourable Member for St. Peter actually paid a site visit to Queen Street. Also a Senator known as "Mr. Economist" paid a site visit.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: So, in fact, this land acquisition did not start this year. It started as far back as 2002 and as a result it is difficult to see how an error like the one being stated could have existed, having passed through so many hands for so long a period and was not detected prior to coming to the Parliament of Barbados. Mr. President, that in itself is another important piece of evidence that has to be pursued in this debate.

Sir, how could a process that is as thorough as land acquisition which goes from the policy position to the technocrats, to reporting information to the Minister, a Cabinet Paper, Cabinet discussion, the formulation of a Resolution which had to be approved by the Attorney General and yet still one error was carried through from the year 2002 to 2004?

Mr. Speaker, the question is, are there any alternative public access roads that could have been used by the public at Queen Street? Are there any other accesses that could have been used? It is extremely difficult to appreciate that the two parcels of land which are to be acquired could create an access to any beach by Fort Denmark.

11.00 a.m.

After the Opposition recognised that something was amiss and drew it to the public's attention, we were then told that the two parcels of land were being acquired to provide an access to Queen Street. I have my own suspicions and I will now start to develop my suspicions.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me, a certified plan of the area. It is an extended plan of the original one brought to this Chamber by the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. It is the same kind of plan, except it has more detail for the express purpose of allowing me to convince those who are listening to the merits of my arguments, because it will be extremely important for me not only to show this to the Honourable Members on That Side, but also to show it to those in the gallery.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, Honourable Member, you should know better than that, please.

Your document must be made a document of the House.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I am going to make it a document of the House but how I hold it, Sir, is just a question of convenience. If I hold it this way, it is going to block the microphone. Therefore, I find it most convenient to hold my evidence on the left-hand side.

Mr. Speaker, let me now indicate to the people at home why I thought it necessary to bring this plan to Parliament. In fact, this is where the argument in this case will be won.

I, only after visiting the site, was able to totally understand what was happening at Queen Street. Only after other Members of the Opposition visited the site, did they understand the gravity of the problems. Therefore, it cannot be a question of frivolity. It cannot be a question that the Democratic Labour Party is looking for any particular mileage. The fact is that the Democratic Labour Party did its homework and has been able to come up with the issues in this Resolution.

I repeat. The Democratic Labour Party is not on trial. The Government is on trial. I now propose to explain this plan. Mr. Speaker, the two areas shaded in black are the two parcels of land which the Government of Barbados was seeking to acquire. The elongated one belongs to Mrs. Rita Licorish and the little parcel of land belongs to Fort Dignity Limited.

I have no doubt that the Honourable Member for St. Joseph would be most familiar with this land, having been the Attorney for Fort Dignity Limited on that occasion. Therefore, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph is very much familiar with the circumstances surrounding the guard wall at Schooner Bay.

Mr. Speaker, you can see from the area shaded in blue, which is the ocean, that in fact two parcels of land at Queen Street, shaded in black, could not have been acquired for the purpose of a public access to the beach, because in order for an access to the beach to be accomplished, it would have required the Government of Barbados to be able to acquire the area shaded in red.

The area shaded in red, is the lot of Mrs. Westerman on which there are four houses belonging to Mrs. Westerman and Mrs. Scantlebury who are very much deep in age. They did not see it necessary and did not intend to move from their current location.

Mr. Speaker, it therefore means that since the land at the back which is Fort Dignity, shaded in yellow is Fort Denmark, on which the Sanitation Authority was located and which is currently a car park, there is no way in which an access to the beach could have been reached from Queen Street, unless it went through the property of Mrs. Westerman.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, it could not have been reached, so when we said that something was wrong, because the two parcels of land which were being acquired could not have been for an access to the beach, we were then told in a Ministerial Apology, that the two parcels of land

were now to provide an access to Queen Street, but for well over 50 years, these persons have been able to access their residences from Queen Street.

What is also most important, Mr. Speaker, in the same Cabinet Paper, it was suggested that the residents were suffering as a result of the construction and there would have been obstruction to their properties, had the Schooner Bay property, which is owned by Fort Dignity, been allowed to build its guard wall along its original land line. Therefore, I have no doubt that the Honourable Member for St. Peter made representation, attempted and succeeded, apparently, in preventing it, by the acquisition of this land because the construction of the wall would have blocked Mrs. Westerman and Mrs. Scantlebury, and that is exactly the point.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, it therefore means that at this point one may say, well, Mr. Mascoll or the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, now that you have agreed in principle that the piece of land which Fort Dignity owned and which was acquired to assist the residence, was indeed a justifiable reason for the acquisition, and therefore perhaps you can sit. Agreed. I did not come to the Parliament to lose an argument. I did not come to Parliament to lose a case and therefore this is the point that has to be made.

Mr. Speaker, given that a road cannot be made from Queen Street to Fort Denmark, it means that the original Resolution for a beach access could never have been. Therefore, the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment is in fact...Maybe I should extend an apology, but it is not that simple because this gets far deeper.
11.10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the Government of Barbados has already approved the land at Fort Denmark for commercial development is a major argument and a point of reference in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain now the true gravity of the land acquisition. I therefore now invite your attention to Almshouse Gap which runs next to Jordan's Supermarket, next to Pizza Man Doc and goes east to west and then north to south. Given that the land at Fort Denmark has been approved for commercial value the problem would be Almshouse Gap because Almshouse Gap runs from east to west and then north to south across the land intended for commercial development. It splits the land in two and the land shaded in green is already, I am reliably told, owned by a developer. It has already been cleared and it is being prepared. It therefore means that if you are going to develop the sea side of the land acquisition where the Sanitation

Service Authority existed up until last year, then it would be exceedingly difficult to allow a public road to cut across the land by the Sanitation Service Authority and where the old St. Peter Almshouse and the Rate and Taxes Office was.

Mr. Speaker, I now revisit my own ignorance, therefore, I am going to reverse what I said before. It is not the case that the original intent of the Resolution could have been other than for a beach access. I am therefore saying that the original Resolution that came to this Parliament was in fact accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I will now continue to prosecute my case. Mr. Speaker, after not being able to acquire the land of Mrs. Westerman, it was no longer possible for the Government to put a beach access from Queen Street through to the sea at Fort Denmark.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading the House. In saying that it was not possible to acquire the Westerman's land, the Honourable Member is suggesting that the Government did not have the power to compulsorily acquire, when in fact it did. If the Government wanted to acquire the Westerman land, it could have and would have used the compulsory acquisition method to do so. So the Honourable Member misled the House when he suggested that it could not have been acquired, it could have been acquired had the Government wanted to acquire it.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I can now see why the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment gets herself in trouble so often.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not allowed, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The Honourable Member could not...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, please, you are out of order. I am suggesting to you that you continue with the point that you are making.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I am suggesting that the Honourable Member for St. James South...

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no need for any personal attacks, continue please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the Honourable Member for St. James South never visited the area because had she visited the area she would have recognised that the residents indicated that they were

not going to move from that area and therefore Government could not compulsorily acquire the land because of their loyalty to the existing Government.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Therefore, I am suggesting that the original Resolution had the correct intention of providing a public access to the beach, but it was deeper. If as Government has already agreed that this entire land area will be developed for commercial reasons, then it would not make sense to have a road running north to south across the existing land. If you think I am foolish, visit any...

Mr. SPEAKER: Nobody said that, Sir, you said it.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I will repeat. If you think I am foolish, then you can believe that the land acquisition here in green and the area of yellow which was acquired for commercial development and the alternative acquisition or access to the beach was going to be a road from Queen Street straight along this path onto Fort Denmark.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, I am sorry to interrupt you, but this House has a tradition that when you are making certain allegations and statements you must have some proof, you know. You are stating that this is what is supposed to be, do you have any proof that you could present to this Chamber, please, I am only asking you that. You could continue, but I am asking you if you have any proof.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I will continue and let the Speaker know that this land here at Fort Denmark has already been approved for commercial development. Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the original Resolution could not have been an error and that the land was acquired for a beach access. Mr. Speaker, what the residents of Queen Street wanted to know is why the Government is going to acquire two parcels of land when there is already a gap called Almshouse Gap which they can use to get to Fort Denmark and which is already a beach access. That was the reason for the argument by the residents. They could not understand why it is that Government was seeking to put a beach access through this area when Almshouse Gap runs east to west and then north to south and goes at the back of the land. That is the point that has to be made. So therefore the original Resolution was the intended Resolution. To hear that it is now an access to Queen Street after a "poor-rakey" Opposition was able to smoke out the Government on this matter and after an apology was tendered, this Administration apparently believes, and some members of the public, that you cannot attack this Administration because of how imbedded it is. Sir, the fact of the matter is that the two parcels of land could not have been acquired for

an access to Queen Street and that, in fact, they were acquired for access to the beach.
11.20 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am, therefore, suggesting that a major developer already owns the lands which are adjacent to Fort Denmark, that there were two houses on Fort Denmark which were relocated to Mount Brevitor earlier this year; and that Sanitation Service Authority was, in fact, dismantled and the area approved by the Government for commercial development.

Sir, in fact, it is not a simple question of revising the Resolution. In this debate there is more in the mortar than the pestle. It was a question that the Opposition identified clearly what the issues were in the acquisition and contrary to the talk about big man versus small man in Barbados, in fact, the Schooner Bay development (Fort Dignity Limited), a multimillion dollar development, was adjacent to some average, poor Barbadians and the development that is to be undertaken would be another major development. Therefore, locked between these two developments may be a few houses that may not be appropriately located and there is an attempt to move these individuals to some alternative site because it would make commercial commonsense.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West asserting his last statement as a matter of fact in relation to the removal of the houses in that area and to the motives of the Government? Is the Honourable Member asserting it as a matter of fact?

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: I have reasoned, and that is why I am here. I have reasoned, and that is where this Administration does not like persons to reason. In fact, this is exactly the problem why we have reached this stage in this Parliament because a Resolution has come to this Honourable House; no real information is provided by the Government; there is debate, only to discover that we did not have the full facts.

When this site was being visited, the residents were saying and have said quite clearly that they were not going to move. In fact, one man has been quoted as saying that they were approached by Government.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Scantlebury and Mrs. Westerman, I know are loyal supporters, but they told us that they were approached. There are four houses on this plot of land. They were called to a meeting where it was discussed. Now we are being told that is not true, when the residents of St. Peter, who we have visited, have said that they were approached on numerous occasions.

Sir, it is the only logical explanation why the original Resolution would have been drafted as a beach access because there is no way in which Government could have acquired the two parcels of land up front and be able to access the beach.

Sir, let us go further. I said earlier that one parcel of land belongs to Schooner Bay Development (Fort Dignity Limited) but would you believe that when we had the original debate on May 11, 2004, we were told that the Schooner Bay Development was an exemplary corporate citizen and that it, in fact, had cooperated fully with the residents. Sir, having spent in excess of \$10 million, the last thing that the Schooner Bay Development could have done, was to have made available to the Government as a means of truly demonstrating its corporate spirit, the little piece of land that jutted out.

Sir, one would buy a whole acre of land for approximately \$15 million and a little piece that cannot be used for any purpose, and you did not see it fit to extend your hands to the residents surrounding you, but you are now asking Government, or you are going to receive as much as \$46 700 for a little piece of land that is of no use to Schooner Bay Development (Fort Dignity Limited). And we talk about big business/small business relationships.

Mr. Speaker, let us go further. Government did not have to buy this little piece of land or did not have to seek to purchase it, Government could have used moral suasion. Government could have spoken to Schooner Bay Development (Fort Dignity Limited) and could have gotten them to understand that these persons were there for in excess of 60 years. Therefore, now to come and suggest that one would build a guard wall around one's land mark, and that one is now fetching \$46 700 from the Government as the value of this land, is certainly inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I said that the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, who was the Attorney-at-Law for Schooner Bay Development (Fort Dignity Limited), who, in the original debate, talked about the spirit of collaboration between big businesses and small people; about how the interest of the people have to be served; about how Schooner Bay Development (Fort Dignity Limited) is an exemplary corporate citizen, yet he is still seeking to get \$47 000 from the Government for a strip of land, having already been paid in excess of \$15 million.

Mr. Speaker, again there is more in the mortar than the pestle. Sir, the Chief Town Planner would have visited the site. In granting permission for the development of the Schooner Bay Limited, why did the Chief Town Planner not require the developers to provide a public access as a condition of the approval? Why did the Chief Town Planner, in granting the development of the Schooner Bay, did not

require the developers to provide a public access as a condition of the approval? In fact, it is convention almost, that any person or developer going into an area should not disadvantage the existing residents, and we are told that the residents at Queen Street were there for almost 100 years.

Therefore, in the granting of this permission, why did the Chief Town Planner not seek that kind of understanding and agreement by the developers in the execution of the project at Schooner Bay?

Mr. Speaker, the other thing is that they should have been told that as a condition for developing the property, a beach access would have had to be provided.
11.30 a.m.

In fact, years ago at the back of the Westerman's land, there was a beach access. Schooner Bay developed the area, took away the access from the resident but it could have been negotiated for such an access.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the Honourable Member asserting that as a fact or a figment of his imagination? I would like the Honourable Member to produce the evidence. Is the Honourable Member stating it as a fact or an assertion?

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I will ignore that because I am not in a court. This is a matter that could have been dealt with by the Chief Town Planner in executing and granting permission for the development at Schooner Bay. This is why it is important to note that the original intention of the Resolution was correct but having failed to acquire the land, Government was never able to get back to the original Resolution to reword it and only after the Opposition exercised its prudence and vigilance we were told that it was a question of an access to Queen Street.

Sir, that could never have been the case because when it rains heavily the area does not flood, there are cars driving through this area, there is a young man who repairs vehicles, ambulances are able to get access to this area and Coca Cola trucks can go into the area so it could not be a question of providing a direct area.

We were told that there is a muffler centre at the entrance of the properties and that the owner who lives in St. Lucy was told that the muffler centre would be acquired. Sir, here it is that a small businessman who was plying his trade for years had to give in to the bigger expectations and wishes of Fort Dignity Limited in building Schooner Bay. Sir, the muffler centre had apparently become an eyesore and it was felt that it had to be acquired. Sir, being told that, the man subsequently died.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: He was a resident of St. Lucy and I am reliably informed that he subsequently died some time last year because it could not have been tolerated that a muffler centre would sit right next to Schooner Bay development which housed millions of dollars in condominiums for millionaires and, therefore, there was always a plan to acquire the muffler centre at the entrance of the gap.

Sir, this debate also has to do with a big man versus a small man. Over the last ten years we were told that this Administration is rooting for the average man yet still there were attempts to acquire land in this area in order to make big developers happy and the small people less happy.

Sir, on the question of Fort Denmark where the two houses were resited to Mount Brevitor, those residents complained but they were squatting legitimately on the lands of the Government. I am surprised that lawyers do not understand that after seven years of occupying land that you almost have entitlement to that land. Sir, I have been told repeatedly that persons who have been occupying land for seven years would have to apply to the Crown for permission. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with saying that they were squatting legitimately because only now that the area would be developed by commercial enterprise where they removed but they were there for several years even though the land belonged to Government.

Sir, the land that ran from the almshouse went behind Schooner Bay and persons in the area were able to take their boat onto the beach but Schooner Bay has planted trees and flowers in this area which used to be accessible to the average Barbadian and this is no longer the case. Therefore, one would have to question: was Schooner Bay given permission to block off the track that existed there for several decades and was an extension of the Almshouse Road which is well-paved and goes up to the landmark at Schooner Bay.

Sir, I have no doubt that the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, having been the lawyer would know about this. How could a private developer block an access to the beach that was there for so many years. This is similar to an average Barbadian squatting on a piece of land which he does not own. How could a private developer be allowed to block off the track that runs across the beach in the back of Schooner Bay without there being any public outcry. This is something that must be legitimately addressed in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go to the substantive Resolution before us. First, it is recognised that there could not be a provision for beach access. It is also recognised that if the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment has knowledge of the area and an understanding of

Queen Street, that this Resolution would not have reached the Parliament of Barbados in the words that were written.

Sir, it is the responsibility of the Minister to ensure that the correct Resolution come to Parliament but to come back to this Parliament and apologise for an error committed by a public servant is not acceptable. This Resolution was around for a long time. It went into the Ministry as far back as 2002. Therefore, there can be no justification for the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment, indicating to the people of Barbados that she was in possession of a Resolution that had such an error. There can be no justification for it because it had travelled too many miles. It had gone through too many hands. It had gone from politician to a public servant back to a politician and to the Cabinet. How could you justify it? Therefore, this is one of the reasons that the Opposition had to bring this No-Confidence Motion. It is an issue that is also procedural but this is not the first time.

11.40 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, at Greenland we would have spent millions of dollars and then others were accused of providing wrong advice and it would have been the same Minister who would have been responsible for the Greenland land site. We spent in excess of \$35 million acquiring a piece of land which was to be used as a dump but which to this day has not received an ounce of garbage. Again, it is a direct result of an administrative error because the Minister said that she got poor advice from the technocrats.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The truth is you are guilty again of misleading the Honourable Chamber. On that occasion you did with respect to the Greenland landfill, and on this occasion you have done it and, therefore, you have to be prosecuted from This Side; so it cannot be frivolous. It is an administrative error once again playing itself out. The only difference is that was a \$35 million error. That error caused the taxpayers a lot of money and not an ounce of garbage has been received by the landfill and there are Members on That Side that called it environmental madness but that is the capacity of this Administration.

Sir, not too long ago the same Minister described the Honourable Member for St. Michael East as being clothed in the garb of deceit and falsehood in this very Chamber. When the Opposition indicated its intent to bring a Resolution, the very member for St. Michael East went to a public meeting and praised the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment and we on This Side are not supposed to bring any kind of Resolution to put this Administration under any kind of pressure but they can be allowed to put themselves under pressure and when it is necessary retreat.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael East, in an orchestrated move at a gathering of St. Michael constituencies, said that he is behind the Minister who would have only two weeks prior to that described him as being clothed in the garb of deceit and falsehood, in this very Chamber.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: He referred to the Minister as a "Tin Goddess". Yet, when it was time to come together to block, they did precisely that in order to protect themselves.

Sir, it goes deeper. The Resolution also dealt with the Right Honourable Prime Minister and Honourable Member for St. Peter who seconded the Resolution and spoke immediately after. The essence is, you have to have an understanding of Queen Street to understand that the provision of a beach access at this location is unnecessary, in the words of the Ministerial apology. The Right Honourable Prime Minister and Representative for St. Peter has, in fact, represented St. Peter for the last 20 years or more and has very intimate knowledge of Queen Street.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Yet, the Right Honourable Prime Minister at the time of the Resolution did not recognise that, in fact, the Resolution was not worded correctly and should have been able to see it there and then. This is a man that has intimate knowledge of Queen Street. This is a man that represented St. Peter for the last 20 years and, therefore, should have saved the Honourable House the embarrassment of the Opposition having to go to find out the truth, bring it to the public domain and then bring a Resolution to this Honourable Chamber. It could have been done. The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter has such intimate knowledge that when someone suggested that they were developing over twenty acres of land somewhere in St. Peter, the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter said "No way!" and that he could not think of any place in St. Peter where a developer could be wishing to develop 20 acres of land. Mr. Speaker, that is simply to demonstrate the kind of knowledge that the Prime Minister has of St. Peter.

Sir, the Minister of Public Works and the former Minister of Housing and Lands, who was the Minister who initiated this Resolution and the Minister who was in charge of the group that visited the site, got up in the debate and spoke glowingly about the acquisition. He spoke to the issues of how effective such an acquisition would be in conducting the affairs of the Government with respect to development, and how it fitted in nicely with the whole question of the Speightstown Development Plan. This has to be seen within that context because there is a bigger plan, apparently in Speightstown, to develop Speightstown proper and this area

at Queen Street is leading into Speightstown proper and he should have known at the time, having visited the area, that we could not have had an access to the beach.

Sir, it got even deeper where the Minister of Industry and International Business, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, also made his contribution and he must have known that, in fact, these two parcels of land were not being acquired for an access to the beach. In fact, we were told that a former member of the Barbados Labour Party represented Mrs. Westerman with respect to her concerns about Schooner Bay's encroachment on her property; and that she, as a good old St. Philip woman, sought the services of a St. Philip lawyer in this case and, in fact, was ably represented. I have no doubt again, that the Honourable Member for St. Joseph would have collaborated with the lawyer from St. Philip and would have known the circumstances surrounding the Westerman property and, therefore, could not have come on May 11 this year and spoke so eloquently about these two parcels of land being acquired for a beach access.

11.50 a.m.

I ask the people of Barbados to think about what has happened here today, because there is no way, as we pointed out in our plan, that the two parcels of land could have been acquired for beach access. Why would such a mistake have been made in the first place, and why would it have passed through so many hands and was not detected? After it was recognised, the Resolution was changed to make it an access to Queen Street, so even the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, the Minister of Industry and International Business who was so intimately involved in this deal should have known about the true intent or the intent of the land acquisition.

In the last debate, the Minister of Tourism spoke to this issue as well. He said that he was in fact happy to see that the Government and the BTII would be getting involved in the further development of beach front property in this area, because Fort Dignity was now developed by Schooner Bay and, hopefully, BTII would be developing the area around Fort Denmark.

It means that even the Minister of Tourism did not know that two parcels of land were not being acquired for beach access. Yet, he spoke about the intention to develop the area, as a prime property where land would fetch its highest value, which has to be again, an issue. I repeat. Land would fetch its highest value and this is, in fact, something that is being pursued by this Administration without it being told explicitly to the public of Barbados.

This is what explains the whole demise of the sugar industry. It is now what is explaining the desire of this Administration to allow development of the beach front

properties. Therefore, you would have situations in which average Barbadians are going to be disadvantaged.

It is all because land is supposed to fetch its highest value. This is where the issue becomes real between big business and small business in Barbados, since this Administration has stated clearly that it intends to allow land to fetch its highest value. This is also part of this debate, that the developer who acquired the major piece of land next to Fort Denmark is also waiting to develop that property in concert with the Schooner Bay property.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West were ordered expunged from the record by Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, they are pretending not to know that there were some big businessmen intimately involved in the development of Speightstown, but the redevelopment project is nothing new. Do you mean that all of us in here are ignorant, we never read anything, we never heard about certain people promoting the development of Speightstown?

Mr. Speaker, I go further because our Resolution was deliberately broadly drafted to make sure that the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment, the Minister of Public Works, the former Minister of Housing and Lands, the Minister of Industry and International Business, the Honourable Attorney General, the Minister of Tourism and the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter and Prime Minister knew or ought to have known that the said acquisition could not considerably achieve the objective of providing access to the beach.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: This is what we said. It is a fact of life. How could you have gone through so many different stages of this land acquisition and no one in Cabinet, or in the Government detected that the original Resolution was incorrect and only after the Opposition pointed it out, there will be an amendment to the Resolution?

Sir, it is a fact that we could not confine the Resolution to the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. If we had done so, we would not have been able to speak more broadly on the issue. We would not have been able to include individuals who participated in the process, and we would not have been able to deal with the question of collective responsibility on the part of a Cabinet.

Therefore, for the public and those commentators, we had no choice but to broaden the base of inclusion in the Resolution to include Cabinet Members and those who

spoke on the original Resolution, because it had to be the case that we could not restrict the Resolution to the current Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment, so we are fully aware of the role played by the previous Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. Therefore, to have confined the Resolution to a single Minister or an individual would not have been appropriate.

Of course, we know the numbers that are against us, but the thing about it is that, do you only fight when you can come first? Are you only a winner in life when you can come first?

12.00 noon

It cannot be the case, so you have to fight your case regardless of the way in which it may appear as though you are being outnumbered, which is why we brought the Resolution. This is not just about winning a vote of No-Confidence, it is about being able to demonstrate that we have been on the ball in this issue. We have raised issues that appeared not to be very evident and obvious in the initial phase. We did our homework and proved and demonstrated that the original Resolution could not have been because of the errors committed. Therefore, we could not simply accept that it was an error when it was so blatant that so much had been gone through in this process that it could not simply be an error.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced to this day that it was simply an error not when you go and view the area for yourself; not when you get a proper understanding of the Queen Street area; not when you traverse Almshouse Gap; not when you understand that Government has already approved Fort Denmark for commercial development and not when you understand that Almshouse Gap is in fact cutting across the intended area for commercial development. Therefore, there was and there is more in the mortar than the pestle.

Mr. Speaker, in light of what we recognised when we did our research, we thought it necessary to indulge and to get the truth out of this Resolution. That is all we did as was said by a former Prime Minister on the Democratic Labour Party side. The Democratic Labour Party was being accused of being silent. The Democratic Labour Party has picked up its tempo.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fellow who writes every week, as though he is being paid, about the Democratic Labour Party. Even in today's newspaper all kinds of observations have been made about whether or not you could refer to a Government as the Owen Arthur Administration, as a basis for stirring up a debate on a matter that we consider to be serious. He is paid, apparently, to have a weekly column to find whatever he perceived to be wrong, to use all kinds of

non-arguments from the United States of America system as compared with the British system. He is paid to indulge.

Mr. Speaker, we therefore thought it necessary to be able to raise a number of questions in this debate. We thought it necessary to demonstrate that this land was not necessarily being acquired for the purpose stated, but that there is a larger purpose for the acquisition. We find it important to ask the question: who is the group or the person that agitated for the access to the beach? This has not been clearly determined before.

Mr. Speaker, since there was supposed to be a public access, we are also asking for greater detail and information with respect to the access road to the beach. It is our duty as Opposition to find out the facts in the interest of democracy and in the interest of prudence in this Parliament. We have therefore determined that this is our mandate and we are not going to be stopped by any form of intimidation or perceived intimidation by anybody.

We have asked for a proper analysis and assessment of the original public access road that was supposed to be provided to the beach from these two parcels of land. It is only but reasonable that the Government provide such information to the people of Barbados. We have asked whether there could not be an alternative beach path to the beach since there is the existing Almshouse Gap road. If that is so, why do they need to have a public access running from Queen Street to Fort Denmark at the back?

Mr. Speaker, we have asked why did the Chief Town Planner, in granting permission for the development of Schooner Bay, not require the developers to provide a public access as a condition for approval. We have also demonstrated that if there is one public servant who can be blamed for any error, according to the Land Acquisition Act, it could only be the Chief Surveyor of Lands. Therefore, the Government of Barbados can blame the Chief Surveyor of Lands because he has no recourse. He cannot come in the public domain and say that it was not true. He cannot come and defend himself in public. When you pass on the blame to a public servant, he does not have the right to come into the public domain to deny the allegation.

Therefore, it is unfair for any Government to seek to put blame on a public servant when in actual fact it is quite clear what the process or procedure of land acquisition is about.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that a competent Chief Land Surveyor, as he is, would have done his homework, therefore he cannot be accused of having made an error not on the basis of the prudence and the precision by which public servants conduct their business; not on the basis with which public servants stick to the letter of the law and not on the basis on which public servants ensure that they dot every "i" and cross every "t". That is their nature because they see

themselves as ultimately responsible for the accounting part of the Government bureaucracy or the financial part of the Government bureaucracy.

Therefore, it cannot ever be the case that a Chief Land Surveyor, who might have visited the site along with the Minister of Housing at the time and with the Chief Town Planner, could have come back, having viewed the two parcels of land, and made such an heroic error as to suggest that the two parcels of land were being acquired for public access to the beach. Mr. Speaker, that could not have been the case and I can never be convinced of that. That is why I drew my argument along those lines, appearing to agree initially with the error and then proving that it could not have been an error like that. There is no way in which you can expect me to believe that an entire Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment would have perused files for over two years and still make an error of that magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that public servants are not able to represent themselves in public, because if they were able to, then we would know the truth about this original Resolution. Mr. Speaker, the thing is one can blame the public servant knowing that the public servant does not have the right to come into the public domain and tell the truth about the original intent of the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is also the case, as convention, and corporate citizens, as big businesses are supposed to have a heart, that they would look around to see who they are inconveniencing in any development and as a consequence they would seek to make it right. When we were told by the Honourable Member for St. Joseph that Fort Dignity Limited was considerate and concerned about the need to collaborate the interest of the public with its own interest and that of Government's, then at that very stage we would have been expected that he would have been able to tell this Honourable Chamber the truth with respect to what Fort Dignity Limited had intended, and what they were capable of doing. Instead, we have had a situation where this Resolution and the previous one were allowed to travel so far without any true explanation as to the original intent.
12.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we also have a situation where under Section 72(1) of the Constitution of Barbados, the Attorney General is responsible for Resolutions that are brought to Parliament.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Honourable Member needs to read it. Section 72(1) does not make the Attorney General responsible for approving Resolutions before Parliament. Section 72(1) simply says that the Governor-General shall appoint Ministers, one of whom shall be reputed to be an Attorney General and the Chief Legal Advisor.

Sir, the Honourable Member can read it before he gets back up.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is responsible for Government Business in this Chamber. The Attorney General is Leader of Government Business.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the fact that I carry the designation, Leader of Government Business, does not go with my job as Attorney General. If the Honourable Member would remember that in his own Party, the gentleman who just wrote him a letter which said the Honourable Member for St. John should be Leader instead, was Leader of Government Business and he was also Minister of Home Affairs. I am referring to the last Honourable Member for St. Michael North.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Go back and look at the letter.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that to be a Leader of Government Business, one does not have to be an Attorney General. You are Attorney General and you are Leader of Government Business, so it does not mean that there is one way causality and direction. It does not mean that because you are Attorney General, that you are Leader of Government Business. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East could be Leader of Government Business. It has nothing to do with your portfolio of Attorney General.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, could you address the Chair, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, the important thing is that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East is responsible for the kinds of business that come to Parliament, and this cannot be denied.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member must not mislead this Honourable House. As Leader of the Opposition, he holds a higher duty to this Parliament. The only relevance to the Attorney General in relation to business that comes to Parliament is, in fact, to make sure that a Resolution or a Bill is consistent with the Constitution of Barbados. That is a constitutional convention not found in any statute.

Secondly, as Leader of Government Business, all that happens is that I order the business of the Honourable House in terms of how we meet and when we meet, but I do not approve any Resolution or Bill to come to this Parliament. I cannot dictate what matters should come before this Honourable House. If that is how it is done in

George Street, then the Honourable Member must understand that is not how it is done in this Honourable House.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East is a Member of Cabinet and, therefore, is collectively responsible. I, therefore, wonder why the Honourable Member gets additional funds. The Leader of Government Business has extra responsibility as Deputy Prime Minister, which she is now, and I wonder why she gets additional funds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, Honourable Member.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if the Honourable Member had kept building a relationship with his last Leader of Government Business, the last former Honourable Member for St. Michael North, he would know that the Leader of Government Business does not receive one cent for any additional functions that are carried on. This was not so when it was the Honourable Philip Greaves, and if the Honourable Member would talk to him more, he would know that. It was not so when it was the Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown. It was not so when it was the former Honourable Member for St. Thomas. It was not so when it was the former Prime Minister, Sir Harold St. John, who has died, and it was not so now that it was me.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the only person who draws money under false pretences in the Public Service of Barbados, is the Leader of the Opposition, by his own admission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Honourable Member could you move on, please?

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, if, indeed, we are collecting money on false pretences, if the operation and the performance of this Opposition, which has been able to bring several matters to this Honourable Chamber, as a consequence of the hard work being done by this Opposition and as a consequence of the public's recognition of the work being done, there is, in fact, substantial evidence which is in the public domain to show that this Opposition has been particularly active and has been doing tremendous work on a weekly basis in this Honourable Chamber, demonstrating that we are in fact, earning our keep in this Honourable Chamber.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Honourable Member, could you get back to the Resolution?

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: That is why this Resolution demonstrates and represents the vigilance of the Opposition. Therefore, the Opposition has to be praised by the public of

Barbados for the effort it is making in keeping this Administration on its toes. Sir, nobody can deny that over the last year in this Honourable Chamber, this Opposition has, in fact, been keeping the Government on its toes in many respects.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this Resolution today is just another example of the prudent work that the Opposition has been doing and will continue to do in the interest of the good people of Barbados. As a result of our vigilance, we have certainly demonstrated that we can no longer take it for granted that issues coming to this Honourable Chamber, are, in fact, issues that are necessarily purely above board, and are in the interest of the wider public of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, it is not by accident that we were so well prepared for this debate. It is not by accident that we visited with the residents of Queen Street. It is not by accident that our arguments were made to suit the circumstances of the Resolution. It is not by accident that we were able to identify clearly efforts made by this Government with respect to this Resolution. It is not by accident that we got the kind of information from the people of Queen Street that allowed us to be able to defend their cause and to defend a cause for the wider interest of the average black Barbadian. It is not by accident that we thought it necessary to go there and to do our work, to ensure that we represent the interest the small man against the interest from entities such as Schooner Bay Development. It is not by accident that we are concerned about the potential development of Fort Denmark to the exclusion of the average Barbadian and to the average person in St. Peter.

12.20 p.m.

Sir, it is not by accident that we thought it necessary to bring out the issues which may not be apparent in a simple Resolution and that we investigated this matter thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, it pleases me that we have been able to bring such a Resolution against the Government of Barbados having provided the evidence to demonstrate where there was wrongdoing and that we are concerned about the further development of the area surrounding Fort Dignity and Fort Denmark. Sir, we are also concerned with the potential threat of the access road.

We raise these issues because we are convinced that we are doing so in the interest of average Barbadians and making sure that development, while it has to occur, cannot do so to the disadvantage of the average Barbadian. In this instance, there was evidence that residents of Queen Street were being disadvantaged to some extent by the intent of the original Resolution to make a public access to the beach. Sir, this is the purpose and stated reason for our bringing this No-Confidence motion to the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, today is St. Peter Day. It is a day in which all of mankind recognise St. Peter people wherever there are. I want to begin through you, Mr. Speaker and this House, by sending salutations to the wonderful people of St. Peter on whose behalf I have had the honour to serve as a representative for twenty years. In that general salutation, I must also send happy greetings for the day to my constituents and loyal supporter, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West although I suspect that after this debate he will not have anything to be happy about.

Sir, it is often said that silence is golden. The House and country will recognise that I have allowed this controversy to swirl because I recognise that the base of it is not about the people of St. Peter or my capacity to represent them or the interest of the Government of Barbados to represent them. This controversy is about George Street Democratic Labour Party politics and the question is about whether the Democratic Labour Party is alive.

Mr. Speaker, I have been patient in allowing the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West to speak goaded, as he is these days by the Honourable Member for St. Philip West, who now serves him as a moat around a castle as was done in olden days to stop the penetration from the other pretenders in the Democratic Labour Party. So, he must speak, if he can, after this debate.

Sir, a lot of allegations have been put in the public domain and a lot of things asserted without reference to the facts and I have no prerogative to speak other than to the facts. I shall speak today and present the evidence by first asking how did the matter arise.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West went on record today and said that the Government approached these people about the acquisition of this land as part of a general sinister motive to meet the needs of some unnamed developer in the general vicinity.

Sir, this matter started on May 3, 2002, by way of a letter from the attorney of Mrs. Westerman. The letter was written by the attorney to persons acting on behalf of Schooner Bay to try to find an amicable Resolution to an issue that would have been potentially difficult. First, Schooner Bay was intending to build a road to block off what people regarded as their traditional access to land and secondly, that in the case of Mrs. Westerman, Schooner Bay enjoyed title to a piece of land that was in her family for hundreds of years and she needed to go to court to have her rights secured.

Sir, the attorneys were good enough to copy it to me and I will make it a document of the House.

In the letter the Attorney was asking for the following:

“that no building or other works be carried out on that portion of land which is situate to the immediate east of the Westerman’s house”

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West said that Government approached the residents but this letter is dated May 2, 2002.

Sir, the letter continues:

Mr. Speaker, these are the two issues, to stop Schooner Bay from building a road to block the right-of-way and also, if you acquired the land, to broaden it so that the people remaining there can have a road that can allow a fire tender and so on to pass because the galvanise shed was standing in the way of fire tenders being able to pass if people needed them.

Sir, the people said that they wanted to meet with their Member of Parliament to discuss the matter. A letter dated July 11 indicated that the meeting not only took place between Mr. Linton and Mr. Westerman but all the parties involved, including Mrs. Scantlebury on whose behalf the Leader of the Opposition is now shedding false tears. The letter was written to me on May 3, as the Honourable Member for St. Peter and by May 12, I had met with all the attorneys and the residents involved telling them that I would come to St. Peter on that Sunday to see it for myself.

Mr. Speaker, my office has kept copies of the notes with the meeting held with the residents and the site. Mr. Linton’s office was good enough on May 16 to send my office a copy of the notes of the meeting and when you hear these, Mr. Speaker, you will begin to understand the simple facts behind this matter.

Sir, Mr. Patrick Carter, a former Democratic Labour Party member was one of the persons working with Mrs. Westerman and the Government. The notes made by my Executive Assistant said that the property located at the back of Mrs. Westerman’s house is the land of Government. We must note this because this is the key to this battle. The property where the Scantlebury families reside is owned by Mr. Alan Ishmael and the Scantlebury family received a court order to vacate the premises by December 31, 2001. Sir, the property was formerly owned by Mr. Milton Rollock who gave the Scantlebury family permission to build houses on the land.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North is telling this House that this House is involved with some sinister, nasty game to run the Scantlebury family off the land but, Sir, they were served with a court order. The Prime Minister informed the Minister that the Government should

seek to acquire the land for the tenants but it stated that if the court had ordered them to move, Government would have to find land to relocate them. Mr. Speaker, that is how I got involved in this matter to begin with.

12.30 p.m.

Sir, a memo from my office said that, my Executive Assistant is to forward copies of the court order sent to the Scantlebury families to Mr. Rudolph Hinkson, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Housing and Lands and Mr. Chesterfield Scantlebury, who was also an officer of the Ministry of Housing.

Mr. Speaker, the land to the front is privately owned and the private developer intended to put a road across to block the access of people. Mrs. Westerman is saying that the land has been in her possession a hundred years and she has given the residents adverse possession. The residents also said that the road is too narrow and that Government should acquire a little bit more to allow a fire tender to pass and that is what happened on May 12.

Mr. Speaker, the note sent to my office by Mr. Hutson Linton also stated the matters discussed. They agreed at the meeting that the boulders be removed at the entrance of the right-of-way to the Westerman's property. Sir, we were not protecting Schooner Bay. Schooner Bay put boulders and we told them to move them. We have to acquire the land occupied by the galvanised building at the front because if you do not acquire that land, it does not make any sense acquiring any land whatsoever because the people cannot have access by way of a fire tender. Sir, the acquisition of an open piece of land to the east and to the west of Westerman's property would be to give the people access by way of a fire tender.

Sir, provision of a formal legal footpath over Government property leading from the Westerman's house, to the seaside if possible, utilising the existing footpath. Sir, on Government's property, to the west of Westerman's house, there was an existing footpath leading to the sea. Sir, all we are saying that there we have the piece at the back already and we will now acquire the piece of land at the front and join them. That is all that there is to this.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this a document of the House.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, there is an existing footpath on the Government's property. Therefore, when the matter came to Cabinet, to the extent that there was already a footpath leading to the sea that has been used by the people of that district for hundreds of years, we saw this as an entire exercise in and of itself, and as Barbadians would say, acquired the piece to the front to give an access

and to protect the right- of-way of people from Schooner Bay who were seeking to put a wall across it, widen it so that we can have access to it by way of a fire tender and join it to the existing footpath of the land owned by Government.

Sir, the Opposition in this case sought to suggest that we sought to move poor people off that area in the interest of some unnamed developer, the author of the Speightstown Development Plan and that all of this is with a view to hurting these poor people.

Mr. Speaker, the action that my office required when I met with Mrs. Scantlebury and others asked them to get me a copy of the court order evicting these four persons from lands owned by Mr. Ishmael. A letter came on October 28. Attached is a copy...

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: The Government has not sought to move anybody from Queen Street. A private owner got an injunction from the court requiring them to be moved. Mr. Speaker, this is a copy of the court order between Mr. Allan Ishmael, Mr. Nigel Scantlebury, Mr. William Scantlebury, Mr. Victor Scantlebury, Mrs. Elsie Archer and Mrs. Janet Powers.

Sir, what did I do? I sent the court order to the National Housing Corporation and told them that these are four persons who already enjoyed rights of tenancy, they have been ordered to be ejected from lands owned by a private developer and could they help them find lots? I would hope that every Member of Parliament in a similar situation would do likewise.

Sir, the National Housing Corporation wrote my office on October 28 indicating that attached are four reports on the applicants who have been served with ejection notices as requested. The proposed lots allocated to the applicants are as follows:

Nigel Scantlebury Lot 3, Hope Road, St. Lucy; Victor Scantlebury Lot 48, Mount Brevitor, St. Peter; Winston Scantlebury Lot 55, Mount Brevitor, St. Peter and Janet Powers, Lot 17, Maynards, St. Peter.

Sir, this Honourable House has been detailed with this concoction that the Government has some sinister plan as part of a general design to evict poor people from living close to Fort Denmark because there is some plan approved, in the imagination of the mind of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, for the use of the land that these poor people occupy. Sir, the Honourable Member has not been able to adduce one shred of evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this debate to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and to support it with the facts. His facts said that if there was a disadvantage suffered by my constituents, it was not inflicted by the Government, it was inflicted by a Mr. Allan Ishmael who went to court and asked them to leave. As Member of Parliament for St. Peter, I intervened in the matter only to represent them by asking the National Housing Corporation to survey their places and if they can help them for me, that is all that I did.

I have a survey, Executive Order No. 892, from the National Housing Corporation of every case. Mr. Nigel Scantlebury is 42 years old and with nowhere else to turn he went to the National Housing Corporation in search of a spot to resite his house and the same applied for Mr. Winston Scantlebury and the others. They were the victims of a court order and this Government that is being pilloried sought to utilise government land to resite them.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is being taken as some fantastical nonsense of our seeking to clear poor people off land. I say to this Honourable House that never has any person in any Parliament in the world been the subject of a more frivolous Resolution for something that is so nonsensical.

I want to say to the Honourable Member of St. Michael North West that my people of St. Peter feel that they have been used by you and the Democratic Labour Party as part of the politics of confusion at George Street.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I also want to say further that when you read the notice you would see that some of them were keeping pigs and fowls. They asked me to come here to represent them to say that after the visit by the Democratic Labour Party and its members that some of the fowls are missing too.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I am not accusing anybody of carrying away fowls but the fowls are missing.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Sanitation Department has for many years obtained at Fort Denmark, a depot for washing sanitation trucks. Sir, from the time I was in the Opposition until now, I have complained about it, both because it is ill health to wash sanitation trucks down into the sea, and it is ridiculous to have a sanitation depot on a beach at Fort Denmark, a historical site.

Fort Denmark also complained about it. I have been complaining about it for years and I have tried to get the Minister of Health to move it. Fort Dignity said that it really affected their property. I said that the Government is going to move it, but if they wanted to help with the cost of the relocation so as to cushion the impact on the taxpayers. Sir, that has been the extent of our relationship with Schooner Bay.

Sir, there were two old properties on that site that were moved. There were some people who were occupying land illegally whom we have also helped. All we have sought to do therefore, Sir, is to regularise a situation at Queen Street.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, based upon what happened on the site visit, I linked in my own mind, the fact that we were acquiring land to the front to join up to an existing footpath to the back, as the Barbadians would say. When the matter came to Cabinet, I saw nothing wrong with it because it was already planted in my mind that the two were linked.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, when I went there it was both to make sure that there was a right-of-way for the people I represent and the protection of the residents from the outrages of Fort Denmark, but also to ensure that an existing footpath to the sea which people have used for years, would not be swept away by private development. Sir, as I said, in my mind, the two were always linked.

Sir, the fact of the matter is that in strictly accurate terms, the Resolution that came to the House was only for the part to the front for the right-of-way and that is what it should have said, but there is nothing more sinister about this matter. Mr. Speaker, had I been aware that there would have been all this confusion, I would have gone back in my parliamentary records and shared the notes with the Government but that is all there is to this matter.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, now that you have heard the facts and understand why the persons like Mrs. Scantlebury have to move from Queen Street, this is a simple case of the Government trying to protect people from the arbitrary actions of developers. In so doing, if we are going to improve to do it properly, if there is an existing link to the sea, try to link it and then subsequently, Mr. Speaker, try to help tenants who have been disadvantaged by the actions of the court.

Sir, if I am to be held guilty of misusing my office as Prime Minister and my responsibilities as the Honourable Member for St. Peter, for having been party to the actions I

have described, then you will have to hold me guilty. I want to say to the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West that I know how anxious he is for an issue, but this is the wrong issue.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Sir, at the start of this term, I had a consultation with the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West. I said that Parliament has diminished in significance in the eyes of the people, and he remembered it. I said to let us in this term, use the confidence of the people to restore their Parliament. This is true. I told him that I am not here to advise him, but in my parliamentary experience, there have been times when I had to take decisions that my Party may not like but which I thought was in the best interest of the country.

I referenced to him that I felt I could, with confidence, speak about a social contract and a social partnership because when I was in Opposition, I came to this Parliament and said that I believe in an Incomes Policy, social contract and a social partnership, and I was going to support it, even if it offended my Party.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I also told him that as leaders, there are times when we have to do what is right even if it offends our Party, if we are going to restore this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is here because the Executive of the Democratic Labour Party says it has to be brought here. I do not believe deep in his heart that although the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West has spoken for two hours, now that he hears the facts, he really feels this is a matter that should be engaging this House, when this Sitting of the House today was intended for us to deal with all of the CARICOM matters, so that I could have gone to CARICOM, Sir, with Barbados being CSME ready; but we have had to differ.

I have just come back, Mr. Speaker, from Africa. I had to go there because the EU is proposing to cut the sugar price by 40 per cent. I did not go there because I like to travel. I went there because I needed to add my voice to all those in the developing world who understand that the way ahead for us, Sir, is serious unless we see ourselves as parliamentarians in a different way, and treat the people's business with seriousness.

I have public officers working to bring a new Public Service Act to this Parliament to reconfigure the relationship with the employees in the public service and all across this Government, we have serious business to attend. Our people,

Mr. Speaker, know that they are living in a new world of new risks and uncertainties.

As I speak to you, having fought the OECD in 1998, we have to gear ourselves, guard ourselves and brace up our every sinew for the possibility, once again, of having to deal with the OECD and their attacks on Barbados.

What is this House now, Mr. Speaker, reduced to? This nonsense, based on nothing more than a Leader of the Opposition and some of his cohorts, who have sat here and gotten fat and fallow for a whole year, who now need to go to their annual conference, Mr. Speaker, with some evidence that they are alive. If you want to prove that you are alive, you could either belch or wink.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: ...Or ask me to feel your pulse. Mr. Speaker, to engage this whole House at this time, when there is so much serious work to be done, with an exercise merely to prove that the Democratic Labour Party is alive is, I feel, to use this House in a wanton, irresponsible and mischievous way. If anybody should have been on trial today, Sir, it should be the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of our consultation among ourselves to make the House serious, if he would agree I am going to ask him to withdraw this Resolution right away. I am challenging him to be a man and to show that he can lead the Democratic Labour Party from in front and not be swept along like debris, as he is now being swept along like debris. As I said, if he is a man, he should get up and withdraw this Resolution.

I will sit and let him withdraw.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: You are not withdrawing it? 12.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have presented the evidence I have in my files as to why the No-Confidence Motion should be in the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I must now present the evidence from His Side as to why the No-Confidence Motion should be in him. He will get it from Both Sides, Sir.

Sir, the Election Offences and Controversies Act speaks about bribery of electors as being a serious offence. Section 58 of the Act says that any Member of this House who has been elected at a parliamentary election by way of known bribery is guilty of an offence and should be expelled from sitting in this House for at least ten years.

He had a cohort who is his accomplice, the Honourable Member for St. Philip West. He is as a moat for a castle. Sir, I have an interesting set of documents here not just from my files but from the Democratic Labour Party files. Sir, this is a letter from Mr. Kevin Skeete to a Mr. David Estwick complaining about the money the Democratic Labour Party owed him from the last election. Sir, there is one famous paragraph in this letter that I will explain to all and sundry how the St. Michael North West seat went into the possession, because I have to put it in those propriety terms, of this now sitting member after all the good work of Mark Williams. He complained about how much money the Democratic Labour Party owed him. His letter states: I further wish to draw to your attention that Mr. Laron Gibbs paid me \$10 000 to do a job for him and not for the Democratic Labour Party.

The job was to identify 400 persons from St. Michael North West who were not Clyde Mascoll's supporters so that he could pay them to vote for Mascoll.

Sir, I am making this a document of the House.

Sir, the Election Offences and Controversies Act is clear that this is bribery under the law and is subject to imprisonment. You have to act on this now, Mr. Speaker. I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to bring this to the attention of the Director of Public Prosecutions so that justice can be served in this land.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest and to protect the name of Mr. Laron Gibbs in this debate because this is a very serious allegation. In fact, it is so wicked that something would be done about it, certainly to Mr. Skeete.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is your point of order.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The point of order is that Mr. Laron Gibbs never paid anyone to vote for me in the last election. I therefore would have to take this matter very far, and I know he will because it is ridiculous.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, you have made your point of order. Sir, would you take your seat, please. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, I said take your seat!

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, I can understand his anger, but I offered him the opportunity to withdraw the foolishness because I had proven beyond a shadow of doubt based upon the evidence that every one of the assertions he had made without fact were baseless and foolish. I asked him to be a man and withdraw it, he would not, and he will now pay the penalty in this debate.

Sir, the Democratic Labour Party has brought a Resolution to this Parliament that would want to suggest that I have allowed my constituents to be purchased in the interest of big business in this country, and if it were not true that all of the action in Queen Street was because I was willing to allow my people to be purchased. I say to the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West that the people of St. Peter in whose name I speak on this St. Peter's day are priceless. They do not have a price and I am proud to be a St. Peter man.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: One minute, please, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, I am warning you, there would be just this warning. There are rules in here and everybody must follow these rules. I am asking you to desist from this kind of behaviour, please.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I have an hour and in winding up too and I may have to return.

Mr. Speaker, the quirk of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West is that I should resign as Prime Minister of the country because the argument that has been used without reference to fact, but based on what he calls logic, is that I allowed the residents of St. Peter to be the victims of some conspiracy where their interest was being bought out. I repudiate that with every fibre of my being in their name.

Mr. Speaker, in this entire matter even if there might have been administrative errors, the motive of the Government was pure at every stage. Mr. Speaker, nobody can buy the people of St. Peter, but can the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West come to this House on the very grounds that he has asked to condemn me and say that the people that he now represents cannot be bought and can be bought with his direct involvement. If that is so, then the very grounds that he has sought to use against me must now be used against him, Mr. Speaker. That is why I say there is nothing to this Resolution and I am asking this House and the entire country to repudiate it for the frivolous nonsense that it is.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

including draftsmen and architects. They would all come from the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment.

When that is finished, a design team of the Ministry becomes involved and produces a site plan. The site plan is then taken back to the Minister. The Minister will then determine that what is on the plan is what she or he desires. The plan then goes to the Town and Country Planning Department. If the Ministry of Public Works is involved, it also goes to that Ministry.

Sir, the Solicitor-General's Office, located in the Attorney General's Office, then becomes involved. After that, it then goes back to the Minister and a Cabinet Paper is then created. The Permanent Secretary then upgrades the Cabinet Paper to a final Cabinet Paper document. I hope the people of Barbados are listening very carefully to what I am saying.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: I do not want to hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, when the final Cabinet Paper is then drawn up, it is then sent to the Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet then meets as a caucus to discuss that particular Resolution and acquisition. If there were a discussion on more than one occasion, either they are all blind, cannot read or were in collusion. Further, Mr. Speaker, it also suggests to me that Cabinet is collectively responsible with respect to this so-called error. Sir, I will prove later that it is not an error.

2.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Cabinet approved this Resolution on two separate occasions and then it was brought to Parliament. This Government now comes to the House of Assembly, after I have already expressed that this Government, under the Westminster system is bound by Parliament because the Executive is a sub-sector of Parliament and by extension is managed by Parliament because Parliament determines whether Bills and Resolutions are passed are not.

Sir, how in heaven's name after Cabinet met and the paper trail which I have just outlined had been gone through, can any Minister or member on That Side say to this Honourable Chamber that they did not know and now agree that there was a mistake? Sir, the Resolution was written in English, not in French.

Sir, I go back to the fundamental tenets of parliamentary responsibility which is the collective responsibility that emanates from the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy and I then go on to the individual responsibility that the Minister has. Furthermore, under the

Westminster system with respect to individual responsibility to a Minister, if the Minister's department is found to be incompetent or in scandal, the convention is to resign. Additionally, via the collective Cabinet convention, it makes all the Ministers culpable. Unfortunately, under our first-past-the-post system, Government may have a large majority and backbenchers are like jelly fish in their consistency and, in the European vernacular, are backbench payroll parliamentarians who work for the Government not only as parliamentarians but employed by Government. They do not have the moral decency to stand up and do what is right when something has gone wrong. Sir, they sit like wimps...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you cannot make such references to Honourable Members on the Backbench. You will have to withdraw those words. We are all Honourable Members in here whether Backbench or Frontbench and you cannot make such references. Please withdraw the words and move on.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, I follow your ruling. I think they are Honourable Members indeed, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I really had no intention of getting caught up in this idiotic debate. It is important that no other Honourable Member on the Other Side will be able to put words in my mouth. This debate has been already said by the Prime Minister to be one that is foolish. The Prime Minister said the debate did not make any sense and that it was wasting Parliament's time but I do not believe that is the case when there is something called collective responsibility. The Cabinet has met on this Resolution on more than one occasion and still brought the wrong one to Parliament. Sir, it is an amazing thing that with the entire paper trail already laid out, it could not have been a mistake. Sir, if there were a mistake, they should all resign because of incompetence. Sir, do they not meet on Thursday. Is it not the responsibility that if such a Resolution is brought to Cabinet that it is discussed?

Sir, if it is discussed at Cabinet meeting on Thursday, then there is an opportunity for every member of Parliament to speak to it or not to speak. How can they now say it was a mistake when they had the opportunity to correct it. Sir, you are also culpable because everyone on That Side misled Parliament.

Sir, it is significant because, if the Opposition Democratic Labour Party did not point out the error, what would have happened when this so-called Resolution went to the Other Place? Would someone in the Other Place have attempted to point out the error?

Sir, this is a significant debate because Parliament makes law and I believe as well as the other members of the

including draftsmen and architects. They would all come from the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment.

When that is finished, a design team of the Ministry becomes involved and produces a site plan. The site plan is then taken back to the Minister. The Minister will then determine that what is on the plan is what she or he desires. The plan then goes to the Town and Country Planning Department. If the Ministry of Public Works is involved, it also goes to that Ministry.

Sir, the Solicitor-General's Office, located in the Attorney General's Office, then becomes involved. After that, it then goes back to the Minister and a Cabinet Paper is then created. The Permanent Secretary then upgrades the Cabinet Paper to a final Cabinet Paper document. I hope the people of Barbados are listening very carefully to what I am saying.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: I do not want to hear you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, when the final Cabinet Paper is then drawn up, it is then sent to the Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet then meets as a caucus to discuss that particular Resolution and acquisition. If there were a discussion on more than one occasion, either they are all blind, cannot read or were in collusion. Further, Mr. Speaker, it also suggests to me that Cabinet is collectively responsible with respect to this so-called error. Sir, I will prove later that it is not an error.

2.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Cabinet approved this Resolution on two separate occasions and then it was brought to Parliament. This Government now comes to the House of Assembly, after I have already expressed that this Government, under the Westminster system is bound by Parliament because the Executive is a sub-sector of Parliament and by extension is managed by Parliament because Parliament determines whether Bills and Resolutions are passed are not.

Sir, how in heaven's name after Cabinet met and the paper trail which I have just outlined had been gone through, can any Minister or member on That Side say to this Honourable Chamber that they did not know and now agree that there was a mistake? Sir, the Resolution was written in English, not in French.

Sir, I go back to the fundamental tenets of parliamentary responsibility which is the collective responsibility that emanates from the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy and I then go on to the individual

responsibility that the Minister has. Furthermore, under the Westminster system with respect to individual responsibility to a Minister, if the Minister's department is found to be incompetent or in scandal, the convention is to resign. Additionally, via the collective Cabinet convention, it makes all the Ministers culpable. Unfortunately, under our first-past-the-post system, Government may have a large majority and backbenchers are like jelly fish in their consistency and, in the European vernacular, are backbench payroll parliamentarians who work for the Government not only as parliamentarians but employed by Government. They do not have the moral decency to stand up and do what is right when something has gone wrong. Sir, they sit like wimps...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you cannot make such references to Honourable Members on the Backbench. You will have to withdraw those words. We are all Honourable Members in here whether Backbench or Frontbench and you cannot make such references. Please withdraw the words and move on.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, I follow your ruling. I think they are Honourable Members indeed, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I really had no intention of getting caught up in this idiotic debate. It is important that no other Honourable Member on the Other Side will be able to put words in my mouth. This debate has been already said by the Prime Minister to be one that is foolish. The Prime Minister said the debate did not make any sense and that it was wasting Parliament's time but I do not believe that is the case when there is something called collective responsibility. The Cabinet has met on this Resolution on more than one occasion and still brought the wrong one to Parliament. Sir, it is an amazing thing that with the entire paper trail already laid out, it could not have been a mistake. Sir, if there were a mistake, they should all resign because of incompetence. Sir, do they not meet on Thursday. Is it not the responsibility that if such a Resolution is brought to Cabinet that it is discussed?

Sir, if it is discussed at Cabinet meeting on Thursday, then there is an opportunity for every member of Parliament to speak to it or not to speak. How can they now say it was a mistake when they had the opportunity to correct it. Sir, you are also culpable because everyone on That Side misled Parliament.

Sir, it is significant because, if the Opposition Democratic Labour Party did not point out the error, what would have happened when this so-called Resolution went to the Other Place? Would someone in the Other Place have attempted to point out the error?

Sir, this is a significant debate because Parliament makes law and I believe as well as the other members of the

Opposition that we voted for a Resolution under false pretences. As a result, we were cajoled into voting for a Resolution because at the time we voted for it, we believed what was said.

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Peter seconded the Resolution and said that it was a great departure from the way the Democratic Labour Party did Resolutions. The Honourable Member for St. Philip South said:

“I want to thank the previous member of housing for putting us in this position where the House can today treat to this particular matter.”

Sir, what position is he talking about? Is it a position of being misled? Sir, it was a false Resolution but is the Prime Minister saying that it was right? I want to make the point that this Resolution was indeed an attempt to acquire beachfront property under false pretences.
2.20 p.m.

I have the presentation here from the Honourable Member for St. James South and I am using some notes that I prepared from this document. In every paragraph there is reference to beach, coastal lands, beachfront property and windows to the sea. Are you going to tell me that people are going to come and tell us that it was a mistake and that it was with respect to the acquisition of land for the provision of access to a house? It cannot be, Sir.

I even referred to the notes from the Prime Minister's statement. The Prime Minister said,

“I believe that the House would have heard not only a speech delivered with great clarity but with a speech that represents the specific local issues as it should be represented but spoke very clearly and eloquently to the broader national issues related to symbolism of development.”

Mr. Speaker, he spoke to the national policy of developing beachfront property and maintaining windows to the sea. How are they going to argue, after every paragraph in the presentation of the Ministerial Statement to this Honourable Member spoke to beach access, West Coast land and preserving windows to the sea, now we are going to hear that it is a mistake? It cannot be, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister was also hoodwinked that he would also support a Resolution that he knew nothing about, then something is fundamentally wrong. Sir, when I heard the talk about this is a debate that made no sense, it was frivolous and all sorts of nonsense, what I had to revisit was the collective responsibility of the Cabinet of

the Barbados Labour Party and how that collective responsibility is subservient to and is necessarily analysed by Parliament, which includes the Opposition.

Therefore, I have to look for the second element, the fact that a Minister has the responsibility to come to the Parliament, and know what she is saying, it is a responsibility to come to this House of Assembly, present documents that she knows what she is speaking about. That kind of incompetence cannot be accepted with an apology. It is an affront to politics and parliamentary democracy in Barbados and the Opposition will not accept it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the Prime Minister talking about this being an idiotic discussion.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, let us hear the Honourable Member.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: He speaks about the level of debate in Parliament but it is the Honourable Member who continues to bring extraneous information on people's personal files into this Parliament. He even went into the Ministries and brought people's personal files, documents, to the House of Assembly and he is the same person who says that he wants to lift the standard of Parliament. He is the one who is bringing it down.

Sir, I will never forget that they brought a letter that I wrote to the General Secretary of the Democratic Labour Party in the public debate. It is an abomination and now to bring a firm into this debate is an insult and he should be ashamed.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: I want to make two more quick points. I want to revisit the Statement by the Honourable Member for St. James South re the apology where it is stating that the acquisition could not obviously be for beach access. If that is the case I want to find out what were the presentations of the Prime Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, the Honourable Member for St. George North, the Honourable Attorney General all about? Were they dreaming? They spoke to the Resolution.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of order, please.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Once again the Honourable Member has to reflect the facts and accuracy. The Attorney General never spoke in the debate. Therefore, for him to refer to me speaking in the debate is once again to mislead this House. In my view, since he was present that is a deliberate act of misleading.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member would you withdraw?

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: I would withdraw and rephrase. It is the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member stated that she never spoke.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, there were one or two points of order that were raised by the Honourable Member in the latter stage of the debate.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this House. His speech is recorded when a Member takes his position, starts to speak and concludes. A point of order and a point of elucidation could never be considered a speech, if not Mr. Speaker, you would not be able to speak more than once.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East made a contribution to the debate.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please withdraw and move on.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: I withdraw. I want to make a statement with respect to the Town and Country Planning Department that also spoke to this matter. When I was in St. Peter a couple of them told me two things.

Mr. SPEAKER: A couple of whom?

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: When I was on my site visit in St. Peter I had dialogue with the residents in the area and many of them had good recall with respect to what the Chief Town Planner had to say.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: He said that road with respect to the site is a Class 1 road. He said that this Class 1 road is to the east, the Schooner Bay Development to south and an unoccupied house to the north. He went on to say that there are two houses to the west which takes access via the strip of land to be acquired with the development of the coastal land, not ordinary land. There is a need to ensure public access to the beach with respect to that project. Do not question me, question the Chief Town Planner. If it is that the Chief Town Planner could be talking about coastal land and providing access to the beach, how could you come into this Honourable House and say to me or any member of That Side that it was not for a public access to the beach, is the Chief Town Planner a half of a madman?

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: If all of you on the Other Side would opt to go into Cabinet meetings and approve a Resolution to provide for access to a beach and you are wrong, stand up like men and women and take the wrong that should come to you for that. You are accountable to Parliament and the people of Barbados for misleading the Opposition and the people. That is the point.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Mr. Speaker, I want to make the last two points. When we visited Queen Street – I have excellent recall – on the left side is the property belonging to Licorish and on the right there is a piece of land, that we are discussing with respect to Fort Dignity, that juts out in front of the Westermans' property. I heard in this House of Assembly that a service vehicle could not pass there. I measured the road. It is 14.2 feet wide. This is wider than many of the major roads in tenantries, where buses pass, taxis pass, Coca Cola trucks pass, ambulances pass... 2.30 p.m.

Asides.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Yet, they are telling me that they acquired it to provide what already exists. Sir, there is already a path down through the road. I would not accept the position that there was any beach access from that site, because you would have to go through Westerman's land and through the backyards of the residents of Westerman's property.

I walked down through the Westerman property and the three other houses on the right and the only way I could have gotten to the Government land, which is owned by the BTII was to pass through the backyards of these people. How in heaven's name I am being told that this was supposed to preserve an access with respect to the track behind Westerman's property. Let them explain that one to me, Sir, because in order to access the track behind Westerman's property, you had to pass through the yard of those people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has one minute to conclude.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Speaker, what is important is that these are statements that are fully disputed and this Government, because of its collective responsibility to the House of Assembly needs to take stock and because of the individual responsibility of the Minister of Housing and Lands, now with respect to the incompetence of her Ministry and the fact that she would have had to initiate the Resolution, it did not come from a

junior clerk, she must be held accountable. She is responsible to Parliament and under the convention of Parliament regarding the individual's responsibility, the only penalty is resignation, throughout all the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I believe is the only just recourse because it would be an affront, one that cannot survive any ethical premise from the level of the categorical imperative or utilitarian positions. It is therefore a position that is untenable to Parliament. She has to go.

I thank you, Sir.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. Indeed, this is in fact a refreshing exercise because it brings to this Honourable House a debate which is focussed on a Resolution brought by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, seeking to prosecute the Government of the day on a breach contained in a Resolution which they brought in May 2004.

This is not an issue from which any of us should retreat in order to find ourselves dishonourable graves. It is a Resolution which, by our mere presence in this House, we have to treat as serious business on behalf of the affected people of Queen Street. We can argue from our given vantage points any particular matter. We can argue that it was a genuine error. We can argue that it was a duplicitous error. We argue that it was a *complicatus* error. We can put up all of these pedestals and we can try to either keep them up or knock them down.

At the end of the day, anyone with any modicum of sense or decency can say that an Opposition any part of the world does not have a right to bring this matter or any other matter to this House or any other House in which they are or were elected, so let that be clear. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the people will decide. That is their right. In a democracy we cannot take that from the people, neither can we take that from the Opposition in this House.

What essentially is happening, Mr. Speaker, really screams loudly to a corruption of the processes which we tend to employ in this country. What happens in our Ministries and what happens among our public servants, because our public servants are implicated in this matter, where the genuine error is concerned, Sir, but they must be the silent workers. Nowhere in the Ministerial Statement have I yet heard that the Minister has said, I am responsible for this error. I think that is unfair and unfortunate. All I am hearing is, the Ministry, one of the nebulous constructs that we have. A Ministry is supposed to be faceless but the people must have a face so we can blame, and I do not know which civil servant, neither do I really care at this point in time, because this civil servant has to speak now or somewhere down the road.

This has happened in Barbados before, so I really do not have any particular interest at this time regarding who is the civil servant. I do not know. I am not a lawyer. I cannot

quote from the voluminous laws of Barbados the particular section and all of that, but what we have done again, is that we have sought those who cannot defend themselves and we have held them up to public scrutiny.

We are the ones who go out there every four or five years and we say to public servants, and we say to everybody in the hills and valleys of Barbados, "I will defend your interest." We have a Minister, who on this occasion never sought to defend the interest of the civil servant who made the genuine error. That saddens me. I do not disrespect any person. I do not disrespect the Honourable Minister, not by any stretch of the imagination. I do not disrespect the Honourable Member for St. George North, whose job, task and responsibility it was to bring the acquisition of the land first. Yes, people make errors, but they should accept the consequence of their error. Therefore, the Honourable Member for St. George North who sat in that Ministry for a longer period of time has to carry a mass for this blame.

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: I use what words I feel like. You were a science teacher. I teach English. Mr. Speaker, he is interrupting me, and I am very decent so do not let him change that to his style.

Asides.

The error, and I am using their word, was compounded by persons who should have known better, if it is an error, but I am going to take it as an error.

Asides.

2.40 p.m.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Mr. Speaker, let us stretch our imagination and pretend that it is possible, because anything is possible. Why did not all of these brilliant brains that get in here every week and point to some breach or some little error even when it is not, not have detected that something was amiss at Queen Street and on the lands which they claim? Mr. Speaker, I want to stretch even my imagination to say that I find that absolutely impossible. They are brilliant men and women and they are surrounded by a bevy of brilliant men and women who work on behalf of the people of Barbados as civil servants. I do not blame them. Right now every one of them, those who spoke and those who did not have the courage to speak and did not want to speak in support of the Resolution as moved by the Honourable Minister are guilty of this error. Therefore, this Opposition is right in bringing this No-Confidence Motion. It is doing the job of the people. Anyone who believes that we should not do the job of our people should be ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, we heard remarks and it saddens me because those who have been in this Parliament for 20 years

have to raise the level of contribution from the disappearance of fowls. Maybe this act is a foul act, so we can talk about the disappearance of fowls. People laughed and thumped the Table because Parliament is supposed to be humorous. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have to remind you that those of us who come up in the villages in Barbados know how it is to raise fowls and feed them with scratch grain. We rear them and if they do not run around the yard for too long they would not be hard and you could have them on Sundays for food. So let us dismiss that and address the seriousness of what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Prime Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Peter, speak to it and again it boggles my mind because it disconnects from what was said in May relative to that Resolution. It is still possible, even though it disconnects, that you could have acquired the two parcels of land and followed the traditional movement and traditional path through the track of the Westerman's property...

Mr. Speaker, let me apologise to all of them. I do not know them and I had no intention of calling their names. I believe that ordinary people should be protected from the vexatious arguments of Parliament. Unfortunately, they are the ones that fall within the path of the lands which were to be acquired, my sincere apologies to them, they should be protected. You pass through their lands and you enter lands of the people of Barbados owned by the Government and then you have access to the beach at the back of Fort Dignity Property, Schooner Bay, or just at the back of Fort Denmark.

If the Resolution was correct and there was nothing amiss, why then was there this mad scramble? If I were on the Government Side I would have laughed at the Opposition because you can acquire a piece of land to gain beach access and it does not have to be right up on the beach. That could be the piece of land blocking access as it would appear in this case because the Prime Minister spoke of the track over the property of the Westerman's land. Therefore, there was no need to apologise to this House, and there was no need to talk of a subsequent Resolution. If this were the case where somebody is caught on the back foot – I am not a cricketer enthusiast by the way, but I understand the terminology. Maybe you were playing bat and you are caught on the back foot and you panic and you have created a travesty in this matter by panicking.

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: I have looked at the place. I have walked through it. It is only after stepping back and looking at it – nobody says that to acquire access you have to go right up on the beach – I could have allowed the Resolution to go through. I spoke on that Resolution. In fact, there was a beautiful by-play between myself and the Honourable

Member for St. James South because I carry no animosity against her. However, when it comes to the matters of the people, we have to stand as men and women and deal with those issues and put it squarely before them.

Mr. Speaker, you know Shakespeare better than I do. You were on this earth a longer time than I. You know Julius Caesar, Mr. Speaker, I am not as good as you are, I want to confess that, and if I could recall from it: there is no art to find the mind's construction in the face, and regardless of how beautiful you are and regardless of how suave your tongue is you cannot...

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: ... Macbeth! The point is that the quotation is absolutely accurate. That is why I said that the Honourable Members are knowledgeable, so this error could not have missed them and continue to miss them. They can quote from Macbeth that there is no art to find the mind's construction in the face...

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Thank you for the clarification, I have no problem.

They should have clarified this issue and we would not be in here debating it today, we would have been discussing issues relative to the Caribbean Single Market and Economy and CARICOM.

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: I am not from St. Philip, I speak better.

Asides.

Mr. R. D. JONES: My apology to my friend, I love my colleague. In fact, I believe that the residents of St. Philip are some of the most beautiful people in this country. They are strong, revolutionary, committed and focussed people. We just need to remember Bussa who fought for our liberation in this country, so it was just a nice aside. I love the history and the people of St. Philip.

Mr. Speaker, we must understand that we are here today not because of an action or an act of the Democratic Labour Party but because of an act or action by a number of Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party and by extension the Cabinet of Barbados who allowed this matter to reach this stage to come before us. It is our responsibility to point out to the people of Barbados and to this Parliament that it was acknowledged as being wrong. Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition took it a step further as is its right to bring a vote

of No-Confidence against the Government. One does not have to commit major and substantial breaches to have it. Mr. Speaker, that is not what it requires. That is what the Barbados Labour Party Government would want. They would want to have people being asleep and pretending that all is well. This Democratic Labour Party Opposition will never pretend that all is well. All cannot be well. This Resolution, as was brought by the Minister, demonstrates that all is not well.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. R. D. JONES: Mr. Speaker, this has demonstrated that all is not well. Can we find the Government guilty? We have heard the Leader of the Opposition speaking and pointing out many of the severe inconsistencies in this matter. We know in this country and in others that are striving to develop, that in a situation where they are caught in the midst of major economic development, that sometimes in the minds of many, they become an irritant. That is why people revolt.

Mr. Speaker, if I can cast my mind in the mould of a major developer who has spent millions of dollars at Schooner Bay Development, as I go up my elevators, and as I looked down on the Westerman land with the four or five houses, and people saying to me... I am not saying I am describing that to the Barbados Labour Party, I am saying I will become irritated. I will say to my friends, whoever they are, can these be removed?

Sir, if, as a developer, I am going to come next to it and seek to put up another major establishment, I will also speak to my friends, whoever they are, and ask for their intervention in one form or another. It simply means if my friends would respond or not. I am not saying that the Barbados Labour Party Administration has responded to this, I do not know. I do not sit with them at Roebuck Street, neither do I sit with them at the Cabinet. I am simply casting myself in the mould of a developer, as I put in millions of dollars, then chattel houses, some in need of repair, would become an irritant to my guests.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop hiding from these truths. These truths are very self-evident right across the world. As was stated by the Leader of the Opposition, these persons said that they were asked to sell, not to Government but to the private developers. Their words are, they were asked to sell and they resisted. They said no, that at their age, they did not need large amounts of resources which the developers would have provided. They said they were happy where they were and that they can get some of the refreshing air coming off the Caribbean Sea. Therefore, they will not be moved.

Mr. Speaker, we can have and we can argue everything but at the end of the day the numbers on the Other Side are great. Persons believe that where there is might, where there is the majority, that they can force their opinions through, and that they can "bull-rush" the issue. What Barbadians need to understand is that they must search themselves for the truth because there is no art of looking one in the face, to find the mind's construction. They, themselves, must search for the truth.

Mr. Speaker, people must not let the truth be brought only by the Democratic Labour Party or by the Barbados Labour Party but they must search for it. I find that the Barbados Labour Party Government has, in fact, betrayed this Honourable House on this matter and by extension, have betrayed the people of Barbados that we represent and should, therefore, be found guilty.

Mr. Speaker, if it were possible, I would support this Resolution 110 per cent, as was brought by the Democratic Labour Party.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to close this debate, unless other Honourable Members want to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, are you winding up as Honourable Minister for the Government?

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, could you wind up the debate if there are no more speakers. Are there any other speakers?

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak to this Resolution, I would certainly want to make a point that was made by other speakers on This Side, that is, that this Resolution is not about the Democratic Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party has been out of office since September, 1994, when, during the course of that month, the 6th to be precise, the people spoke. That mandate for the Barbados Labour Party was renewed on January 20, 1999, and again on May 21, 2003. Therefore, I believe that the people of Barbados need to understand that the Democratic Labour Party is not at all on trial. We have nothing for which to account in the course of this debate, and there is nothing wrong with reiteration.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. Honourable Members, we need to hear the Honourable Member.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: There is nothing wrong with repeating a point, as the Honourable Member for St. Michael South knows only too well, since he has been making the same speech in here for the whole year.

Mr. Speaker, the fact on the issue before us is that a Notice of a Resolution was given on August 6, 2003. When we finally got around to debating it on May 11, 2004, we heard that the Resolution was for the purpose of providing a beach access.

Mr. Speaker, I think again it is worthy of being repeated, that the chief surveyor is the only civil servant who could define what the purpose was during the course of a land acquisition. Sir, the Act is very clear in that regard, and I think it is unfortunate that this very competent gentleman is being made to look as if he cannot tell that a piece of land does not have access to the beach.

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that it is an administrative error. I do not accept that someone in a typist pool went to type a "B" but typed an "R" instead. Sir, I do not believe it, and it is a statement of fact that it is the diligence of the Democratic Labour Party that has brought us to this point. 3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as though a new orthodoxy has entered into the governance of this country. The Barbados Labour Party has operated on the basis that you can do whatever you like but once you apologise that it is okay. Mr. Speaker, we will have to send Moses back to Mount Sinai to get an eleventh commandment which says that thou can do whatever thou liketh and get away with it, but if you are caught you can say you are sorry.

Sir, in 1994 we heard that Government had created 10 000 jobs but when it was exposed by the Opposition the Government said it was sorry. The CEO of a Government-owned company name turned up at the Urban Development Commission as a contractor and he was also well-known to the Honourable Member for St. Peter. The Honourable Member said he was sorry that it was a mistake. We had the FBI report which we saw on television and again the eleventh commandment politics was used which says I am sorry. Mr. Speaker, the wastage at GEMS was exposed by the Democratic Labour Party and confirmed by the former Chairman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, we have been going very good all day in terms of relevance so please do not change that.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Speaker, I need your guidance for one moment. This is a No-Confidence Motion on the Government of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, it is a No-Confidence Motion but the parameters are set by the leader of the motion. Also, I could refer to the Resolution where all the recitals point to one direction, that is, they relate to housing. So far today, we have not had much diversion from that.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Sir, I appreciate your guidance but a Ministerial Statement was provided for us to respond to the issue of the faulty Resolution. I am of the view that if the Honourable Member for St. James South had come to this Chamber genuinely apologetic, we would not be here at this point. The fact that she chose a Ministerial Statement speaks volumes since the Opposition cannot reply to it. Had the Minister brought a Resolution to rescind or modify the incorrect Resolution, the Opposition could have accepted the apology but there was no genuine compulsion in the Ministerial Statement because the Minister did not want to hear from the Opposition and, therefore, she chose a Ministerial Statement.

Mr. Speaker, sorry does not quite cut it. We could have accepted an apology if it were rightly worded but it was the eleventh commandment politics. Sir, we do not expect much from the Barbados Labour Party but if they admit that they tried something unconventional but it did not work out and that they were sorry, we could have had a simple acceptance and moved on. The Ministerial Statement was chosen and the Statement contradicted what we heard in this House today.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very much justified because the issue of trust is important in any Government. We feel that it has been breached and that the Opposition has a prime responsibility to keep Government on its toes. We know that the arithmetic is not in our favour but we believe that we have a role that matters like this do not just occur and go along. Sir, I have heard it said that in bringing this Resolution to the House, we may be doing damage to Barbados nationally and internationally but I want to categorically say that far from doing damage to Barbados internationally, we are telling the world that parliamentary democracy is alive and well in Barbados. We are telling the world that no Government can behave like a dictatorial type government that exists in other parts of the planet. Sir, this is a strong signal and statement that we are making.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble submission that perhaps what may be doing more damage to us is the way in which we treat to matters like these in this House. Also, want-to-be leaders and would-be pretenders to the throne who believe that prostitution is a means by which young people can earn a living and that alternative lifestyles should be practised by all and sundry will do more damage to us internationally than bringing a Motion of No-Confidence. Mr. Speaker, doing things like that and then marching for Jesus will do more damage to us internationally than bringing a No-Confidence Motion.

Sir, we have to understand that this Opposition will not allow Parliament to tolerate anything less than factual information that comes to us. We need to understand that this Resolution was justified, relevant and necessary to send a signal to all and sundry.

Mr. Speaker, the whole issue is not original but representative of a number of other things happening with this Government. I recall well when the issue of zoning as it pertains to the development of land was raised during the last general election campaign. Sir, charges were made against the Government and the Minister responsible for Town & Country Planning responded at a Press conference with the Chief Town Planner by herself. Sir, was it an administrative error as well that led to the de-zoning of the land in St. James which saw handsome profits being made by land speculators?

Mr. Speaker, if the precedent has been set, why not invite the Chief Surveyor to a Press conference and solve this particular matter? The Chief Surveyor cannot speak on it because they know why he cannot participate in an exercise such as this because they have assailed his professional integrity and cannot be part of this exercise.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Parliament I have participated in a land resolution brought by the Honourable Member for St. James South and even though I was here for a few months at the time, it was my responsibility to see that everything relating to the change of use for the land in Tweedside Road was in order. Sir, surely a parliamentary representative of twelve years standing should have gone through a similar exercise. I only hope that the matters pertaining to that change of use, which related to the constructing of a housing development, there is no administrative error and no administrative error will see that the housing project for Tweedside Road is delayed any longer than it was promised. Mr. Speaker, I do not know because I might find, 2, 3 or 4 years from now that there are no houses because there was an administrative error.
3.10 p.m.

Sir, what about all the land Resolutions that were brought between 1994 and 1999 by the Honourable Member for St. Andrew? Were there any administrative errors then when Government was accumulating this land bank? How many administrative errors are there? Were there administrative errors that led to \$2 million being spent on Eastry House and not a nail, block or board has been seen? It is my understanding that very expensive houses have been built nearby as part of divorce settlements. Where does it stop?

Sir, we heard about Greenland, was it an administrative error that saw Lionel Craig getting a contract for \$15 million? I just want to know where it stops. Perhaps,

someone out there or the Honourable Member for St. Thomas instead of heckling she could be so Christian-like as to shed some light on this matter because I believe that the only thing that she passed at school was Scripture, anyway.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, Honourable Member, please. Honourable Member, you will have to withdraw those words, before you proceed, please. Could you take your seat, please?

Honourable Members, I am kindly asking you to desist from this constant insulting of Honourable Members. It is not allowed by the Standing Orders and, surely, as all Honourable Members know this is not something that normally happens. Could you proceed, please?

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that applies when the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter is on his feet as well.

Asides.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: I withdraw that remark. I am sorry, Sir.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you will have to withdraw those remarks, please.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: I withdraw them totally, humbly and I apologise for failing.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution was brought on the basis of facts, not rumours or hearsay.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: Mr. Speaker, we have an essential duty to provide a check against encroachments by Government. We have to bridle the excesses and I am very curious to hear. We heard from the Prime Minister already. Was he aware or that did he have all of this knowledge that he shared with us when the Resolution was here on 11th May, because he was on a completely different note.

Sir, we heard about refreshing departures and he seconded the Resolution. Did he have knowledge on all of that information, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke about when the Democratic Labour Party was in Government? Did he not have this knowledge at the time the Resolution was presented?

Mr. Speaker, I would think that if he has such a high regard for Parliament and wants to see the standards improve, one of the first places that he could start is by the provision of information. I would want to assume that what was suggested in the Ministerial Statement would not apply to him and that is, he has an understanding of Queen Street, one certainly got that impression in here earlier today. I am saying that the first place to start in raising the standards of Parliament is by the provision of information. Could he not have shared that information when the debate first came on the 11th May?

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the reasons advanced by the Government. I think that the Opposition had no choice but to bring this Motion to the Floor of the House of Assembly and while the arithmetic may not necessarily be in our favour, I think that all of the Honourable Members on That Side can search their souls. As I said seeing is believing and we need to ask ourselves some questions.

Sir, some may feel smug or some may feel smart; deep down some may be wondering but day only runs until night catches it. Whether or not they like it, the sun is going down and going down rapidly on this Government and we on This Side will continue to be vigilant in bringing matters like this to the House of Assembly because this is where they need to be brought.

Sir, I have a sneaky suspicion that this is the first time that we are going to be dealing with matters like this on this Floor. I hope that I am wrong but the people of Barbados need to be assured that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition stands ready to check the excesses of this Government and to bring matters like this to the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully in support of this Resolution and I am grateful to you.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution which was tabled by the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly this debate presents a further question on Parliament's ability to control actions of the Executive and, indeed, restoring confidence, faith and trust to our parliamentary democracy.

Sir, if I may analyse the defence that was placed by this Government through the Honourable Member for St. Peter, what can we say of that defence? No relevant evidence was produced. In fact, what we had was a vicious attack on the Leader of the Opposition. There was no relevant evidence having any probative value. We heard talk about fowls, foul play and a lot of talk but nothing of substance to defend the actions after the Leader of the Opposition prosecuted this matter and, obviously, he has proven the guilt of the Government beyond any reasonable doubt.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: So, it is our duty as the Opposition to continue the prosecution of this Government and certainly by extension, and particularly, the Minister of Housing and Lands.

Sir, the history of this Resolution places itself in the heart of the Honourable Member for St. George North and certainly the Honourable Member for St. George North's actions were then condoned by the present Minister of Housing. Certainly, they share a common intention, as the Opposition is saying, to mislead this Honourable House. They share a common intention, actions condoned by the Cabinet and, certainly, that are reinforced by the supreme law of this land, in accordance with Section 64, sub-section 2 of the Constitution. And so, the collective responsibility, one of the basic tenets of our democracy makes it possible for them to be guilty of the charge that we place before this Honourable Chamber today.
3.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, their excuse is to cast the blame on a nameless and faceless civil servant. We on This Side have a constitutional duty in the interest of democracy, in the interest of transparency, in the interest of accountability, Sir, to defend public servants in this country. If one looks at the *Nation Newspaper* on Saturday, one will see what is happening to civil servants in this country when they speak their minds, but I will move further.

Mr. Speaker, the noted Constitutional expert, Smith, in his book, *The Smith*, on constitutional and administrative law, when he mentioned the concept of ministerial responsibility, he said that all Ministers, whether they are inside or outside of Cabinet are responsible for their personal acts, the general conduct of their department, and acts done or left undone in their name by their departmental officials.

Mr. Speaker, it brings to mind, as an aside, what is happening at the National Housing Corporation. I do not want to dwell on that because as *The Smith* is saying, although ministerial responsibility, not expressly recognised by the Constitution, the supreme law of this land, the whole notion of collective responsibility is recognised by the Constitution, the supreme law of the land.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, we rise to continue the prosecution and, of course, when we examine the Resolution, the particulars of the charge and the evidence, I would advise the Minister of Housing to plead guilty because there is a common thread, the thread of incompetence, the thread of confusion and the thread of negligence. This is against a background, Sir, in a day and age where the principles of accountability, the principles of

transparency, the principles of collective responsibility, the principles of ministerial responsibility seem to be no longer vital to the existence of our parliamentary democracy.

Do you know that the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment never visited the site, but got in here and introduced the Resolution. In fact, she spoke eloquently. The Prime Minister in his statement mentioned the word, "misleading", and we all know the purpose for which the Resolution was brought, after the vigilance of the Opposition, that this purpose cannot be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Nation, is this negligence? I will submit that the Honourable Member owes a duty of care to this country, her Cabinet colleagues and her constituents. It is manifested here that she has breached that duty of care. This debate is about trust, faith and confidence, so when Parliament can be so misled, what can we say about the affairs of this Nation? The fact that we have no confidence in the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment is not coming from us alone. It started over there and I can count them one by one. They placed her in the political dot, before we started to place in the political dot to answer the charges.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, they were so rough on her that they placed the political handcuffs on her. As I said, Sir, when we prosecute a case, we have to look at the evidence. We must lead the evidence and we must have cogent, compelling and convincing evidence as, indeed, the evidence in this case. What is the evidence? In fact, as I said before, her own Members have disclosed no confidence in her.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael East is on record as describing the Honourable Member as a "Tin Goddess", the Ministry of Housing petty oligarchies, ministerial absolutism.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: He said that he has a major problem in his area, where there are 14 households in one house, but in spite of this, he is receiving no assistance. This is a manifestation. What we are doing on This Side is reinforcing the No Confidence that the Honourable Member for St. Michael East placed in her. He started the prosecution. Then, he went outside of Parliament at the St. Giles Primary School and said that it is difficult to get things from the Government of which he was a part, and he mentioned the Ministry of Housing as one of the main culprits.

I challenge the Backbenchers, Mr. Speaker, to put a defence for this miserable performance.

Asides.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: I am only manifesting what the Honourable Member of St. James Central said when he was a Member of the Democratic Labour Party that the Honourable Member was a "c'dear" Minister". Therefore, I challenge the Honourable Member for St. James Central to get up and speak.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Mr. M. A. LASHLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will go further because, in three months, after the Honourable Member was lambasted, how can they rise in this Chamber and sing a chorus of competence? How can they do that? I am throwing down the gauntlet today, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for St. Michael East was lambasted as clothed in falsehood and if he gets up in here and says to this Honourable House that the Minister is competent, then he would obviously be reinforcing the labelling of the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment as being clothed in deceit and falsehood. Mr. Speaker, I recall the passion by the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment when she said she was not in a place where she could use or speak with the strength of language and the description aptly to portray the Honourable Member for St. Michael East.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what is the case against this Government as put by the Leader of the Opposition? The Government has confessed that the land could not have been acquired for beach access. Their aim is to remove the poor people against their campaign slogan that no one should be left behind, but the poor people are being left behind in this country. A former member of the Barbados Labour Party said at the Princess Margaret Secondary School a couple Sundays ago that he was left out. He was a former Minister and if he was left out, you could imagine what would be left of the poor people now. Their aim is to make life for the poor working-class people, as according to that great philosopher, seem brutish, nasty and short.

This Government is not for the rich. Mr. Speaker, I further submit that this Government by the evidence in this case is for the rich. This Government is not for the poor working-class man who catches the route 10 bus after a hard day's work and goes home to his family to feed them and to spend quality time with them. That is the philosophy of the ordinary reasonable man on the street, but where is the hope for the poor and the disabled in this country?

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned by the Honourable Prime Minister that we must restore all principles of democracy. So we hope that democracy could be alive and that Parliament be returned to its standards. What was exhibited was a document in an attempt to damage the reputation of the Leader of the Opposition, recognised by the

Constitution, who was so vigilant in bringing this Motion to this Honourable House on behalf of the people. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is the voice of the people. Mr. Speaker, this Resolution went through all the formal documentation and through all the processes. It went to Cabinet. It was perused by them, they accepted it and they brought it to Parliament. They then got up and defended it and accepted that the Resolution was proper in the four corners of the law.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble submission that the Opposition has brought a Resolution of necessity to bring back standards to this Honourable Chamber and to make sure that the whole concept and convention of ministerial responsibility and collective responsibility remain intact.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, you would forgive me, I hope, if I begin by performing a personal task, that is, to thank the many people who called me to wish me well, to thank the people who telephoned to pray for me through all this and to thank the people who stopped me on the street who recognise that the Barbados Labour Party and the Government finds itself in an untenable position.

Sir, this morning at 4 o'clock after I finished saying my prayers I thought to myself that this Parliament is the highest court of the land where the jury is the people of Barbados as constituted by their lawful representatives and we come to this Chamber like a man who is riding a bicycle without a bell, but ends up being charged for murder. That is what this is analogous to. That a simple infraction in an administrative way which is analogous to a man riding a bicycle without a bell, brings a whole Government before the highest court of the land and is asked to resign, and is analogous in criminal terms to a murder charge. That is the nature of what is against us.

Sir, what is the prosecution doing, what is the weight of the evidence? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, who styled himself as the prosecutor said, I have no evidence, I do not have to bring any. So you drag an individual into court on a murder charge the highest possible charge that one can bring against a Government, a Motion of No-Confidence, and then get up as an aspiring Prime Minister and say to the people of Barbados, I bring no evidence, I do not have to bring any. That is the arrogance, the indifference and the callousness with which a man who aspires to be Prime Minister would treat the people of this country, but what do you expect of a self-confessed loiterer who told us in here last week that for seven months he was at Government headquarters receiving a five-figure salary as a consultant to the Government of Barbados but he did nothing at all for it during that time. What would you expect of a man

who is leading a Party but yet diverts the funds to himself to ensure that he secures victory irrespective of how...

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member that would not be acceptable, you would have to withdraw those words, please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I withdraw them, Sir, without reservation.

I say only that in here today we heard about two letters, one which is written by a man who made an allegation and the other which is written by the elders of the Democratic Labour Party calling on the Leader of the Opposition to resign. He has not denied the existence of neither one nor has he brought any letters himself to say he is refuting the allegations made. We made allegations on This Side through our Leader the Honourable Prime Minister who said that letters exist and produced the content of the letters, that has not been denied. That is the nature of the prosecution in here today. A Government comes in to be castrated on the basis of the arrogance of a particular individual.

Sir, you must understand that this is make-or-break time for the Democratic Labour Party. That is what this is about. With the elders calling on him to resign and the Honourable Member for St. John indicating that he is asking for the leadership but perhaps not now at this very minute, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West is desperate to prove that he is a real, real man and a real, real leader, that is what this is about.
3.40 p.m.

The Honourable Member has to compel the people, using the Executive of a Party. An Executive of a Party has to vote and to compel people to support a No-Confidence motion in order to make the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West look like a real leader. That is what this is about. It is make-or-break time for him. He was beaten in St. James South by me. He will never forget that, because people like him who feel that they are former village stars, would be contemptuous of people like me.

Secondly, Mr. Mark Williams beat him and ran him out of this Parliament with the blows that he got. That is why he was so desperate to get back in, and desperate he is for the leadership, knowing he is being challenged by all of them.

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central, who is being supported as a would-be leader by some persons inside, himself comes in here, week after week, and makes the poorest possible speeches that anybody has ever heard in this Parliament. So that, week after week,

half of his speech has to be withdrawn. When one looks in the notes of Hansard, one would see white-out because everything he said would have been withdrawn. He is the "Shallow Minister of Nothingness" and that is who is prosecuting us. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central cannot even succeed with a two-by-two football team but would want to tell us how to run a Government.

Mr. Speaker, every week the Honourable Member for St. Philip West comes in here, holding his face up, and one cannot understand what he is saying. He is not even speaking English. Somebody is bound to shout: "Call the dog pound! Call the dog pound!" And they are the people who have brought this country to the point where people are saying that there is a No-Confidence Motion against the Government. It is not a question whether there is a legitimacy of a No-Confidence Motion, it is a question of whether the use of the No-Confidence Motion, in this instance, is valid.

Mr. Speaker, they have attacked me, whether it is how I wear my hair; with whom I go out or what car I drive. They now put words in my mouth relative to Greenland Landfill, and now they attack me on this. I noticed that the Honourable Member for St. Philip North has today found a bounty of words but his chickens will come home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the charge. I start with the issue of whether Government or I have failed to shield a civil servant in these circumstances. Let us understand that I have never called the civil servants' name, their rank, nor has ever exposed them in any way. I simply said it was a genuine administrative error for which the Ministry takes full responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I took responsibility because I was not the Minister at the time but I have led the Ministry at the time the Resolution came to the Honourable House and, therefore, I said that the Ministry accepts full responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Labour Party has said that the file has disappeared. Sir, the file is here in Parliament. The Barbados Labour Party has nothing from which to hide. There is no reason to make the file disappear. The Democratic Labour Party wrote in their column that the file had disappeared. Sir, let us look at the file. The cover of the file says: "Acquisition of Land, Queen Street, Speightstown, St. Peter, for Beach Access."

Sir, I have copies of the documents that I am going to cite and I will make them all documents of this Honourable Chamber. On the first page, the file is opened, as requested by the civil servant in question. It then goes to the person for that person to execute an order. The first one is a visit to

Queen Street, St. Peter, on May 12, 2002, where two parcels of land were identified for acquisition in order to construct a beach access.

Sir, when I said that an administrative error occurred at the start of the file, I said that in all honesty. I did not have to shield myself. I did not have to shield anybody in the Barbados Labour Party. It was written as the first instruction by a civil servant at that time. It went from there as an instruction to the Chief Surveyor, as an instruction to the Chief Town Planner; as an instruction to the Commissioner of Land Tax. Sir, all through the file, at every stage, that language went. It then came to the point.

Mr. Speaker, there is then this matter where the Honourable Prime Minister writes and says:

"Please help the people to acquire this land for a public purpose, and not for beach access." But the civil service error is weaving its way through every page in the language of this file, from page one through to every page.

Mr. Speaker, let us understand what happened with regard to the Westerman property. A private developer sought to build a 7-foot wall to enclose a traditional track used by a chattel village on the beachfront. They cried out, "Help us, intervene, do something!" That is exactly what the Government has attempted to do and, in fact, has done.

Sir, as I said, the thing continued. It was these persons who asked for the service entrance. It was these persons who said they wanted emergency vehicles to be able to get in, and for us to create a larger road. Sir, that did not originate with the Barbados Labour Party. It originated with them as contained in a letter from their Attorney-at-Law, which too will become a document of the Honourable House.

Sir, let us understand that if the Government had wanted to acquire the Westerman's property, it would have used the method of compulsory acquisition so to do. There was no fear. Therefore, in fact, there was an administrative error. It went to the Cabinet, the Cabinet approved it in 2002 as land for a beach access, and I was not the Minister at the time.

Mr. Speaker, people are calling on me to resign over the issue, but why must I resign? When I came to the file, the matter was completed. It came to me in 2003, and I have that document as well. All it said to me at that time was: "Minister, be aware of this issue. Kindly note that the surveying plans are complete..." and it gives the specific quantities.

Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet decision was made long before I was Minister. The matter went back to the Cabinet by an Acting Minister in December when I was out of the

country. I brought the matter to Parliament based on the language in the file and in the ministerial brief that was given to me. At one stage, it passed through the Cabinet. I was there and had contact by making a presentation to the Cabinet on the matter.

Sir, all of the documents in support are here, therefore, it is not a matter as to how the politician has intervened or where the politician has done something dishonest. There was nothing to hide. It is all here in the file for the public, and I am making them documents of the Honourable House. Sir, why am I negligent? Was it my responsibility as Minister to go to the site? My answer to those two questions is no, I was not negligent and no, it was not my responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I need to make two points, which are that total unfamiliarity with Government processes have caused the Democratic Labour Party to cite a lot of formalities and processes, some of which are grossly inaccurate, of citing the real file and of citing a human error.

Sir, we had a number of human errors in here today. Only recently an Honourable Member said "rich" when he intended to say "poor". Another Honourable Member wanted to talk about Macbeth but instead talked about Julius Caesar. Another Honourable Member in his very first five minutes made an error of substance. Why do they not resign this minute?

Mr. Speaker, it was not my duty to go to the site, and for two reasons. The matter was completed long before I became the Minister and the site visits were made by all of the relevant technocrats, including the Honourable Prime Minister and the Honourable Minister at that time and, therefore, there was no need for me to visit the site.

Secondly, and I want the public to understand this carefully, despite all the talk and processes that were pointed out today, the Opposition has failed to make a critical point and that is that the acquisition notices that went into the Paper also had beach access written on them. The letters that the property owners received had beach access written on them.

3.50 p.m.

When I picked up the file in 2003/2004, I had no opportunity to be right because everything on the file was wrong and I could not have known that. It was my responsibility to go to the site and say no because it was previously dealt with? Sir, a Ministry of Housing acquires hundreds of parcels each year but the Minister is not a land surveyor, walks around asking to be shown six inches of road or comes out with a tape like the Honourable Member for St. Philip West to measure it. Sir, that is the role of a pooh-pooh Minister and not the role of a real Minister. Sir,

a Minister is a policy-maker and there was no duty on me to go to the site. I was advised by the civil servants on whom I rely.

Sir, I want to warn the Opposition that they will have to rely on those civil servants as well, that they will be subject to being the victims of the same kinds of errors because we are all human and at that time whether I am in here or not – I have every confidence that the people of St. James South will ensure that I am in here – believe me, Sir, I will be lying in wait for them.

Sir, under the publication of the Section 3 and 5 Notice of the Land Acquisition Act, the rights of the people of St. Peter were secured.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that once the Prime Minister spoke in this matter and now that I have gone through the files that it lays all the nonsense raised by the Opposition to rest. Sir, this was not about the Government doing anything wrong. The allegation that was first made was that it could not have been for beach access. They have turned around on themselves and say that it was for beach access but they should make up their minds, Sir. They are acting out of an abundance of their own confusion by alleging all along that no beach access was intended but today they are saying to the public that beach access was intended from the start.

Sir, people are not naive to be caught up in the confusion of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. Philip West spoke about incompetence, confusion and negligence but was it not the negligence of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he either did not know or disclose that they were poor people who had a court order against them and had to get off the land but gave people the impression that Government wanted to move them off the land. Sir, I will not have my name dragged down like this. If I do something wrong I will walk away from the Cabinet and unlike some members of the Opposition I can make an independent living for myself because I have been self-employed since 1987 when I was admitted to the Bar and I do not have to worry.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to serve and by the grace of God and the will of the people of St. James South, I will continue to do service. I know who my constituents are, they are the poor, black and oppressed out of which I had my origin and I am not ashamed to admit. Sir, the Opposition with their desperation to get their hands on power have issues because we are popular.

Mr. Speaker, housing is challenged and I want to talk about it in the final ten minutes remaining to me. In 1986, the Barbados Labour Party built 1 300 terrace units across Barbados, developed 2 400 lots and 1 200 single houses. Sir, as compared with the above, the Democratic Labour

Party built 150 units, 700 single houses and developed 500 lots. Sir, between 1995 to 2004, the Barbados Labour Party did 178 terrace units, 1 911 lots which was the largest amount ever developed by a Government and built 464 houses. We released on to the market on Friday, 26th, 26 lots at \$2.50 per square foot for the poor people in this country.

Sir, in 1994 when we came to Government, the Housing Credit Fund stood at \$3.7 million but it stood at financial year 2001/2002, at \$15.6 million. Sir, these were loans lent to poor people. The General Workers Loan Scheme between 1958 and 1986 distributed 6 446 loans to poor people and 1986 to 1994 they distributed a paltry 821 loans. Sir, when the Democratic Labour Party had an opportunity to house poor people they were running people out of their jobs and people's houses were sold in this country. Sir, from 1994 to date, 3 986 loans totalling \$47.9 million were distributed by the Scheme.

Sir, the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Limited in 1993 distributed 123 loans worth \$8.1 million but at 2002, they distributed 282 loans worth \$29.2 million. Sir, the Democratic Labour Party wants to talk about records and say that I should be ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to some of the things that I have done in the time I was Minister.
4.00 p.m.

Let me make the point that things happen in Government very slowly. The reality is, July would be a year that I sat in the Ministry and I will tell you why July. We were appointed in May and I was ill immediately after the election. June is always Environment Month and in that month I stayed at the Ministry of Environment to guide them through it because I knew that a lot of my time would have to be dedicated to housing and I came to my desk in July.

Sir, during that time I saw the sale of 237 lots to low income earners at \$2.50 per square foot. I put in place and continued the sale of the terrace units policy with generous discounts. Under the Democratic Labour Party, which they did not deny, to qualify for a housing unit you could only get 3 years' rent rebate, not a full 40 per cent as we are offering. You could not have been in arrears. We are saying that if you have arrears still come and join it to the purchase price and buy your unit. The Democratic Labour Party did not maintain units when people were in arrears. We continue to do so even though the monies outstanding put a constraint on us. We are in the process of releasing the joint venture programme, 1 200 houses and about 200 lots to low income and middle income earners all across Barbados.

Sir, if the programme I am working on succeeds in the way it is conceptualised, by the middle of next year I will have across Barbados, and I pray God to help me do it, 1,000

houses for low-income earners priced at \$125,000.00 and with the majority of them costing about \$80,000.00.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I wish to thank the much maligned National Housing Corporation and their technical staff for supporting me in the new vision that I am seeing for the National Housing Corporation. We spent weeks in retreat evaluating ourselves and trying to re-engineer the institution because housing is in tremendous demand in Barbados and we believe that the National Housing Corporation, given the right direction and leadership, has the ability to be the premium statutory corporation in Barbados and under my guidance as Minister I will see that it becomes that.

Aside.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: On a point of elucidation.

Aside.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Just one minute, please. Go ahead, Sir.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: Has she given way, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Dr. D. C. ESTWICK: What does this have to do with the substantive Resolution being discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order, Sir.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir. As indeed, this whole No-Confidence Motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I am challenged as Minister of Housing in what I did there and how I am performing as Minister. I have to enunciate what I have done, what I am doing and what is my vision for the National Housing Corporation, the Ministry and the country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just one minute, please. Could we have some order, please? Honourable Members, order, please. Let us hear the Honourable Member.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. At this time, it is a fact, that throughout Barbados there are

people who are working in residential districts as mechanics, spray painters, *et cetera* and it causes tremendous disturbance to people with asthma and other rhinal tracheal conditions and it makes housing development untidy. We are in the process of developing lots for sale and rent to black entrepreneurs so that they can move out of the villages, expand their businesses and have more space. We are working on a property paper for rental property in Barbados. Too many people rent properties that have no electricity.

I went to a house one night and I went to embrace the patriarch and fell through the floor board. I am not telling any lies. Everybody in the house was embarrassed. I did not know how to put them at ease and to say that it is all right and that I understand and if you could do better you would. They did not have any water. Sir, we are developing a policy paper that will look at developing a framework for the kinds of properties that are put on the rental market because it is poor people who suffer the most from this.

We are expanding the Government's loan facilities.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has one minute to conclude, please.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, I have covered a range. Was I negligent? Was the Government seeking to do wrong in trying to show the circumstances from which this arose and how people are protected?

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West said that he is prosecuting. Sir, I plead and the Barbados Labour Party pleads, not guilty. More than that, after we saw the pathetic performance of the Honourable Members on the Other Side, particularly that of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, who today disgraced the name of Combermere, it was a pathetic performance.

Asides.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: I was waiting all the time for two-and-a-half hours to see what the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West would have come with.

Mr. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Member conclude, please?

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Yes, Sir.

It is not only that we plead not guilty. The reality is, no evidence to support the charge before the court is there for the jury to answer. In which case, the case must be thrown out. We have no case to answer, not because we say so but because the facts and the circumstances support that there is

no case to answer. We are not guilty. We have done nothing wrong. We have done right. We are trapped only by the error in the administrative process and for that we apologise but we will not apologise for improving housing conditions in this country and the standard of poor people all over Barbados. Nor will I resile from my responsibility, Sir.

I am obliged, Sir.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, tempted as I am to respond to the comments of my namesake on the Other Side, who spoke just before me, I recognise that this is a Private Members' Resolution and that your interpretation of it is that I should stick to the rubric of the introducer's box.

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, if I may interrupt you at this point, some lead-way was given and that is extended to all Members but we surely would not allow you to go into any details on any of these points.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Tempted as I am, you have not tempted me to go there yet nor has the Honourable Member for St. James South, not even the Honourable Member for St. Peter because I think despite what has been said, either in prosecution or in defence in this particular Resolution, we must as Members of Parliament learn some lessons from it.

The first one, of course, is the temptation to be arrogant and to believe that everything that is put before in briefs, Cabinet Notes, Cabinet Papers or any of the other documents that come on a file always represents the most accurate position. Sir, that is why I have always been concerned in this Chamber when Ministers who have, I assume independent judgement and intelligence of their own, put up a brief prepared for them by a civil servant either during the Estimates debate or in any other presentation and stick slavishly to that brief. There is a danger in that. A civil servant is supposed to be an independent and impartial officer. Some of them may turn out to be Cabinet Ministers in subsequent Governments, but when they are giving you advice – I mean in opposing Governments not necessarily in your Party's Government, and I want to compliment those who advise me, I am not speaking against any of them in that regard – you make the assumption that you are independent and impartial.

4.10 p.m.

They may not therefore appreciate the Government's policy in a particular area, and they may not appreciate the thrust or the circumstances which give rise to a matter coming to Parliament. Therefore, where Ministers stick to the rubric of that document, very often they are going to get

themselves into a tangle. In circumstances like this, it is possible, although on This Side, Members have said it is unlikely that somebody stuck too slavishly to words and expressions which were not intended to be in a document, so we are fallible. Why is it that Ministers act the day after they get appointed as if everything that issues from their mouths represents the beginning and end of history, the final pronouncement, and why are they not quick to respond when, as I say, circumstances may reveal that something else has occurred?

The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter looked at it from the point of view of it being a constituency issue, but there are others who see it as a national issue. It is not just a question of a road access or an access for fire engines and ambulances in St. Peter. It has greater significance. However, when you look at it, at the end of the day, it does speak to the issue of public sector reform in Barbados, and the need for the Government to be serious about the manner in which it reforms the public sector to ensure that it is carrying out the objectives of a Government's policy.

I think this is what this exercise at the end of the day is about. One area of concern is the fact that Ministers permit an Addendum to be written to a Resolution which discloses nothing, and very seldom helps Members of Parliament to prepare themselves accurately and efficiently for a session.

Therefore, when you get a nonsensical Addendum to a Resolution that says merely that land is being acquired to provide a public access to a beach, or for a playing field, and then when the debate opens up in this Chamber, the Minister of Housing, whomever he or she may be, then expands the debate into a whole set of areas that were not identified by the Addendum. Very often, no plan of the land is provided to parliamentarians.

I am very grateful for the drawings that I saw in here today on My Side. I think that they should be lent to the Government as an example of how matters should be presented to Parliament in future, where land acquisitions are taking place. If those plans were provided, perhaps somebody would have gone behind the Speaker's Chair and said...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: I heard previous Ministers of Housing say that plans are always provided, and undertakings are given that plans will be provided, but plans are provided on the day on which the debates take place when the Minister brings the file in here. I am not talking about that, and do not stress on what takes place in here on the day of the debate.

I am saying that as part of the process of preparation for a day's Sitting that Members on Both Sides of the House, including the Backbenchers, on whose behalf I always have

to speak, should be provided with a plan of the area that is going to be acquired, so that they can see exactly what is happening on the ground.

I agree with the Minister. It is not always easy to do site visits. Perhaps on this occasion, I assume that being the MP for St. James South, the proximity of the area would have meant that she would have had a greater sense or appreciation of what was happening. The Honourable Member explained the circumstances why it happened. I understand that another Minister went, but anything could happen when he goes somewhere.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: He is my good friend but anything could happen. He may set out on one mission and complete another, so I would not even rely on the report of a site visit that the Honourable Member for St. George North had undertaken.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, let us be serious. There is a lack of information. I do not want to get into every debate on land acquisition and, generally speaking, I do not debate land acquisitions. There are Shadow Ministers responsible, and no one Shadow Minister can shadow with effectiveness all the areas without the tools to do it. Therefore, we would often have had land acquisition debates in here, in which we would have relied on information that was very scant from the time the Addendum to the Resolution was presented and then all kinds of new concepts suddenly emerge in the debate.

Sir, if a Government is serious about freedom of information, democracy, efficiency and avoiding the errors that took place in this particular case, that information would be provided in a more expansive form, when we have debates relative to land acquisitions. I am calling on the Government to be more responsive to the needs of Honourable Members who are not in Cabinet, again I speak for the Backbenchers and Honourable Members on This Side, by providing them with the information, upon which they can make a sensible judgment.

Had the Honourable Member for St. George South seen that plan, he would have raised a question. He is a plan's man, and he would have called the Honourable Member for St. James South and said that there is an error in this. I am certain that the Honourable Member for Christ Church West, who is very swift to correct what he perceives to be other errors recently, would have picked up very quickly that there was something which needed to be addressed.

I think the Government needs, if it is committed to democracy and to raising the standard of debate in this House, as the Honourable Member for St. Peter said, to give us the tools to do the work that needs to be done. Thereby to avoid situations in which Members would make errors and then have to blame public servants for them – if that is the case, sometimes unjustly so – and in other circumstances expect public servants to understand what is going on in a Minister's head.

Many years ago, in a debate in this Chamber, Honourable Members on the Other Side attacked me very viciously because I said that I wrote a Cabinet Paper. I have no apologies to make for writing a Cabinet Paper. The Minister takes his policy to the Cabinet, not a civil servant's policy. If there was something to add, when it was sent back down to be looked at, anybody could have added something, but what finally goes to Cabinet is fully the responsibility of the Minister. It has nothing to do with any civil servant. It is the Minister's Cabinet Paper, and where Ministers do not get support for matters they bring to Cabinet, they cannot fall back and blame an officer in the public service for adding some words that should not have been added. It is your Cabinet Paper.
4.20 p.m.

It is true that there are some Ministers who may have more Cabinet Papers going to Cabinet than others and the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment is one of them because land acquisitions though they appear to be small matters, are frequent and are often on the Cabinet's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, Ministers have to recognise that the Cabinet Paper is their policy. When you have Ministers who have very little to do, as we in Barbados have in the largest Cabinet in the history of this country, all of them should have time to write their own Cabinet Papers on a daily basis or to at least read through them, to know what is in them, to know what they are about, to correct any errors, to ask any questions and get to the bottom of issues which come before the Cabinet.

The second area of concern I have relates to the Land Acquisition Act and the manner in which it is often being used in Barbados. We have had many examples in this country of the Land Acquisition Act not being used, to my mind, in the best interest of the people of this country. I think we need to have much more transparent procedures relative to land acquisitions in this country by giving the citizens of Barbados the right to have more say in the process, particularly the previous owners of the land thereby ensuring that the transparency which is necessary before a matter comes to Parliament at the policy level to determine whether there is in fact a need for what the Government says there is a need for, is fully and openly ventilated.

The Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown said that the greatest thing this Government has done since it was elected is to introduce consultation as part of the process of modernising democracy in Barbados. I remember the words and how she said them. She said that she holds public consultations all over the country such as town hall meetings where she discusses issues and the people make an input. If that were so, why would people have so many questions, doubts, queries and concerns about the manner in which the Land Acquisition Act is being used in Barbados to take up people's land either to leave it idle for long periods of time which is what is happening now in many cases and not compensating the people you are taking the land from quickly and then very often reversing the policy or the basis on which you previously said you were acquiring the land. If you had a true process of consultation, openness and democracy in Barbados, those concerns would not arise.

Sir, in relation to Parliament in this particular exercise there is another lesson to be learnt. I have never liked the procedure by which Ministers are able to give ministerial statements on controversial issues in response to what Honourable Members have raised in here and to criticise Honourable Members of Parliament without an immediate response being allowed because very often ministerial statements contain inaccuracies but you cannot get up on a point of order to correct. You would have to bring a Resolution noting the statement and at some point in the distant future perhaps it might be debated when the issue is dead. Sir, it is grossly unfair and totally untenable for Ministers to be able to make ministerial statements and to make refutations or allegations against Members of Parliament whether in the Government or in the Opposition and the opportunity for response or reply is not allowed.

To my mind, it would be a grave abuse of democracy if the item Ministerial Statement is allowed to be used in that way. I hope that a word to the wise is enough because if we are practising democracy in here no paramountcy must be given to a Minister of Government just because he or she is a Minister to make statements in which allegations could be made which you as Presiding Officer, Sir, because you do not get the Ministerial Statements to read them before they are read, that is the other danger, may not feel that you have the right to interrupt the person, neither does an Honourable Member in this Chamber who may wish to correct the record or to refute a statement that is made have the right to get up on a point of order and correct it.

We have archaic procedures in Barbados such as archaic parliamentary question systems and an archaic system where Ministers can issue statements without the right of reply of an Opposition or individual Members. These are all archaic procedures which create the very

environment that causes suspicions, doubts and concerns when we should be moving toward a process of openness in this Chamber where people are debating, not from civil servants' notes, but from knowing their ministries and debating as if they are debating. Sir, I fear that if we continue like this, if the interest has not already been lost in the proceedings of this House... I am very glad to see so many people in here today they may be looking for a little political blood to be spilt.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: It would not be mine because I have on blue. Those who have on red may be looking for some blood. Maybe some on This Side who are supporting the Democratic Labour Party would be looking for some political blood, so there is a heightened interest in the debate. However, when we were debating the original Resolution, nobody was interested. We could have acquired the whole of Speightstown along with all the businesses and the Public Gallery would have been empty except for the police officer, two reporters and one or two faithful "attendants" to the Chamber to use the words of the late former Prime Minister Tom Adams. Other than that, where is the interest and the concern about what is happening?

Sir, although the Opposition has taken it as its responsibility to jump up and raise these concerns to be proactive in exposing the Government, you could only do that if the people are interested in that exposure. That only makes sense if there is going to be a response by the people that would then make the Government they elected in such large numbers do what they are supposed to do in the interest of the people who elected them and even those who did not vote for them because that is what Government is about.

Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the Standing Orders and Parliament. Let me move on now to the question of the Land Acquisition Act and the manner in which I think the Minister should now start to use the Act. I listened to her and heard her say that her constituency is the poor, the black and the oppressed, so the Honourable Member for St. James South would fall squarely within the consideration of the people who live in the constituency of St. John. Do not doubt that. There are no large plantations owners riding horseback in khaki anymore...

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: If you consider CLICO to be that, I assume that you had a broader outlook of the success of black business, but since you want me to bring you down so low that I am limiting you to such a narrow consideration I would...

Mr. SPEAKER: Please, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member asked me to take it out of business and to bring it down to a narrow confine of the Land Acquisition Act. Do you prefer narrow then, Sir, than low?

Let me bring it down to the basics then. I want the Minister to use the Land Acquisition Act to acquire, on the instructions of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East, a parcel of land at Massiah Street for sporting facilities. I have asked for that since I was elected to this Chamber. 4.30 p.m.

If Government wants to use the Land Acquisition Act to liberate people who need modern facilities and development, let Government use it in Massiah Street and at Four Roads, St. John, where the former Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment had agreed with me when we had visited that area. I am only going to deal with those Ministers who are in the Resolution. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East name was in the Resolution.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You were not? I cannot even talk to the former Minister of Sports, because he said that he does not get anything at all now. I would have to talk to the Honourable Member after but I am asking for that.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to tracks in Barbados where ambulances and fire trucks cannot pass, where people do not have water mains, where poor people in this country are living in conditions of almost squalor in some areas because they do not have waterborne toilet facilities, I am asking the Government of Barbados to provide public accesses and proper tenantry roads at Guinea; College Savannah; College Land; Foster Hall; Cherry Grove; Venture and Edgecliff.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: You cannot tell me what to do!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Minister said that is how she is going to use the Act, and I know the Honourable Member for St. James South, in this regard, is going to have the credibility that some others in here do not have.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue: Glenburnie; Zoares; Church View; Haynes Hill; Society and Kendal. Sir, this very Parliament could be compromised. I sat in the Other Place at the beginning of this Session, and I heard the highest public official in the land, although one is not allowed to bring that individual into debates in this Honourable

Chamber, but I heard him saying in the Throne Speech that the Government was going to finish a number of tenantry roads in rural areas in Barbados, including St. John – and everybody giggled. He said: “My Government is going to finish the Polyclinic at Gall Hill,” – and everybody giggled.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Oh, I see. He did not say when.

Asides.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Apparently the people of St. John or St. George South do not pay taxes, and I can go through the list of the other areas such as Christ Church West Central. I do not know who pays taxes in Barbados. I cannot summon a public official to a site a week after I get a letter and tell that person to come and see that we need a beach access, or an access for a fire truck or an ambulance. The Honourable Member for St. Peter can do that and I am sure the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East has the power to do that. There are other Ministers who can do it. The Honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown apparently is so vociferous that she does it all the time. She even walks with a tape measure, kicks down doors in the London Bourne Towers and says: “This has got to be replaced by tomorrow morning.” But the Minister who is saying that she will use the Land Acquisition Act in a manner that would liberate people from oppression, when the concerns of the oppressed are being put before Government, what do they do in this debate? Why was it not done? Well, we are not sure when the Throne Speech was read that it did not say when. I thought they were all committed to balanced, fair, and just development in Barbados, in which all the citizens in this country would share from the economic benefits or economic growth and development.

Sir, maybe I am wrong in assuming it. Maybe I am wrong in saying that the Land Acquisition Act could be used to acquire a piece of land to put another day care centre in St. John. Maybe I am wrong to say that it should be used for low income housing, based on this great record which the Honourable Member for St. James South has said the Government has. What areas are going to be acquired for that purpose? What about a Civic Centre, since they are being put in other rural districts in this country? If they are going to use the Land Acquisition Act, the statement that I would like to hear in this debate from the Government is that it is going to be used fairly and justly, not only for those who have access and can wield power and influence, but that compassion and fairness would be shown to all the citizens of this country who are paying taxes and who are entitled to the benefits of the development to which this Government said it is committed.

Sir, this is the basis upon which I have made my intervention in this debate. I hope the Government would take some of those suggestions seriously, and I will do my duty as an Honourable Member of this Party.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I had told the Honourable Member for St. John that I had notes in my right-hand pocket for if he had made a certain speech, and notes in my left-hand pocket for if he had made a different kind of speech, but he did not make either. Therefore, I will discard my notes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Honourable Member for St. John for bringing the maturity of his years in Parliament to bring some reason to this debate.

Mr. Speaker, this debate started off this morning in a manner which troubles me. I have been in Parliament for a long time and am frequently told by my Honourable colleagues that I am the father of the House. Therefore, as father of this Honourable House, I have certain responsibilities to make sure that the integrity of Parliament, Parliament’s Rules, Standing Orders, and traditions, remain intact.

Sir, Motions of No-Confidence are tools to be used by an alert, vigilant and efficient Opposition. It is a tool that should be used sparingly. It is a tool that should be used only when the conduct of the Government or a Minister is so serious, so undermining of the public good, that some drastic sanction should be called for.

Sir, we have had a number of No-Confidence Motions in Parliament since I have been around. There have been No-Confidence Motions for alleged corruption, misappropriation of funds, abuse of prime ministerial power and things of that ilk. That perhaps is the most famous of them.

Mr. Speaker, here today we have a No-Confidence Motion for the commission of an error. That is stated in the words of the Resolution. Sir, all the contributions on the Other Side have dealt with the error that was made but what has transpired before that? Sir, this issue came to light and the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment made a Ministerial Statement. I do agree with the Honourable Member for St. John that it was not the appropriate way to deal with it. If it is not a Bill or a Resolution before the House, then until an issue comes up, a Ministerial Statement is the proper tool for which to clear up matters for Parliament and for the public of Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, to hear the Honourable Member for St. John speaking about the Ministerial Statement recently and an outpouring of nonsense on the radio yesterday or the day before about the Ministerial Statement being meant to hide, *et cetera*...
4.40 p.m.

The Ministerial Statement is enshrined in the Standing Orders of Parliament and have been made by all Governments all the time. Sir, it is not a device to hide something from the public and this business that it shuts you up for all time does not make sense. Sir, in this case, the Government pointed out that it was discontinuing the acquisition process, was bringing a new Resolution and it would have been ample opportunity for all these things to be debated.

Sir, those who say that this motion is an abuse of Parliament, I join with them because this is too low on the Richter Scale to merit this kind of emergency action. The validity of the Ministerial Statement has been accepted because it has not been rejected by any Member of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, so much of this has been wrapped up in shouting and vagueness but in essence, the Ministerial Statement has not been seriously challenged. Sir, if the Ministerial Statement has not been seriously challenged, then some new incriminating evidence must have arisen since the Statement to warrant the bringing of a No-Confidence Motion.

I have said to my colleagues that the Members of the Opposition are not fools and that they cannot bring a motion such as this unless they had more than what I heard. I came today expecting a bombshell, something they had up their sleeves holding back and of which they did not give us notice but, lo and behold, nothing happened.

Mr. Speaker, I like a good debate, argument and verbal jostling. When I came in here, I want to lock horns to use the words of the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West. I wanted to get into a spirited full-blooded debate because this is an important matter but nothing was said to get my juices going. Sir, Marcus Tullius Cicero said in defence of Marcus Anthony that as a young man he served his country and party and as an old man that he shall not desert it.

Sir, I really wanted to hear something with meat in it so that I could make my occasional tackling with the Opposition on an issue of substance.

The Honourable Minister of Housing acquitted herself very well today as she always does. She put in a proper defence but she is not one only to defend because she shares

her fair share of blows. Sir, I thought that after she had spoken it would be the end. I understand that the General Council told the Honourable Members of the Opposition that they must speak up and they did.

Mr. Speaker, this debate collapsed right after the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West spoke because not a single member after him, including the Honourable Member for St. Philip West, who speaks with exuberance, called for the resignation of the Government. Sir, only the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West called for the resignation of the Government.

The Honourable Member for St. John in his own inimitable classy style gave a few bits of wisdom as to how Government should approach these things. He spoke about circulating plans which used to be the practice in the old days. In those days when you came to Parliament with an acquisition, you had to pass the plan around to Members of Parliament who would decide whether or not they would debate the matter on that day or not. This was one of the pearls of wisdom of the Honourable Member and I support it. I urge the Government, in particular the Minister of Housing and Lands in the avoidance of problems of this sort that we circulate the plan to Members of Parliament before the debate so that Members can see what we are speaking about and this would avoid these little errors.

Sir, the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is like my protegee and is misguided in politics because he is mixed up with the wrong people. I have made my impact in law as a criminal defence attorney and the Honourable Member for St. Philip North is coming along well. Today, he said he was speaking for prosecution but there is no prosecution in this case because nothing has been set out either on the charge sheet or the argument.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West talked all over his face and he has not, in my view, come up with the kind of evidence to show that there was deceit, intention to mislead, fraud or ulterior improper motive.

Sir, it is easy to drop nasty little innuendos and talk about inferences but we cannot rely on hunches or suspicions because we need hard, cold evidence. The Honourable Member for St. Philip North let me down, not as a politician but as a lawyer he could have done much better.

Sir, there is simply no case to answer. If I were the Prime Minister who spoke after the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the House, I would have been minded to close the case after the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West spoke... I would have said that if that is all it is then let us go home.
4.50 p.m.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: The Honourable Member for St. John thinks that I like to go home early, which is true, and he likes to come late.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Sir, if the two things are not conflicting, he also does not last long.

Asides

Mr. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I should prolong this debate but there are a few things which are very striking. The lukewarmness of the contributions; there is no passion in it. This no-confidence thing should be exciting the public.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I am not talking about making a lot of noise. I am talking about passion. The Honourable Member for St. Philip West makes a lot of noise. You must not consider noise and passion as synonymous. They are not.

Sir, there was no passion in this debate. The body language was not right. It did not feel as though they were into anything. The Honourable Member for Christ Church East Central, who is staring across at me, "dipsy doodled" and talked around and never bothered to get into the debate.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central ...

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: I believe that his own attitude to Parliament is wrong. The business of coming into Parliament as a young person, looking to attack people and using a lot of slurs is not for young politicians, but that is the way he is. I am sorry because in other senses I like the Honourable Member. I am not partisan. The Honourable Member for St. John is my friend but I must tell you that I do not trust him any further than I can see him.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: This debate is lukewarm. It is tepid. There is no passion in it, no enthusiasm at all. It is almost as though the other Members of the Opposition Democratic Labour Party left the Honourable Member of St. Michael North West like the boy on the burning deck.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: Left him out there hanging to dry, that is how it appeared to me. If I can be persuaded otherwise, fine.

Sir, this debate seems to be rooted in something more than what meets the eye. In other words, what you see is not what you get. As I said to my colleagues it is like, as is said in the Book of Genesis, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West is the voice of Jacob but somewhere there was the hand of Esau. Something just is not right. Whereas I may have taken the debate with greater seriousness, I could not.

It seems to me that all that was done was to use Parliament as an arena for putting on a show by the Democratic Labour Party, a charade, a "pappy show". He wasted only the meretriciousness of certain members of the Democratic Labour Party. I would like the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West to know that I am sympathetic as a human being but I certainly am not sympathetic as a politician. There are people in the Democratic Labour Party who are at this moment rubbing their hands in glee. The divisions are visible and even blind people can see them and this no-confidence debate was to provide a platform for a tawdry show by the Democratic Labour Party. It is unworthy of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I say that I have been in this Parliament for a long time and I do not have a lot more time in here. I am at the stage where I do not have to talk and look over my shoulder about votes. I bring no malice to any debate in here and I never did as Member of Parliament. It is an institution that I have been a part of for a long time and that has shaped and fashioned me in many ways. I am grateful for the opportunity provided to me by the people of St. George North to have been an active part of a Parliament in my fourth decade, before some of the Honourable Members in this Parliament were born. I have an overriding responsibility to caution Parliament that it should not take this kind of step to lower Parliament from the very high level that it has obtained through the years.

Asides.

Mr. L. R. TULL: We have some powerful traditions and they have to be maintained and we must not allow divisiveness, envious persons or grandiosement, which is evident, power plays and all these things to make us fall from those high standards of which I speak.

Sir, I have to vote against this Resolution, not because I am on This Side but because it does not do anything, because it does nothing. It does not say anything. It does not achieve anything. It has not proved anything. It is petty. It shows poor political judgement and I hope that I will not have to stay in Parliament for whatever time I am around and see something like this happen again, Sir.

I am grateful to you, Sir.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this Resolution and to say from the outset that what has been stated in this Parliament today I am now convinced that the way the land was acquired in St. Peter, the approach was wrong.

Sir, the reason why I said that is based on what I heard from the Other Side today and that is that the first piece of land was owned by a Mrs. Licorish and was tenanted to a Mr. Winston Hinds. I want from the outset to declare an interest in this debate because the gentleman by the name of Winston Hinds was related to me. As I perused the documents of this Honourable House I cannot see in these documents any mention of that particular name or any compensation for that particular name.

Sir, what I have seen from the records is that the land is owned by a Rita Licorish and the estimated value of this parcel of land is \$68,880.00 and that she had improvement of \$8,000.00.
5.00 p.m.

Sir, to the best of my knowledge, the land was not owned by Rita Licorish and if the Crown has paid money for improvement of land, they would have paid it to the wrong person. They can be assured that a case will be put on behalf of my constituent who happens now to be a Rosie Payne, the wife of Winston Hinds...

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. I do not mean to interrupt the Honourable Member but I would just like to correct the Honourable Member on a point of procedure. No money has been paid at this time. I made this quite clear in the Ministerial Statement. The people now have to go into negotiation, so money has not been paid to the wrong person.

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: As I said, Sir, if, is the key word.

I am sticking to my original point. I see no mention of the name Winston Hinds in any of the documents that I have perused and I am sending notice to the House that something has gone wrong here. It was known that the land was tentative and Rita Licorish lived in St. James and the land was rented to a gentleman by the name of Winston Hinds who also had a similar business at Nesfield in St. Lucy. He has passed away, Sir, and I think I have a right, as parliamentary representative for the area, to serve notice to this House that his wife and family are entitled to have a claim on this particular matter.

Sir, in examining the Plan, you will realise that Fort Dignity had an odd-piece of land that projected out and interfered with the properties of the Westermans, the

Scantleburys and the Bournes, and the natural process to the sea. Anybody who understands the culture of Barbadians will tell you that Barbadians prefer to travel through the normal village to get to the beach, instead of having to expose themselves to a town to get to a beach.

I am saying that based on the evidence produced in here today, Sir, I am told that a Mr. Allan Ishmael owned the land to the west of the Westerman's land, Mrs. Archer's land, Mr. Elder Whitehead's land, and Mr. Cheeseman's land. It is clear to me that when the Court Order was given, those houses had to be cleared from that site and one open piece of land would have been left there. There might have been a possibility that the real owner of the land, Mr. Allan Ishmael, might have used his legal authority, the same way he took his legal authority to remove these persons. I believe that the only way this gentleman could have gotten judgment against these four houses, is because the land was running to the sea. As you know, Sir, once the land runs to the sea, it cannot be declared as a normal tenantry.

I hope you are following me on that particular point. Sir, if that argument holds for the four persons who were tenants on the land, there is a possibility that the same Mr. Allan Ishmael might return to the Court and ask the Court to stop people from trespassing on his land, which means it would block the beach access.

Sir, the wording, in my opinion, cannot now be wrong but the acquisition will have to be wrong. Based on the information given to this House today, I honestly believe that what we should be doing is coming to this House, not for the land belonging to Mrs. Rita Licorish and Fort Dignity but also for land from Mr. Allan Ishmael to guarantee that the people of Rector Road, Burma Road, Farm Road and around the town, who will continue to prefer to continue to pass by the Seventh Day Church, then come onto the Highway on Queen Street, and go down through the land that leads to Mrs. Archer, the Westermans and so on, and go on to the beach.

I honestly believe that this Parliament has no choice than to come back later and, if the Prime Minister wants to do it, I will support him on this particular matter. I am saying that the wording is not wrong, but the amount of land required is wrong. The facts are here to prove it because if he took those people to court for living on the land, the next charge will be trespassing on the land. I hope you can follow that point. Sir, I am here to protect the masses, and that is why I am here to protect the people from Rectory Hill, Burma Road, Farm Road and around the town, who would naturally use the road from the Seventh Day Church. The Honourable Member for St. James North would understand what I speak of, because he loves traversing the North of Barbados and there is no doubt that he would have checked this one already.

I honestly believe that when the Prime Minister of Barbados hears this particular argument, he has no choice than to agree with me. You do not now, Sir, have to walk through the town in your swimsuit, because you know Barbadians have pride in themselves and they do not like walking through town in swimsuits. They prefer to walk through the village and go on the natural course to the sea.

What I am asking is that the next Resolution coming to this House is not an amendment of the wording, Sir, but for an additional piece of land to give a real beach access to the people. I can understand the point made by the Prime Minister when he said that it was a natural pathway that the people used to get to the beach.

I was confronted with a similar problem down at the end of Sutherland Hill, by a piece of land belonging to Mr. Richie, where people were accustomed walking right across the middle of the land to get to the beach. He decided to block it and I had to go to him and I said to him that my constituents do not have a legal right to trespass on your land but you must be told one thing. You have purchased the land, you are now living in Barbados, you are now part of the society of Barbados, tell me, can you honestly believe that you could live in Barbados against all those persons who believe they have a right to get to the sea?

I advised the gentleman that it was in his interest to come to the south to his land and develop the access to the beach at that side, so that the persons could continue to access the sea, without interfering with his land in a major way.

I am saying, Sir, that we have to protect the citizens of Barbados up front, and I am calling on the Government now to do this, based on the fact that Mr. Allan Ishmael has been able to get judgment against those persons who were living on his land. Also, based on what you are saying, he has no connection to those persons, how can he have the connection to the persons who would be trespassing on his land? We have to protect those persons. We have to understand that we cannot put those old ladies and old gentlemen to walk through Speightstown to get to the beach. We must provide a reasonable access for them to get to the beach and the best place is right here.

Sir, based on what I have seen here today, I can only come to that conclusion, the Government has to admit that they need to come back. They must have a social conscience on this particular matter because it is in the interest of the masses of people, in that particular area.

On the Other Side, Sir, the impression was given that the Democratic Labour Party does not like to look after the interest of capital. This is not true. We are saying that the approach must be balanced. We understand in this country

that we must encourage investment but at the same time, it cannot be investment where the masses are put one side and ignored, while the other side is accommodated. What we are calling for is fairness for the investors and also for the masses of people in Barbados. I do not think anybody can have a problem with that particular call.

We also have to understand something and I have spoken about it for about ten years, and I will continue to speak about it until there is a change in this Parliament. The Land Acquisition Act as it stands gives too much power to the Crown, and I am against that. As long as it remains that way, I will speak out against it because I honestly believe that in a day and age like now when there is a demand for the masses of people to own land that it is wrong for the Crown to take land from people and just put money on the table for them.

5.10 p.m.

Sir, I am saying that the same way the Crown has the right to decide which piece of land it wants, the vendor must also have some right. His right cannot be just money, his right has to be an alternative piece of land if he wants it. The vendor must be one to have the choice. That is a fundamental change I have been calling for. I am happy to see that this Parliament today suddenly understood the point that was being made previously. All the time they could not understand it and I am very happy that they now understand it for the simple reason that philosophy is something that once you are grounded in it, you cannot stray too far away from the point. Once you know your philosophy, you can get up in a dark night and speak on any matter because you are grounded in a philosophy. My philosophy since 1994 has always been a very straight and clear one. Do not care what matter it is, it would always be grounded in a particular philosophy.

Sir, I hope that after today I would have no problem with the Government Side in understanding this particular point. If it means going to St. Peter to understand this particular point, once there is an understanding on this particular point, I am happy.

Sir, we have to understand that if we allow our people to operate the Land Acquisition Act as it stands that we will continue to have fundamental problems in this country and we might even have social unrest. Sir, as it stands right now, a Minister could come to this Parliament wanting two pieces of land but he could take 50 under disguise. He or she would use the two parcels and then do whatever they feel like with the additional. If they are vexed with a particular person they can use the Land Acquisition Act to get what they want without pretending that it is being used in the interest of the national good, only for somebody to realise the thing later on.

Sir, I am not saying right now that it might occur on That Side. I am saying that the way the Land Acquisition Act is worded there is a possibility. Anybody who doubts what I am saying just has to look and see the amount of land next to the highway that is now owned by Government where sometimes you would happen to see a for sale sign. Sir, that might be good when it occurs within a plantation, but when you go into Greenwich Village and you hear the cries coming from the people within that village, you would understand the point I am making. The Honourable Member for St. James North can confirm that. There are people who owned land who have now ended up being landless. I can speak to that particular issue because my family used to own one and three-quarters acres of land when the cement plant was being constructed and then we ended up without any at all because we were singing the wrong tune. Sir, I have promised myself because it happened to my family, that it would never happen to anybody without my speaking out about it. I am not going to be like some of those who would say it happened to me, so it can happen to somebody else.

Sir, since I came here in 1994 I have given myself a mandate and I will continue to fight on that particular mandate because this mandate must be carried out in the interest of the masses of people of Barbados. Sir, I would not be caught up in debating based on cocktail parties, the types of games I play or anything like that. The mandate has to be done based on the people who I represent. That does not mean that because I put a case for the masses of the people of Barbados I would not put a case for the business people if they have a just cause. There are a lot of people who believe that because you put a case for the masses you can only concentrate yourself in that particular location and that you do not believe in fairness.

Sir, I am here to be a politician, to associate myself with fairness and to deliver in the interest of all and represent the interest of everybody in this country. I have an understanding that it is capital that creates work. If you have capital and you do not have anybody to work the capital, it is waste capital. I understand the relationship between the two and I am not going to be pushed into a corner to believe that I can only speak on behalf of the masses without realising that I have a role to bring capital and labour together. That is why when I see those who are supposed to represent the interest of labour waiving and ignoring their command, I have to bring them back on track and let them know that they must not only look at the capital side that they have to look at their mandate and the mandate that has been given to them. Any man who cannot speak from a position of I am and move on is a man doomed to fail.

You belong to the royal family, you speak like the royal family, you remain there. I will remain here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you addressing the Speaker?

Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN: You represent the royal family, Sir, but I was not speaking to you at this particular point in time, I was speaking to someone you cannot hear because even though I can hear an aside, you are not allowed to hear asides, neither can you see strangers but I might be able to see them even though I cannot speak to them.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a position today where I am calling on the Barbados Labour Party to rethink the position they have placed before this Parliament and to understand that it is in the interest of the people in Rectory Hill, Burma Road, Farm Road and Around-the-Town that this road does not only stop next to the Westerman's but it makes a north turn and then goes westward onto the beach so that those persons in that particular area are allowed to have access to the beach. Sir, the more accesses we have to the beach, the better it is for community tourism.

Sir, one of the reasons I would support a beach access in this particular area is because it allows those persons who live in the hills who are not near to the beach to have a beach access to develop community tourism which as you know, Sir, is now the life-saving thing for tourism in Barbados, so I would not want the people in the north to be deprived of this particular opportunity. It is also based on a principle. I have always stated in this House that it is not owning land on the beach that is important but the right to have the beach access. The more we get to the north of Barbados the better it is because that is the area where tourism is growing and will grow, so we have to make sure that when it occurs that the masses of people have an opportunity to get a piece of the spinoff.

I thank you, Sir.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of a No-Confidence Motion in a Minister or a Government is a very serious matter. It is indeed one of the most powerful weapons available to a parliamentarian particularly to an Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is no accident that this debate is being had some ten years after 1994 where two No-Confidence Resolutions were introduced. Both stood at either end of the spectrum. One spoke to an abuse of prime ministerial power in Cabinet Government and indeed led to the fall of a Government. The other one was brought against me for making a statement via a ministerial statement reflecting that a number of items were awarded beyond the recommended price, indeed awarded at five times the price recommended by the tenders committee of the day, and hence would have led to Government requesting a substantial supplementary in funds.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today as the only Honourable Member in this Chamber who has faced a No-Confidence Motion. Therefore, I can well sympathise with the Honourable Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment, for even though the Motion has ended up against the Government, it has started as a malicious and wilful assault on the Honourable Member for St. James South.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member cannot say "malicious".

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you will withdraw the word "malicious".

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I will withdraw the word in respect to Honourable Members of this House because I cannot impute improper motives in this House.

Mr. Speaker, those who mandated at the General Council of the Democratic Labour Party that a Party should bring a motion that not even its members have accepted as being a valid Resolution, would understand what I mean when I say malicious.

Mr. Speaker, our Government and our system of parliamentary democracy is, in fact, rooted in a series of constitutional conventions. Sir, there is no single doctrine of ministerial responsibility, there is a trinity, and I would use at least five minutes to correct a number of misstatements in relation to constitutional conventions today.

Mr. Speaker, the trinity of ministerial responsibility is that there is an accountability on the part of a minister to the Sovereign, because Barbados is still a monarchical form of Government. There is a responsibility individually as a minister to Parliament and to Cabinet, and there is the principle of collective responsibility. Those are the three premises upon which our constitutional system is based.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the use of no-confidence motions by a new Democratic Labour Party in the last 10 years, not to treat to serious issues of substance but indeed, to be able to reflect their own impotence and inability to settle internal issues as they arise.

This debate today has nothing to do with the error which was duly acknowledged and for which there was an apology by the Honourable Member for St. James South. This debate has to do with the in-fighting within the Democratic Labour Party.

Sir, I can find no better words than the Honourable Member who just sat, who in today's front page clearly stated that this is to prepare the Honourable Member for

St. Michael North West for the leadership elections that will take place in George Street in August.

If this debate were about principles of constitutional democracy, then we perhaps would have heard them refer to the fact that throughout Commonwealth parliamentary democracies, even though a Minister is accountable to Parliament, that person is not held responsible for administrative error.

Mr. Speaker, I start with a quotation of 1956 from Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, quoting from the *British Hansard*, where he said:

"Of course, the extent to which we condemn a minister for an act of one of his officers or for a failure by one of his officers, obviously depends on the circumstances. There are minor occasions when a minister admits that something has gone wrong, and the House accepts it and the matter is left there."

Mr. Speaker, those are not my words but are the words of a former leader of the British Labour Party, Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, even if I did not want to stop there, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, former Home Secretary in 1954, understood that a minister could not accept responsibility for every word or act of his public servants. He said:

"Today the work and the task of the Government permeates so many spheres of our national life, that it is impossible for the minister to keep track of all of these matters."

Mr. Speaker, if 50 years ago it was impossible for a Government to be held responsible for the act of every public servant, all the more so when the task of Government has become even more complex. I say to you Sir, that we have a responsibility to ourselves and to the traditions which we have inherited.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to rely only on the examples of the United Kingdom, let us come home, and perhaps in particular the Leader of the Opposition needs an example of history lessons occurring in his own party and of the perspectives held by the Democratic Labour Party as it related to errors. It is all accepted across Barbados that the Right Excellent Errol Barrow was the physical embodiment of the party that they have now decimated, devalued and debased. Sir, in the Budget of 1987 when the then Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central brought a Budget that purported to impose consumption tax on vegetables, do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? The

Honourable Member for St. Peter got up and pointed out the error and no less than three persons from the Democratic Labour Party, two of whom are still elders of the party, two of whom are still available to give advice to a wayward leader, at page 1130 of *Hansard*, it was said by Mr. Evelyn Greaves, the then Honourable Member for St. Lucy:

“The Honourable Member for St. Peter referred to the appendix attached to the Budget. We recognised that there has been a number of typographical errors in relation to fish and vegetables...”

Mr. Speaker, at page 1166, the then Honourable Member St. Philip North and the current Honourable Member would do well to go check with him on this too, rather than feigning to defend an issue, one in which he does not believe.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Franklyn on that occasion said:

“There has obviously been an error...”

Mr. Speaker, the then Prime Minister himself, the Right Excellent Errol Barrow, at page 1189 – and I want Parliament to listen to these words carefully because we feel that history began yesterday.

“I take responsibility and I share it with the Honourable Minister because at all times, I had access but like most of us in these positions, we do not go through things like appendices in any detail because we must trust the people with whom we are supposed to work.”

Mr. Speaker, a Democratic Labour Party of 1987 understood that but Sir, in the last 10 years, we have been subjected to a new form of Democratic Labour Party leadership. Sir, yesterday I was told that there are only four rules to the new Democratic Labour Party leadership.

Certain remarks made by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East were ordered expunged from the records by Mr. SPEAKER.

5.30 p.m.

The Honourable Member for St. John had a secret deal with the IMF and the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West has JAWS.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Sir, I have noticed that the Chair does not intervene anymore. I assume that as a Presiding Officer you would not allow a member to accuse Honourable

Members of being malicious. You cannot allow members to accuse Honourable Members of lying. Sir, I do not have to point the rules out to you because I know that you know them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you were on your feet.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, were you asleep?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, Honourable Member, I was not asleep. Honourable Member for St. Michael North East you referred to the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party. Technically, we could allow that but normally the leadership is always a member of the House. I am suggesting to you that what you say is not allowed.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: I am grateful for the directions, Sir.

Mr. D.J.H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, in case you did not hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East said that one rule of leadership of the Democratic Labour Party is that you must tell a big lie within the first three months. She then looked over at me and said the Honourable Member for St. John. Sir, you may have been asleep, I do not know. Sir, there was no implication because a direct statement was made and the records will show that a direct statement was made if we send for them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. Michael North East, I am asking you to withdraw those words and that those words be struck from the records.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the words. I also want to say that I did not accuse the Honourable Member for that but if the Honourable Member wants me to accuse him for telling lies, I can go back and reflect on the secret deal with the IMF. Sir, I would never accuse him in here because I am not allowed to impute improper motives to persons.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, have you ruled on the matter or will you allow somebody by implication as a Member of this House to suggest or impute that a Member of this House told a lie, whatever it may be. Sir, are you going to rule that out of order as well and get the debate back on track.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. Michael North East, there is no need for the remark. By inference it is clear that you are referring to the Honourable Member as having told a lie.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Honourable Member for St. John invited the whole of Barbados down to Queens Park on the night before elections in 1984 to speak about a secret deal with the IMF.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am going to say this again, Sir. First of all, two rules are being broken here. Sir, you made a statement earlier relative to the four corners of this debate. If the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East wants to carry the debate in a new direction, I have no objection to participating but, Mr. Speaker, you laid down the rules and if you are not going to stand by your own rules, then I have to object.

Sir, I am objecting on two grounds, relevance and that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East is challenging your ruling relative to the matter when you said that the words must be struck from the records but you are allowing the Honourable Member to go down the same road you said she is not to go down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East, there is no need to go down the route of trying to make out that the Honourable Member for St. John as having told a lie and it is irrelevant to the matter.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is irrelevance whether the Honourable Member for St. John lies as a habit or not, that is true.

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a proper retraction, please. I am asking you to withdraw the whole matter relating to the reference of the Honourable Member for St. John. ***As I have said before, this one also must be struck from the record because it is not relevant at this point.***

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: Sir, relevance has nothing to do with that because the Standing Orders of this House makes it abundantly clear about imputing improper motive. If you cast your ruling in that light, you are saying that you are entitled to impute them if it is relevant. Sir, I want a clarification on your ruling. The Honourable Member wants to take the debate in the gutter and I have tried my best in this debate as a senior member of this House but I am warning the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East that if she wants to speak about who tell lies in this country that my morality is not on trial in Barbados and that three months ago her morality was on trial. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East had better get out of that and get on with the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you have made your point. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East I have asked that the reference made be withdrawn and struck from the record and that there be no more reference to it, please.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree that it be withdrawn. Sir, I am saying to you that the Democratic Labour Party practises a form of leadership that encourages persons to go down the road of manufacturing the truth. On their own admission, within the first three months of leadership whether JAWS or a secret deal with IMF...

Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East is imputing improper motives to the leadership of the Democratic Labour Party by saying that it encourages persons not to tell the truth. Sir, at the time when the Honourable Member was making that statement I was in this House and I am a former leader of the Democratic Labour Party and the Honourable Member must withdraw those remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree with the Honourable Member for St. John that you should not say that the Democratic Labour Party encourages leaders to manufacture the truth. There is no need for that at this point.

The rule is clear in our Standing Order about imputing improper motives to members. The leader of the Democratic Labour Party is here and you have to withdraw the remark. I can find no other way to ask you to make the statement you want to make. Please, let us move on from there. Also, the remark must be struck from the record.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark and stand guided. I want to make the point that what we have seen in the last ten years in contrast to 1987 when the Democratic Labour Party stood on this Floor through the leadership of the Right Excellent Errol Barrow in the best traditions of this Parliament, an example not yet to be followed by any subsequent leader of the Democratic Labour Party, recognising that there is...

5.40 p.m.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North East is misleading this Honourable House because the Right Excellent Errol Walton Barrow accepted the responsibility and if you read what you quoted again, you would recognise that he accepted the responsibility for the error made in the appendix of the Budget, quite unlike the Honourable Member for St. James South who passed the responsibility to the Ministry and to a civil servant.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. If the Honourable Member would read the debates or stay in the Honourable House, he would know that the collective membership of the Democratic Labour Party on that occasion blamed it on a typographical error of a civil servant. Mr. Speaker, he is misleading the House because the Honourable Member for St. James South acknowledged the error at the earliest possible opportunity in a Ministerial Statement and did not wait for a new Resolution to be brought. It is nonsense that we should have brought a new Resolution first instead of acknowledging it on the Floor of the House and doing the decent thing, Mr. Speaker, what did we do? We stopped the debate before it went to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the error perpetrated by the Democratic Labour Party in 1987, under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, became law upon the speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance then. Sir, the consequences of that error were to be deleterious on the backs of everybody in this country who was to buy vegetables and fish. Mr. Speaker, where is the contrast?

Sir, the contrast today stands that this Government's error is not to foist injustice on a poor woman or families in St. Peter as the Honourable Members on That Side would want to accuse. It stands because we sought to stop a developer from blocking off access. He would do better to get the Honourable Member for St. Philip North to advise him rather than the man from the Other Place because then he would have had a proper Resolution that, perhaps, Members on This Side could have spoken to.

The Honourable Member for St. John sought refuge in the Standing Orders and tenantry roads in his constituency because he could not make contact with the Resolution that the Honourable Member brought. He stands here today smiling because, and as a journalist said on Sunday night, he stands to be the beneficiary of your incompetence as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we have known better days in this Parliament and I, like the Honourable Member for St. George South, feel that the bar has been set too low. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy never came into contact with the request of the No-Confidence Motion that this Government resign. The only person whose judgement stands in question here today is that of the Leader of the Opposition and also the Honourable Member for St. John because he too presided over the building of the monument that he now accuses you, the Leader of the Opposition, of leading. A monument does not happen overnight. Nine years of incompetent leadership and I feel for you because you inherited it.

Sir, the problem is, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, apart from looking into the mirror and filling his

own eyes can fill the eyes of no one else in this country. It is easier for an elephant to pass through the eye of a needle than it is for him to fill the eyes of the people of his Party or his country.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in here today, not because of any error, not because of any misstatement but because the Honourable Member faces challenges for the presidency of the Democratic Labour Party, and the Honourable Member for St. John sits back and smiles waiting to catch the ball at first hop. The people of this country are not foolish. We should be in here today dealing with serious issues of the day.

The Honourable Member can hide behind what are lies and not lies and what is ruled out and what is not ruled out but I say to you today that we have a Parliament with a strong history. I have quoted from Gaitskell and Fyfe and I can quote to you from his 1986 Royal Australian Commission on Administration, which says the same thing. I have quoted to you from our own *Hansard*, from the Right Excellent Errol Barrow.

Mr. Speaker, why are we here? Why is it that Barbados' name appears, and I make this a document of the House, on a Daily Corruption News Full Text Service? The Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central said that I am talking nonsense when I talk about Barbados' negative publicity flowing from a trivial misuse on a parliamentary motion.

Mr. Speaker, *Transparency International* published on the 23rd June, 2004, Daily Corruption News Full Text Service. There is no allegation from the Opposition that anybody stole or no allegation that anybody abused ministerial office but the country's name is now being sullied across the globe.

Sir, the only person that I know in Barbados that is associated with *Transparency International* is a man well-known to the Democratic Labour Party, a former High Commissioner to Trinidad and Tobago and to Columbia. Sir, I really have to ask because I do not know if he is in the habit of making reports to *Transparency International* or whether he is being reported on. I really do not know but I know that today we have to go and defend Barbados' good name internationally because what should otherwise have been acceptable as an apology, as an acknowledgment of wrong in terms of error, accepted by the British Parliament as sufficient censure, accepted by the Australian Parliament as sufficient censure, accepted by the New Zealand Parliament as sufficient censure, accepted by this Parliament as

sufficient censure and accepted by the Founder Leader of the Democratic Labour Party as sufficient censure is now to be elevated in a way to debase and devalue the best traditions of this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, constitutions are held together not by laws but by the principle of consensus, by the fact that we agree that there are conventions that bind us together. The unfortunate thing in all of this is that every time you attack the fabric, ignoring the best traditions, you leave a scar that is difficult to wipe out.

Sir, I am not even going to get into that because I think the Prime Minister has ably placed the issue as to the kind of conduct that should be a No-Confidence Motion—a breach of the Electoral Offences Act, an intimation for criminal sanction to flow from a breach of that Act. What is the issue that we are being asked to answer here today? An administrative error that Gaitskell, Fyfe and Errol Barrow have acknowledged to be nothing more than something for which an apology is due.

Sir, a Minister is accountable only because the Minister is the only person who can come here and accept responsibility and only when there is some level of moral turpitude, personal immoral behaviour, that you demand ministers to resign or be dismissed, not for pure error of an administrative type.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunate and regrettable incident. This Government does not pretend to be perfect. No Honourable Member of this House pretends to be perfect. Mr. Speaker, this is the point that I was trying to make to the Honourable Member for St. John. When I came to this Party, I had the examples of a Bree St. John, the late Sir Harold St. John, Henry Forde, now Sir Henry Forde, the Honourable Member for the City, and the Honourable Member for St. George South who told us that if we could not prove something with documents, not to get up and talk about it. They brought us back from the brink.
5.50 p.m.

If the Honourable Member for St. John is the mature parliamentarian that he feigns in here today to be, then I would have expected that he would have brought the Honourable Leader of the Opposition back from the brink. His silences and his inaction on this matter and, I trust his vote, would show that he is no less guilty than the Leader of the Opposition for the error of political judgment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between them. It is a funny thing because the Leader of the Opposition got up in here last week and ran so far from the Honourable Member for St. John, to say that he worked for the Honourable Member for St. John as the Minister of Finance for seven

months, and he did not even give him a piece of paper to look at. This is what he said about him but then, the Honourable Member for St. John pays him back today, by coming in here and never speaking to the Resolution, so I suppose it is even. Therefore, what are we left with? An Opposition that continues to fight divided, an Opposition that the Government and people of Barbados want to perform. Sir, we want them to perform. We want them to do your job, but instead, we have a slur on Parliament's best traditions, instead of you holding the most powerful weapon for when you have something, you do not do it. The Honourable Member for St. Lucy said it was the wrong move. The Honourable Member for the City, who has not yet spoken, told me it was the wrong battle, in the wrong dress at the wrong time, with the wrong people. Everything about it is wrong.

The Right Honourable Member for St. Peter gave the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to withdraw it. Yet, we hear about ego in here from the Honourable Member for St. John. The only ego in here is the one displayed today by him in the face of the evidence and in the face of a Court Order. It was not issued by any Honourable Member of this Parliament. It was issued by the Courts of this country.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, this is a Government that sought to do right for people and along the way there was an administrative error, and rather than waiting to bring a new Resolution, the Minister did the decent thing and came in here and corrected, acknowledged it was wrong and apologised.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any assurance that errors of an administrative nature will never happen again during the tenure of this Administration. I do not have that power. The way you hear the Opposition speak, it would be as if any error were to happen that a Government would collapse, the country would be ungovernable; and Errol Barrow understood that. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that there is a need to be able to treat to the provision of mentorship and guidance to bring Honourable Members back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, I heard in here the Honourable Member for St. Michael South Central accuse me for marching for Jesus. Sir, if it is a badge of dishonour to march for Jesus, then I stand so accused. Equally, the same Honourable Member accused the Honourable Member for St. Thomas of having no other certificate than Scripture. He makes it sound as if it is an unworthy thing to have a certificate in Scripture. We stand condemned, as charged by him on that point pertaining to Scripture and marching for Jesus, and no amount of apologising by him can redeem that, Sir.

Mr. R. L. SEALY: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I never spoke to anyone's possession of certificates.

Asides.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not even going to give you the chance to call for the record,

because mercifully, as I look around, everybody who is here now was here when he spoke. Sir, if he believes that people now believe him, that is a matter for the Honourable Member, but I perhaps will treat that last statement, in the same way that I treat the statements of all Honourable Members on That Side who spoke today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member, could you conclude, please. Your time has expired.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir.

They want to say one thing and have us believe another. Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been a regrettable incident.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that, yes, there may be elements that will cause us to come here in the future, or they, if they ever become a government to speak to the issue of administrative error. Every government tries to do the right thing in the right way, at the right time. This is the goal and commitment of a Government but it does not always work that way because we are human beings and we are fallible. The commitment must remain steadfast. It is that commitment which is the difference between good Government and bad Government.

Mr. Speaker, we face many challenges as a country today. We have many tasks to complete. I would have hoped, Sir, that we could have engaged in a serious debate about those challenges, rather than setting the bar low, speaking to sanctions for administrative errors by Ministers that are not found throughout the Commonwealth to be relevant where there is no form of moral turpitude.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I really believe we have a duty to the people of this country to put this matter in its proper context, recognise the apology which is given and to move on. Let us, Sir, get on with the people's business and not be tarrying with irrelevancies. I ask this House today to express confidence by voting against the Resolution of the Leader of the Opposition, and to express confidence in this Government that is committed to getting on with the people's business.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West will now wind up.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my final contribution in this debate. The truth is, for all that have been said today, no one has really refuted the major charges laid in this Resolution. In fact, I referred to the issue of the Ministerial apology in which the Minister said that an understanding of Queen Street makes it quite clear that the provision of a beach access at this location is unnecessary.

Today, in fact, even the evidence presented would suggest that at the time of considering the acquisition, there was to be an access to the residence, as well as an access to the beach. In fact, this was stated in quite clear terms as we have learnt, as I said, in the Press. We know that it is contained in the Cabinet Paper of 2002 that the action by Fort Dignity will create some measure of inconvenience to the surrounding residents, who would now be hindered from having access to their residences and to the beach.

This is important because the reason why the No-Confidence Motion was brought in the first place, was because the original Resolution spoke to a public access to the beach. When the Opposition did its work, it was determined that it was an access to Queen Street. Yet even today in his contribution, the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter recognised that there was consideration of an access behind Mrs. Westerman's land to the beach and that Government owns the land that currently has the car park on it. So when you speak to the matter at hand and to the two parcels of lands being acquired for the purpose of a public access there was recognition that there was also consideration of an access to the beach at the back of the properties of Miss Westerman in Queen Street.
6.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness notwithstanding what has been said I think that the Democratic Labour Party was able to ask what is the public purpose for which the land is being acquired. We now have an answer that it is an access to the beach to the residences, but yet there was consideration of an access to the beach at the back of the Westerman property which we had demonstrated this morning. So in actual fact we are left to wonder if the original Resolution was not the correct Resolution in terms of being a beach access.

Therefore, the Honourable Member for St. Peter has in fact agreed that there is a Resolution, and this is the point that has to be made, yet in the ministerial apology it was being suggested that the land was being acquired simply for an access for the residents to Queen Street.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss as to why we have been told about the wrongdoings of the Opposition when in actual fact the apology tendered by the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment did not give us the correct reason for the land acquisition. Therefore, no one can blame the Opposition for having brought any Resolution because even the ministerial apology that came in the aftermath of the Resolution was still erroneous and did not make contact with the reality and the intent of the original Resolution, so why therefore should the Opposition be pilloried for bringing a Resolution of this kind and it was deemed simply to be a procedural issue.

Sir, I think the Honourable Members on This Side spoke extremely well, particularly the Honourable Members for St. Philip North and St. Lucy. In fact, I think the overall standard of the debate was extremely good. I do not mind the contributions of some of the Honourable members of the Other Side who would seek to condemn the Resolution, because it is a fact that there would have been some real reason for this Resolution coming to Parliament in the way it did. So we on the Opposition side are justified in suggesting that the original intent of the Resolution was indeed the real and true intent. Therefore, not even the contribution by the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment can get me away from that position because when she sought to make an apology, the apology still did not make contact with the reality of the acquisition, that is a fact.

Sir, I have come to these Chambers to ensure that the standard of debate in this Parliament is good, that we are in fact a competent and a reasonable Opposition and that we are in fact performing like an alternative Government because that is what an Opposition is. An Opposition is really an alternative Government, a Government in waiting, therefore it is our duty to ensure that we bring these kinds of issues to the awareness of the people.

Mr. Speaker, let me again state that a very fundamental point I made in my original presentation has not been dealt with and I would hope that we can shed some light on this matter. The truth is that Almshouse Gap which runs east to west then north to south may become a hindrance to any intended commercial development at Fort Denmark. So all that is required is for there to be some acceptance of the point because if you are going to permit commercial development where the Sanitation Service Authority used to be, it may be difficult to justify having a public access road running across the land.

However, the Government and the Cabinet of Barbados have already agreed in principle to the treating of the land at Fort Denmark for commercial development. That was also stated in the Cabinet Paper of 2002 that the land at Fort Denmark was approved for commercial development. So I do not see how you can say no when it is a fact of life. I do not know who the commercial developers would be, but I would wish again for this Honourable Chamber to be told the truth about what kind of commercial development would occur at the Fort Denmark site because no one can refute that the Cabinet of Barbados has already given approval for commercial development at Fort Denmark.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the Cabinet Paper and a copy of the contents were put into the *Weekend Nation*, so I do not see how any person on the Other Side could deny that Fort Denmark has already been approved for commercial development.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not correct to quote from a Cabinet Paper and therefore I would wish for the Right Honourable Member for St. Peter to say that in the Cabinet Paper of July 16, 2002, serial number 030011/702 Volume 1, if anyone wants to refute what I am saying, there was an approval for commercial development. Contrary to what the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East tried to insinuate, I have no record of being any liar. In fact, the truth is that most, if not all, of what I have said over the last ten years in my contribution to political life in Barbados has almost come to pass on the economy with respect to taxation and with respect to almost everything so nobody can accuse me of being a liar in Barbados.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I never accused the Honourable Member of being a liar in this Parliament. Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak about his concoction of his own admission on JAWS but if he wants it to be part of the record fine, but he admitted that JAWS was a concoction. Now if that is telling lies, I really do not know.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I have received a few thousand dollars for the fact that I never made that comment. I received quite a few thousand dollars from one of the leading newspapers in Barbados and should have and could have received similar from the...
6.10 p.m.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is misleading this Honourable House. What the Honourable Member did not receive a few thousand of dollars for is the information that he has just given. The Honourable Member referred to a particular Cabinet Paper and said that it was part of a decision of the Cabinet on that date that the land would have been used for commercial development.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to make a record of the Cabinet's decision to this Honourable House, which the Honourable Member cannot do. Sir, I will read verbatim. It is found at Minute No. 49 of this File, which the Democratic Labour Party had said in their column, had disappeared. I know it was their intention to get their hands on the file. I know how these things drop off the backs of trucks, so from the time this matter surfaced, I had this file under lock and key, so that when their operatives were looking for it, it had, in fact, disappeared because I was holding it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please read the decision.

Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, it is a decision arising from a meeting of the Cabinet on July 25th, citing the file to which the Honourable Member has just spoken, and confirmed on August 14th.

Acquisition of land at Queen Street, St. Peter:

“The Cabinet agreed that two parcels of land at Queen Street, St. Peter, measuring approximately 217 square metres, owned by Fort Dignity Limited, and 320 square metres, owned by Rita Licorish, should be acquired for the provision of an access road to the beach.”

It is not true, therefore, that Cabinet decided on this date to acquire the land for development, therefore, the Honourable Member must be accurate and truthful. He has gotten enough blows earlier in the day, that at least he should now try to be truthful.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, again I said that the land at Fort Denmark Limited was approved for commercial development. I never said the land at Fort Dignity Limited and that cannot be refuted. In the proper administration and conduct of this Honourable House, I am tempted to break what I do feel and believe about the way in which we should conduct affairs in this Honourable Chamber. Sir, it cannot be refuted, and even though I will not make it a document of the House, I am going to make the Cabinet Paper which I have, a document of the Honourable House. I am also going to make it public. It is factual that, in fact, the Cabinet Paper said ...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: About Fort Denmark, which is the Sanitation Park, so do not let us go there.

Asides.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, let me go on because the reality of life is that we have asked quite a number of questions. We asked whether or not there could not have been an alternative access to the beach. If it is being said now that there is no intention to do anything with the Almshouse Gap, then the Almshouse Gap remains a major public access to the beach for the residents of Queen Street and for the people of Speightstown. Therefore, there would be no reason for any other public access to the beach in the area of Queen Street but it has been determined already that within the Cabinet Paper, there was an understanding that the development at Fort Dignity Limited might have affected access to both the residents, as well as the access to the beach at the back of the residents, which is on the westward side of the Westerman property. That has been admitted to in this debate, so there is no need to go there.

Mr. Speaker, we went on to answer the question about what really is the intent, and I think that in all fairness the Right Honourable Prime Minister is in a position where he

could give the Honourable House the benefit of the facts with respect to the proposals for Fort Denmark Limited and the adjacent areas.

Sir, it is also true that a major developer in Barbados already has access to the land in the area and is seeking to make a major development out of it, as far as I understand, with respect to that entire area which constitutes part of the overall attempt to develop Speightstown and the wider areas of Speightstown. Nobody could deny that as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have put the issues to the people of Barbados. We have demonstrated that there might have been an error but even in the apology for the error there was still not an acceptable response or reason for the acquisition.

Sir, only today we have now discovered that not even the proposed amendment or the suggestion that the Resolution, at first intent was not correct but could be corrected by the amendment proposed in the Ministerial apology. That has been established fully in this debate today. Whether or not it is major; whether or not it is corruption; whether or not it is bribery, to which I must now refer, because I have been accused and I think it was unfortunate and is something to which I have to respond. The suggestion was that a big, black businessman was a major supporter of mine in the last election. That was the inference from this morning's debate but as far as I know...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: It was said but all of us in here know that political parties in Barbados, especially That Side, are, in fact, financed by big businesses. All of us in here know that Honourable Members from the Other Side get all kinds of financial donations from businessmen in Barbados. It is a fact of life.

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Let me go on and deal with the substantive issues. It is known, and nobody can hide it. It makes no sense pretending in today's Barbados that contributions are not made to political parties but from companies in Barbados. Let me say that, in fact, when we received this letter...

Asides.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Of course, we did. It was directed to the General Secretary of the Party. When we received this letter, I approached the offended party, a big, black businessman in Barbados. In fact, when he took it to his lawyer for action, and his lawyer is a supporter of that side, he was persuaded not to act against a Mr. Kevin Skeete. It was said that he could not have been serious about writing such a letter because even if someone wanted to make a contribution to a candidate, would that person tell

anyone that he, in fact, intends to buy votes? He would have to be a madman! Therefore, to have this written in such a way was unfortunate, and the disclosure made today was also unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, let me go deeper because it is an allegation that has been made in a letter, and I am saying that you better believe that action would be taken on this matter now. Originally, there was an attempt to stall the action by the lawyer representing that individual.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin Skeete, who is supposed to be a computer guru, has approached the Democratic Labour Party and said that he had, in fact, worked for the Barbados Labour Party in the election providing computer software and that the Barbados Labour Party owes him in excess of \$100 000.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. This is the act of a desperate man. There is no computer software which has been purchased by the Barbados Labour Party, either from Kevin Skeete or from any other person. The Barbados Labour Party uses a Microsoft package, Micro Access.

Secondly, the Barbados Labour Party, maybe unlike the people in the Democratic Labour Party, has paid all debts owing to all persons.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, I said that he worked for the ruling party creating software computer programmes in 1999.

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I was General Secretary and Campaign Manager in 1998 and 1999. I say to you that the Barbados Labour Party never purchased any computer software for any campaign from Kevin Skeete or any other person.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Sir, he came and said that he provided the software and proceeded to say that he would work on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party.

Sir, there is contention over this issue and it will be dealt with because it is a fact. I have come to politics knowing that the truth shall be told. Therefore, I could not stand here and allow for the kind of information that went into the public domain not to be challenged but this will be dealt with in a more meaningful way within the law courts of Barbados.

The comment here was unreasonable, untrue and would have reflected badly on a man that has also made contribution across the political spectrum.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes to conclude.

Mr. C. A. MASCOLL: Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that in today's debate we demonstrated in large measure that the original Resolution was a flawed Resolution and demonstrated by way of the evidence that we provided in today's debate that it was justified, that the question of collective responsibility had to be pursued, that we had to broaden the base of inclusion with the Resolution to ensure that we do not target only the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment. Given how this entire process started in the earlier years in the year 2002 when another person was Minister of Housing that we could not but broaden the base of inclusion of the Resolution but that we provided evidence.

There has been a lot of retreat with respect to the issues in this debate and there has been conflict in terms of evidence provided by the Minister with respect to why the Resolution was brought the way it was brought initially and why an amendment was made to the Resolution to be brought to this House in order to be able to acquire such land as a beach access.

Mr. Speaker, we were also able to demonstrate that there is a wider agenda that the lands at Port Denmark area would be utilised to actually give greater opportunity for commercial development but the whole question of balancing the relationship between big business and big developers must be balanced with residences and the opportunity to provide for ordinary small Barbadians to have access to business opportunities within the Queen Street/Speightstown area.

Therefore, no one can say that this Resolution was frivolous because it was able to get us information that otherwise we would not have been able to get on this matter and to provide us with some semblance of the truth with respect to why the original Resolution was drafted the way it was.

Mr. Speaker, I can say with a sense of confidence and comfort that there was justification contrary to the views expressed by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East and other members on the Other Side that we brought a Resolution out of pure concern for access to the truth and understanding on what transpired and what will be the intention in terms of development of the land in the Queen Street area. In that regard, I feel justified and satisfied that we approached this No-Confidence Motion in a most appropriate and correct way.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Right Honourable Prime Minister, according to the rules of the House as Minister may now conclude this debate.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was truly fascinated by the speeches that came from the Other Side. Ordinarily, in concluding the debate, I would want to speak about the members on my Side first but on this occasion, I will depart from convention.

It was fascinating because the Honourable Member for St. John gave a speech that sounded to me like an acceptance speech. I do not know what he is accepting or if there is anything left to accept but he would have to know. The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West is my constituent and I have pledged to him that in this House I will make sure that he will not be treated unfairly by members on this Side but I cannot give him the assurance that he will not be treated unfairly by members on his Side. Sir, speaking as his parliamentary representative, his speech sounded to me like a verbal representation of Custer's last stand.

Sir, in my twenty years of politics, I had the experience of once bringing a No-Confidence Motion against a Prime Minister. It succeeded in removing the Prime Minister and the Government. I made the point in that representation to Parliament that one does not bring a No-Confidence Motion for light and trivial reasons. In fact, I said then that something had happened about which it was difficult to speak but impossible to remain silent. I also said that I did not rush to it.

It is clear to me that Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, by his own admission at the end, had intended after a year of doing nothing in this House to have brought a Parliamentary Question to ask for information. Sir, I am putting it in this chargeable context. I suspect that under pressure from certain elements in the Democratic Labour Party, he was forced to bring in the form of a No-Confidence Motion that which would have been better brought as a Parliamentary Question.

Mr. Speaker, a No-Confidence Motion, if accepted would lead immediately to the removal of the Government from office and the removal of the Prime Minister from the head of the Government. Is it the considered judgement of my constituent that he should remove a Government from office, his parliamentary representative and the Prime Minister of the country on the basis of some questions that he wants answered?
6.30 p.m.

Surely, my good friend, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, should not feel that you remove a Government from office, because you want some information, because you can ask for it. I have given the assurance already that any information he wants I will give to him but you have to show that there is some malice on the

part of the Government, some moral turpitude, some vast abuse of office or executive authority or some major breach of the Constitution.

Sir, as I wind up this debate, I am sure that all Honourable Members of this Parliament have not heard anything coming from the Leader of the Other Side that suggests that the matter before the House rises to the level that will warrant a No-Confidence Motion being brought. In that regard, I really have to go back to what I said originally. Sir, this is a sad debate because I have had one consultation with the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, as Prime Minister to the Leader of the Opposition, when I told him to please let us work in this term to restore Parliament and do not let us use Parliament other than for advancing the people's business.

Sir, I believe that the use of this Honourable House for the purpose by the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West, and I am serious about this, has been an abuse of Parliament for a most unworthy personal purpose. I say in great seriousness that his only motive was in response to the strictures coming from His Side, led by the Honourable Member for St. John. His only motive was to show the people of the Democratic Labour Party that his Party had not gone to sleep and that after not having asked a question for a whole year he can still find it in him to ask a question and that he was responding to the urging of His Side that he had to go for the jugular of the Barbados Labour Party.

Sir, if that is what he wants to do, then he has his Democratic Labour Party columns to do it, he can write letters to the media, he has his Party branches but that cannot be the purpose of this Parliament. There are too many important things that this country and people want us to deal with for us to be dealing with things that could be dealt with by way of a Parliamentary Question, as just happened in this debate.

Sir, I think that the Honourable House has been diminished, that public life in some respect has been devalued by the spectacle of the people's representatives being embroiled in this matter that has already gone abroad in the foreign and international media as evidence of some corruption in Barbados that has warranted the House having to meet to chastise the Government of this land.

Sir, I believe that it was in a Trinidadian newspaper, *Transparency International* led by a Mr. DaSilva, that there is corruption in Barbados and the Democratic Labour Party had to bring a No-Confidence Motion against the Government. That is what makes this such a disgraceful exercise by the Democratic Labour Party, because it will not affect the standing of the Government *per se* because the public recognise the trivial personal nature that has inspired

the bringing of this Resolution but it will defame the name of this country for good governance among the family and the community of nations of the world.

Sir, on My Side, I have to thank and congratulate the Honourable Member for St. James South, my Representative, who has had to endure a lot in politics, some of which I might have also contributed to. In this particular matter she has distinguished herself by one attribute which I would urge all young politicians to take notice of – a generosity of spirit to accept responsibility for something that started long before she took over that office. She was generous enough to apologise for it.

In 1986 when we recognised, on the Floor of Parliament, that the Democratic Labour Party brought an error in the Budget that would have imposed a tax on food, Errol Barrow accepted responsibility but he never apologised but the Honourable Member for St. James South accepted full responsibility for something that she was not responsible for because it started in May 2002 and everything had been concluded by the time she took over. She said that she is going to accept responsibility and also apologise for it. It would really be an unjust act for this Honourable House, after she accepted responsibility and apologised, to have subjected her to a Motion of No Confidence.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I have to say that in this debate she has distinguished herself. I do not often speak about, and will not do it often, about why I appoint people to Cabinet. I remember making a statement on the opening of the National Housing Corporation's new headquarters, that housing is the area of Barbados' national life where I felt that our progress had not matched the other aspects of our national development. It is the area that I feel needs strong, aggressive, imaginative leadership and I have appointed the Honourable Member for St. James South, fully confident in her ability to give the strong, aggressive, imaginative leadership to that area of national life which has not kept pace with overall national development. I have appointed her to that position because I think that she has it in her to leave an outstanding and extraordinary mark in dealing with that area of our national affairs that needs the capabilities of a person of her attributes.

Sir, I have come to this debate, and you can say whatever you want to say about me in this matter, to express my fullest confidence in how she has managed this affair. More especially to express my fullest confidence in her as my Minister of Housing, Lands and Environment.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: I expect her to leave her mark on housing, lands and the environment. I hope that she would leave this debate with a new mark as a person of great

integrity but a person who would never shirk her responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has saddened me, if only because I know how I got involved in the matter. I have explained to the Honourable House, contrary to what the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West said, that the Government did not approach the people of Queen Street, the people of Queen Street approached me as a Member of Parliament to ask me to prevent them from being disadvantaged by the investors at Fort Dignity and I responded in good faith.

Sir, I want to say that I give the assurance from this side that My Side will never ever hide behind public officers and ask them to accept responsibility. That is, perhaps, why the Honourable Member for St. James South accepted the responsibility but the Honourable Member from the Other Side must never use the people of Barbados for their insidious political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I know the people in Queen Street well and this whole thing has pained me. Sir, when I hear the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West speak in terms of how I was trying to sell out Mrs. Scantlebury it saddens me. Mrs. Scantlebury is a person whom I have known for all my life. Mrs. Scantlebury is a person at whose table I have eaten as a child. Mrs. Scantlebury's son is married to one of my cousins and I frequented her house, which is the subject of this issue.

Sir, Mrs. Scantlebury and Mrs. Westerman came to me in May 2002. I remember this matter vividly because I told them that I was coming on the Sunday and that Sunday was Mother's Day and the public officers were vexed because I had taken them out on Mother's Day and the people in Queen Street were glad that I came. I had to wait until they came from church, including Mrs. Scantlebury. They knew that I did not go down to Queen Street on Mother's Day to sell out anybody's house but to help. This lady, who now walks with a stick, feels that the Democratic Labour Party has used her and Mrs. Westerman feels that they have used her. Sir, these people are my mother's friends as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to lift public life in this country, when we use innocent people in this way. If members of the Democratic Labour Party had to ask Mrs. Scantlebury, as I did, she would have told them that she had been served a letter of eviction by the courts and that is all that it would have taken the Democratic Labour Party in this matter to get the truth. They did not have to come to Parliament. All they had to do was to ask the lady a question. They have come to this House falsely so in her name and authority, using her, Mr. Speaker, as a political pawn in a nasty political game. This evening, Sir, in my mother's name

and that of all the mothers of St. Peter, I deprecate strongly the nastiness of the Democratic Labour Party in using old people on crutches like Mrs. Scantlebury to bring this matter to the House.

6.40 p.m.

Sir, I remember it vividly because I waited until he came back from church on Mother's Day. This was a Mothers' Day action and it has come to this House now as a matter of no-confidence. We have a duty to the people in this country to lift our politics. We really do and there have to be ways in which the Democratic Labour Party must go for the jugular of the Barbados Labour Party but not by using old ladies on crutches as their political props.

Sir, to bring this in their name when they do not want you to do it, when I know that they asked me to come and I went as an honest man for honest purposes to help them, is unworthy of the Democratic Labour Party, and they should be ashamed to sit in their seats and support a leader who can do this to them.

Sir, this is bad. This is why I have kept silent because sometimes if you speak about these things, you speak too personally but this is a bad thing that the Democratic Labour Party has done, and to seek now to ask the House to vote on this, is bad. This is why before the debate started, I went behind the Speaker's Chair of Parliament and begged the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw. I told him that it is not worth it, and if he has questions to ask them, and I will answer.

Fort Denmark is owned by the Government. It is called Fort Denmark because it was a fort. It is a heritage asset and the Government wants to restore it as part of the overall effort to have Speightstown as the Centre for Heritage Tourism. In the past, people have put in application for land in Barbados that is not theirs. Today, Mr. Speaker, I made a decision as Minister of Town Planning, somebody wants to use Harrison Point as a Cruise Ship Pier. They do not own it but they put in an application. Town Planning will make a judgement as whether or not, for planning purposes, it is appropriate. It does not mean that the investment is on at present.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Government is going to restore Fort Denmark as a heritage asset. It will have to be because Speightstown is being restored as the Centre for Heritage Tourism. One of the reasons why we moved the Sanitation Service Authority, is to allow Fort Denmark, the Fort that used to defend the entire West Coast of Barbados to be restored. The Government's actions, Sir, are no more sinister than that, which is to redevelop the land as a heritage site. Eventually, there may be some commercial aspects around it, but there is nothing more to the matter.

The Honourable Member for St. Michael North West could have brought a Parliamentary Question and have it answered in that simple way, but he brought a No-Confidence Motion to waste the time of the House and to taint the name of this fair land in the international community. He should be ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has defended itself in circumstances where we did not have anything to defend. The matter, as I said, was explained to the House. From the very outset, we saw ourselves as acquiring the piece of land to the front which we did not own, and that was the subject to the Resolution.

In reality, since that was intended to provide a right-of-way, the Resolution strictly was not accurate but from the outset, as I have explained, we have seen the whole parcel of land as constituting:

1. With an acquisition giving rise to the land going for a right away;
2. The part owned by the Government continues to facilitate people using the existing pathway.

This is all the Resolution is about. Seldom in the history of parliamentary Government, wherever Government has been practised, from the time going back to a period, Sir, when the memory of man runs not to their contrary, there has never been a more serious matter brought on grounds that are so trivial and frivolous. This is why the Government is saying that we cannot vote for it, not because there are not questions to be answered but, because there is a disconnection between what they are seeking to do, that is to overthrow a Government by asking a question.

If he wants to overthrow a Government, then let us agree that he cannot overthrow a Government because there is a question that he wants answered. It speaks very desperately to the lack of judgment of the Leader of the Opposition where he can feel he can take more than 400 years of parliamentary governance, and turn it on its head because he wants to get a question answered.

It also speaks very poorly of his judgment, Mr. Speaker, that the name of Barbados, our governance and every Barbadian can be tarnished by something that is so ridiculous. Sir, we now have to go abroad and say that there was nothing about corruption.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that where in the House's power that the House should censor the Honourable Member for St. Michael North West for his conduct. He once said on the platform that his mother flogged him when he was a boy because he did some shoplifting.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: Mr. Speaker, on another occasion, he said and I believe him, that the flogging he got for shoplifting had put him on the straight and narrow. It seems to me, Sir, that nothing has changed. I felt it was my duty today, Sir, to add to another flogging for this undeserved, unwarranted, irresponsible act that rises, in my judgment, against shoplifting. It would appear, Sir, he now wants to be involved in government-lifting.

Asides.

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR: This is what it is about. A young man born as a shoplifter, now wants to become a government-lifter, and wants a government to support him.

Sir, I give the House the assurance as I leave this debate. First, I have been serving the people of St. Peter for 20 years, this is St. Peter's Day, and as long as they continue to have confidence in me, I will never tire in serving them.

This work was done on Mother's Day Sunday, Mr. Speaker, and I will urge all Honourable Members not to tire in serving the people who sent us here and even if they have to put out themselves on Mother's Day, to go and serve the people. As I said, this action was done on Mother's Day to help guard against a person who wants to take advantage of them.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the people of Barbados through this debate that for the time that I have left in public life, all I am interested in is to help this country through some very challenging times.

I had hoped that on this day, this House would have been able to pass many pieces of legislation which would have allowed me to go to a Heads of Government Conference next week and say that Barbados has made itself CSME ready. It is a sad thing that, rather than being able to go in the people's name to say that, I now have to say that we were taken up dealing with a No-Confidence Motion.

I give the House and the country the assurance that this Government will stand for serious and honest Government. If we make a mistake, Mr. Speaker, we will be big enough to say that we made a mistake and we are going to correct the mistake. If we make a mistake, we can also say that we are sorry. This is the way this Government will govern because it is the mandate that we have asked the people of this country for and, as I said, I leave this debate, confident that the Government has discharged its responsibility of answering what was before it. I also leave this debate confident that the Opposition has brought no serious case to answer.

I really do feel, Mr. Speaker, that we can only now lift the life, esteem and standing of this Parliament but all together as one, reject this piece of nonsense that has seriously polluted the clean waters of Barbadian public life.

I am obliged to you, Sir.

Asides.

6.50 p.m.

DIVISION

A Division has been called for.

The bell was rung.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

Noes: Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR; Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY; Hon. Dame Billie MILLER; Hon. R. C. EASTMOND; Hon. R. R. FARLEY; Hon. G. A. CLARKE; Hon. A. P. WOOD; Hon. H. F. LASHLEY; Hon. N. A. LYNCH; Hon. Miss H. E. THOMPSON; Hon. J. X. WALCOTT; Hon. D. D. MARSHALL; Hon. Miss C. Y. FORDE; Hon. K. D. SYMMONDS; Mr. R. St. C. TOPPIN; Mr. L. R. TULL; Mr. T. A. PRESCOD; Rev. J. J. S. ATHERLEY; Dr. W. F. DUGUID; His Honour J. M. EDGHILL; Mr. R. D. MARSHALL. - 21

Ayes: Mr. C. A. MASCOLL; Dr. D. C. ESTWICK; Mr. D. J. H. THOMPSON; Mr. M. A. LASHLEY; Mr. R. D. JONES; Mr. R. L. SEALY; Mr. D. St. E. KELLMAN. - 7

Mr. SPEAKER: The result is that 21 Honourable Members voted "No" and 7 Honourable Members voted "Yes". The Resolution is therefore defeated.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this brings us to the end of the business of Parliament today. As I indicated, we would have suspended Government Business to accommodate this Motion and in the circumstance, we will resume Government's Business next Tuesday, July 6, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Police as there were arrangements made by them and others for more deployment of persons in the precinct of Parliament as well as all

who catered to Parliament for their efforts today given that they would have had a larger number of people to accommodate than usual. We hope that we would sustain the presence of those persons who have joined us today.

I beg to move that this Honourable House do now adjourn until July 6, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. in the morning.

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

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, July 6, 2004 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.55 p.m.

CONTENTS**MINUTES**

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY	1
--------------------------------------	---

Confirmation of Minutes of the Meeting of
Tuesday, June 22, 2004.

PAPERS

Rt. Hon. O. S. ARTHUR	2
------------------------------------	---

1. Exchange Control (Authorised Dealers and Depositories) (Amendment) Order, 2004.
2. Duties, Taxes and Other Payments (Exemption) (Whitepark Development Limited) Order, 2004.
3. Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 2004.
4. The Annual Report of the Central Bank of Barbados for the Year 2003.

Hon. A. P. WOOD	2
------------------------------	---

Annual Report of the National Petroleum
Corporation for the Year 2002.

**SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN
STANDING ORDERS**

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY	2
--------------------------------------	---

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Miss M. A. MOTTLEY	2
--------------------------------------	---

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 2 – RESOLUTION THAT THIS HOUSE HAS NO CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PRIME MINISTER AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PRIME MINISTER AND MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR ST. PETER RESIGN OFFICE IMMEDIATELY	2
--	---

Mr. C. A. Mascoll, 2, 51; Rt. Hon. O. S. Arthur,
16, 55; Dr. D. C. Estwick, 21; Mr. R. D. Jones,
25; Mr. R. L. Sealy, 27; Mr. M. A. Lashley, 30;
Hon. Miss H. E. Thompson, 32; Mr. D. J. H.
Thompson, 36; Mr. L. R. Tull, 40; Mr. D. St. E.
Kellman, 43; Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 45.

SUSPENSION	21
-------------------------	----

ADJOURNMENT	58
--------------------------	----

Hon. Miss M. A. Mottley, 58.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTHUR, Rt. Hon. O. S. (St. Peter)
ESTWICK, Dr. D. C. (St. Philip West)
JONES, Mr. R. D. (Christ Church East Central)
KELLMAN, Mr. D. St. E. (St. Lucy)
LASHLEY, Mr. M. A. (St. Philip North)
MASCOLL, Mr. C. A. (St. Michael North West)
MOTTLEY, Hon. Miss M. A. (St. Michael North East)
ROETT, His Honour I. A. (St. Michael Central)
SEALY, Mr. R. L. (St. Michael South Central)
THOMPSON, Mr. D. J. H. (St. John)
THOMPSON, Hon. Miss H. E. (St. James South)
TULL, Mr. L. R. (St. George South)
WOOD, Hon. A. P. (St. Philip South)