
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(UNOFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION 2013 – 2018

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2015.

PRESENT

The full list of Members present is to be inserted from the Votes and Proceedings. Members identified from the record of this Sitting:

His Honour M. A. CARRINGTON, Q.C. (Speaker)
Her Honour Mrs. M-J. M. THOMPSON (Deputy Speaker)
Hon. C. P. SINCKLER (Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs)
Mr. J. D. PAUL (Chairman of Committees)
Lt. Col. J. D. BOSTIC
Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE (Minister of Health) (Leader of the House)
Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE (Minister of Environment and Drainage)
Hon. A. D. BRATHWAITE, Q.C. (Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs)
Mr. G. A. CLARKE, J.P.
Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND
Mr. D. D. MARSHALL, Q.C.
Miss C. Y. FORDE, J.P.
Mr. E. G. HINKSON
Hon. D. O'N. INNISS (Minister of Industry, International Business, Commerce and Small Business Development)
Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS
Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN (Minister of Housing and Lands)
Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Good morning, Hon. Members. This House is now in session. Members, I have with me the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, August 20, 2015.

MINUTES

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the minutes be taken as read.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not yet in receipt of the minutes for our meeting held on Tuesday, 24th October.

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the minutes referred to of 20th October be deferred.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Members, I have with me the accounts and statements for the month of March 2014 as prepared by the Accountant General. The council statements for the month of March 2014.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the first reading of the Shops Bill, 2015.

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

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Anti-Terrorism Amendment Bill, 2015 be read a first time.

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

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Excise Tax Bill, 2015 be read a first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. CLERK: Order No. 16 - in the name of the Honourable Minister of Housing, Lands and Rural Development - to move the passing of a resolution to approve, in accordance with Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, Chapter 228, the compulsory acquisition by the Crown of a parcel of land situate at Vacluse in the parish of St. Thomas in this island for the public purpose, that public purpose being the Sanitation Service Authority to implement and execute its green energy programme which is designed to facilitate the effective and efficient management of solid waste and other activities related to the preservation of the environment.

ORDER NO. 16 – RESOLUTION – LAND ACQUISITION ACT, CAP. 228 – COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT VAUCLUSE, ST. THOMAS, FOR THE SANITATION SERVICE AUTHORITY GREEN ENERGY PROGRAMME

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Honourable House seeks permission to compulsorily acquire a parcel of land comprising approximately 10.93 hectares or 27.01 acres located at Fort Lewis, St. Thomas, the property of BC Holdings Inc. or Mr. Brian [Inaudible.], for the Sanitation Service Authority in order for it to implement and execute its green energy programme. This programme is designed to facilitate the effective and efficient management of solid waste and other activities related to the preservation of the environment.

At the meeting of Cabinet held on March 10, 2014, it was agreed that a parcel of land at Fort Lewis, St. Thomas, the property of BC Holdings Inc., should be acquired in order that the Sanitation Service Authority can implement and execute its green energy programme which is designed

to facilitate the effective and efficient management of the solid waste of Barbados. This land is being acquired to be used by the Sanitation Service Authority to implement its green energy policy and falls in line with government policy as it relates to the green economy and also the environmental programme of the government.

The resolution for this compulsory acquisition of 10.93 hectares of land has been certified by the Attorney General, has been in order and for consideration by this Honourable House. With these few remarks, sir, I beg that this resolution do now pass. And also that this is a continuation of policy that dates back as far as 2007.

Miss C. Y. FORDE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish, sir, at the outset to refer to the four major pillars that the Democratic Labour Party indicated to the people of Barbados in 2013 that it is committed to. Pillars of our future success. It says in the manifesto four pillars. And the first one says: socially balanced policies; economically viable development; environmentally sound practices; good honest government.

Mr. Speaker, in the performance document of the Democratic Labour Party 2008–13, there is an item in the Ministry of Environment under the title of the performances or the achievements that speaks to construction of a \$400 million waste energy plant at Vacluse under a bolt arrangement. And of course, take a look at page 42 of the 2008 Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party where it speaks to situations such as there is a need to preserve the environment as breathing spaces for ordinary people at whatever cost. It also goes on, sir, to say the DLP is committed to changing this and creating a new land use policy for Barbados. I still await that new land use policy eight years later. In the first hundred days, they introduced an Agricultural Protection Act with two-thirds majority on both sides of the House. And at page 43, gave maximum support to all organisations committed to environmental protection. And I believe the future Tender Trust will be one of those organisations so mentioned.

I recognise the government's efforts, Mr. Speaker, to construct a facility to accommodate the sanitation workers who deserve the best working environments in which to operate. Any worker in this country, sir, or any worker in the world, I believe should have the best environments under which to operate if they are to be productive and they are to remain healthy citizens of this nation. So I think it's an honourable thought or effort to ensure that this kind of construction will take place at Vacluse or wherever to facilitate the needs of these people. And I support such ventures whether they're in the private or the public sector. Because public sector workers deserve the best in the same way that private sector workers deserve proper environs in which to work.

I acknowledge though, sir, that these times are harsh economically. And I want to know from the government why the rush and then a halt when I know, Mr. Speaker, that this government has gone to extremes to rent facilities belonging to private entities at astronomical costs for workers to be comfortable and to produce. And I'm asking why the haste? When I believe that at this time all these millions of dollars and all these efforts need more?

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is a rule before this House that deals with anticipation. And there is an order before this House dealing with the sanitation headquarters.

Mr. SPEAKER: In what way is she anticipating? You are saying to me - what is the order on the paper before the House? Are you saying that because there is an order which will deal with either providing for or the construction of the building, that she is not allowed to mention it? The construction of the building is or is not a fact. I am saying that even though it may be down for debate, I cannot see why a member cannot refer to the fact that a building will or will not be constructed. But I would ask you a question - if you can assist me, I will be happy.

Miss C. Y. FORDE: Thank you for guiding me, sir. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that we are talking about the acquisition for the five-storey structure for the Sanitation Service Authority workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Member, you have the floor. There is no point of order. You have the floor.

Members, we are dealing with Order 16, which simply says that it is for the public purpose, that public purpose being the Sanitation Service Authority to implement and execute its green energy programme which is designed to facilitate the effective and efficient management of solid waste and other activities relating to the preservation of the environment. Now, it does not say whether it is dealing with a particular building and so on. However, I note that later at Order 18, there is a resolution which speaks to a bolt arrangement and so on. So we are dealing with Order 16. The mover of the resolution did not indicate exactly what part of the Sanitation Service Authority's implementation and execution of its programme is being dealt with.

Miss C. Y. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your explaining to me. I had prepared for both of them and I thought that this one was the five stories at the point in time when I entered the chamber, sir. I beg your pardon? I want to say then, sir, about this acquisition, sir, is my understanding that it will be in for clues. Because I'm extremely distressed, Mr. Speaker, that when a government wants to work towards enhancing the quality of life of people, generating employment, opening up green spaces

and doing all these various things that will redound to the benefit of Barbadians, that it would be such a secret in the night for a government to go to acquire land at Vacluse, St. Thomas for the purpose of setting up a green energy programme without even a simple word or piece of dialogue with the residents who are living around the environs where that facility will go.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public of Barbados needs to hear more about the green energy project that the government is pursuing. Because it says to me that it is in a very advanced stage if this government is going to be looking towards acquisition and later construction of any facility that will help to enhance the green energy programme. Now, I am in support and I strongly support any efforts to do with green energy, waste energy, whatever expressions people use. However, I am a proud Barbadian, Mr. Speaker. I have been a proud Barbadian before a lot of the other members on this - on the other side, sir, or even on this one. I am older and therefore I'm wiser. But what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that I am a resident of St. Thomas and I'm not talking status now because I was a resident before I came here. And I shall be a resident once God gives me life to be after. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I found it to be extremely discourteous that the people of St. Thomas have been left out of the loop, knowing full well that we would want to be a part of anything that is coming into our neighbourhood.

I noticed, sir, that over a couple of times there were plans for construction and adjustments to various projects in the parish of St. Philip and the residents were informed really early. It's what happened in St. Peter. It happened in other parishes. And residents were treated with the courtesy of being told, we are planning to do this. We will have a town hall meeting or a

series of town hall meetings. And therefore, meetings were held and residents were given the opportunity to vent their feelings, their concerns, and of course, to provide suggestions to what was being offered. And I am saddened, sir, to think that this government will believe that the people of St. Thomas are so less in a position as people who have a voice and an interest and a concern that they will be overlooked in a project of this nature.

According to my understanding, sir, and I stand corrected by you, sir, as I always will, this location is the one being acquired for Cahill. And when I heard, having attended a meeting in June 2014 in a small advertisement about this meeting for Cahill Hill, I chose to attend the meeting as I always do. Any meeting that I know would be to concern the residents of the communities where we live. And Mr. Speaker, sir, I was appalled at some of the things I heard associated with that Cahill location, which I believe now, sir, I'm on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I must tell you, the residents of St. Thomas are extremely disturbed to know about - indeed the whole of Barbados. But let me speak to the home drums first - that a project of that nature will be put in Vacluse. And while I understand the government, our previous government, may have looked at Vacluse to determine that Vacluse could be considered an industrial area because we know that's where the mangrove landfill is. We know, Mr. Speaker, sir, that is where there is a plan for another recycling business to be located. We know that there is a scrap metal facility there, and so on and so forth. That is why it was digested.

I was on to the other thing just now because that is one that has me concerned too. But we have not heard a single word from this government. And I hold this government to accountability in that respect to do with Cahill until the Cahill meeting took place last year, July. And what blew me away, Mr. Speaker, is the cost that the project will amount to. And I have heard the lead spokesperson, a female, who said - one resident questioned, what will be the cost of this project? And the person said, it was originally US\$240 million, but now it is \$300 million. And the resident said, but how do you go up to \$300 million in such a short space of time? And the lady said, it is because of the constant downgrades of Barbados. And that took my heart apart, Mr. Speaker. Because before any project can go to St. Thomas at Vacluse, we must have dialogue. We must have proper communication from this government. In the same way the people of St. Philip and St. Peter and the other parishes have been given. Because we understand what Cahill will bring. Perhaps in the benefits of waste energy. But on the other hand, the negatives that will follow - Cahill, in St. Thomas or wherever it will go in this country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we learned that it would be a plasma gasification facility. That's what the land is being acquired for. And we learned that it will probably raise 650 jobs or so during the construction period. And then we learned, Mr. Speaker, that the project will entail a cost of US\$350 000. And sir, that is the part that bothers me even more. I said, yes, I support those projects. But when you look at the nitty gritty of what will happen in this country if Cahill is put on the site that the Honourable Member for St. Lucy and the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands just identified - right in the heart of Barbados. Anybody who wants to kill you, Mr. Speaker, goes to the heart. And for what I'm seeing will come out of Cahill will destroy the whole of St. Thomas and the whole of Barbados by extension.

And I am speaking from my head more so than anything else now, Mr. Speaker, because I don't have my notes with me. But I know that the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised this whole Cahill issue in this

Honourable Chamber during the budget in her response. I think it might have been on the 16th of June this year. And there were a lot of negative responses coming through. And Mr. Speaker, we are now seeing it come to reality. And there were a few questions I would have wanted to raise. And I shall raise them once the memory comes back. Because I was not looking for the Cahill debate to come first.

Mr. Speaker, we heard about Cahill being given so many concessions by this government. No land tax, no VAT. A whole raft of things that Cahill will receive in the form of concessions as a result. I want to say, sir, that I've been given the privilege to be the mouthpiece for most of the people of St. Thomas, if not all. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disturbed at what will happen on that project. First, I understand it is going there or it will now take up that area where the Central Cricket Club has been functioning for so many decades. The Honourable Minister will clarify that. The Honourable Member will clarify that. Because I'm only able to speculate, Mr. Speaker, if no proper information has been shared with me or to any Honourable Member on this side, when this is a project for Barbados and not a project for the Democratic Labour Party.

I am disturbed, sir, that the limestone, the coral stone development of this place where the water filters in through the coral stone into the aquifers. And I am disturbed that when I heard of all this construction, all these ponds that will be built for cooling, a facility that will go beyond 5 000 degrees centigrade, hotter than the sun, the cooling elements that will take place. When I hear about the importation of garbage, sir. Because that is what the lady said that night and that's what she had said subsequently in July this year at the Sherbourne Conference Centre - the possibility of importing garbage. I really heard that all of Cabinet did not have the privilege to be able to sign on to the memorandum of understanding. Or some of them were not aware. It even came down to me forcefully - well, why are they going to inform you if all the Cabinet doesn't know? And then I heard the Honourable Prime Minister only about two weeks ago speak to the project. And that cannot happen unless it bypasses his desk or it goes past his desk or he approves it.

Mr. Speaker, when we heard about Cahill, I wrote on behalf of the constituents of St. Thomas to about 22 government agencies that I believe will be associated with a waste-to-energy project and to do with the environment. So the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Environment would have been given - would have received the letter - as well as the Honourable Minister and all other ministers associated. So you're talking health, environment, energy, water, transport and so on. And it hurts me, Mr. Speaker, the discourtesy that is being fed to us as a people. Not just to me, but the leaders and institutions who write to the

government agencies seeking clarification and the discourtesy of not even receiving letters of acknowledgement.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I do not receive any files from anybody's office. That is not my nature, that is not my personality, that is not my interest. I believe that all of us are Barbadians who are taxpayers or who have contributed to the development of this country who have nowhere else to go to live but here. And we should be living in an environment that is free and safe from any contaminants or any other impurities that will affect us, our health and that of our generations to come. So I'm not interested in what the members are saying about anybody's files. I'm not interested in that at all. That is not my style.

I want to be given the respect that is due and to the credit of two agencies, Mr. Speaker, sir - and one is the Honourable Minister of Transport and Works to indicate to him about the transport management of the road management in the area when such a project should take place, if it does. The Minister in his faithfulness, I believe, said your concerns are noted. And I want to thank the Honourable Minister, sir, through you I got that response, sir, and one other government agency that said when the Cahill project request for the facility is formally submitted to this agency, you will be informed of whatever the information is to do with the project. So it means that the ministry that is responsible for town planning - that is the Honourable Prime Minister's Ministry - can't tell me a word. I am not asking for information that should not be made public. I will not ask for anybody's private information. I am asking on behalf of the residents who gave me the instruction at our town hall meeting on 8th July this year, 2015, at Content Pavilion. Please write on our behalf because we want to meet with the government agencies not to quarrel and complain, but to be buying - to have the buy-in effect of this project if Barbados is to advance as a result of its construction.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, to have heard from none other - so there are 20 agencies in the government of Barbados that have not even given me a response of courtesy. But then again, I'm not surprised to know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Prime Minister has not yet answered or given an acknowledgement to the Leader of the Opposition's letter about the municipal solid waste stacks that was taken to the office. So I'm not even surprised at that at all. I do not think that any Barbadian, despite their status, should be treated with discourtesy. The Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands cannot answer me, sir, because he did not grant me the courtesy of even an acknowledgement of the correspondence that was submitted - by hand, by me. I did not even wait for it to go through the agencies. But let me get - sir,

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: The Honourable Member is misleading the House by giving the healthy impression that the Honourable Member has written me and I have not responded to her.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not true, sir. Honourable Member, you can take up that conversation that you were having just now across the floor with the Honourable Member outside. No point of order. Please continue, Member.

Miss C. Y. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, let me give the list to some of the concerns I have. This week, Sir, will be two months - two consecutive months where the residents of St. Thomas can get little or no water. It is not unique to St. Thomas because the honourable member for St. John has the same predicament. The honourable member for St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. George, sections of St. James Central. And I believe other sections of Barbados. But we are feeling it the most in the north and in a few of those parishes more to the east of the island.

Now, when Cahill is going to come here - that is associated with this acquisition - we are not getting water now for two months consecutively, even on Sunday morning. Just go on, Mr. Speaker. You cannot cook a meal in your house. Your animals cannot get water to replenish their systems. Old people's homes cannot get a drop of water to tidy them up. Households cannot prepare a meal and get on to church, even breakfast. I would like to know how this government could grant Cahill such benefits, to be able to start up a project in Fort Clue, St. Thomas, when I know that St. Thomas gets no water. I suppose then if the structure is put up and any operation has to happen and there is any inferno, all of the water then goes to Cahill, because you have to set it out.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about the water in the aquifers, but I did not even extend what I was saying. Because that water, if contaminated by garbage that will be imported and travelling all along all roads in St. Thomas that are already in a bad condition - I have more than eight bridges that require an audit right now - I would like to know then, Mr. Speaker, what will happen to that dear little parish in the heart of Barbados.

That is not all, Sir. There will be contaminants exposed in the air, in the environment. And to think that the honourable Prime Minister, as minister responsible for the Town and Country Planning Department, would have given permission for 150 houses to be constructed to the east of the magistrates court at District D - 150 houses assembled and put there, of which only 25 are now occupied - and a Cahill project will be put in there. Where once the wind blows, all of Rock Hall, Westview, Spring Farm, Dunscombe, Pory Spring, Sharp Hill, Duke's tenantry, going all the way down to St. James Central, now

Ridgeway, Sea View, Sandy Lane, Art Hall, Bennett, Redmond's Village. And then if they ever get a wind change at all, lo and behold, it can come to Bexma Hall. It is going to come to Allen View, Carrington's Village, Sturgis, Bloomsbury. That is what I am talking about, Sir. So you are looking now at a massive space that will be impacted upon.

Nobody can tell me it cannot happen because on the March 25, 2013, we saw what happened at Beast Bottles. And that is in the heart of St. Thomas as well. And there are residents from Holders Hill in St. James who came down with asthma attacks as a result of what was happening with the burning of the tyres. That is a first example of what we will have to expect. And that is the reason why people are presuming this is going to be bad for our health.

What will we do? And I would wish, Sir, for this government to be more open and frank. As the late honourable member had made the decision, and I believe that the members who carry on after his death - may he rest in peace - I hope that they will look through and see how community dialogue is pertinent if we are to meet the needs of these people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the memorandum of understanding, I understand, would have spoken to planting some grass called king grass - that we know as elephant grass that the cows eat so well. King grass to be planted. Now, I know that some river tamarind trees have been planted. I cannot say what will happen with them, but that happened too in the cloudy night.

We do not have a sugar crop anymore, Mr. Speaker. St. Thomas is a piece of the most arable land in this country. And when St. Thomas now has all kinds of pieces of land lying fallow for our business people to come and set up houses and so on, when St. Thomas now has to be the home of Cahill, that will now bring a different element to our living where we already have been enduring - Mangrove, Beast Bottles, we had over in Redmond's Village the metal dump. St. Thomas is not the dumping ground for Barbados, Mr. Speaker.

And I want the honourable members on that side, Sir - oh, no - because I understand there are only three or four ministers who signed on the memorandum of understanding. I want those honourable members, please, to assist me in understanding. I am not here to destroy anybody's projects. I am here to help to build up and edify. But I have to know, because I am not going to follow anybody blindly to do anything that will impact on the lives of anybody in Barbados. Furthermore, the wonderful people of St. Thomas only want to know and want to be an integral part of the buy-in process, especially if they are to benefit as all of the rest of this country should.

And therefore, I would want, Sir, for the honourable members to tell me about the memorandum of understanding, because I did not get the impression on the looks of their faces when the honourable member for St. Michael North spoke in the budget that they knew anything about it. As a matter of fact, she became the point of ridicule among a lot of people as a result of raising it to sensitise the public of Barbados as to what is happening - and I am not going to say secretly - but what is happening and what plans this government has for a waste-to-energy facility.

We heard a lot about the technology. We heard a lot about places in the world that tried the plasma gasification incineration projects and they failed. Persons have shut them down because they did not prove good for the environment. Because when the contaminants from all the heat escape into the atmosphere, where will they go and how will they impact on our health as a people? When we invest in our properties, we want for our investment to be able to give us currency. We do not want to go and buy our houses near any waste-to-energy project that will bring about a lot of devastation or destruction or illnesses or anything. We want to be able to be comfortable in our houses, so that when you go through Reese Road and Kane Garden near Beast Bottles, those houses have little or no value.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting if you see what in there looks like. No, it is a dump. We cannot take another dump in St. Thomas unless things are properly regularised and unless the residents get a chance to know what is happening. Why the secrecy where this matter is concerned, Mr. Speaker?

I also want to speak, Sir, because I am not buying into the more jobs thing. The more jobs of the 650 people - you may only have 10 at the end of the project. But I am not the person, Mr. Speaker, who has released this information. It is the Cahill people who have released the information, and they understand it is Barbados on the ground. I can only speak to that, Mr. Speaker, so the honourable Prime Minister does not have to look at me that very way at all. It is the Cahill people who have come out to say that the Prime Minister has opened his mouth and made rumbles and has angered the public of Barbados, not me.

And I know that the Prime Minister will have to run me in the sea, as he said on Saturday. The honourable Prime Minister, Sir - the honourable Prime Minister will have to run me in the sea, as he said on my TV last night, that would have been from Saturday. And the only way we have to run, Sir, though, is really in the sea. Once Cahill goes up in St. Thomas, the people in St. Thomas have nowhere to hide. We have absolutely nowhere to hide. So, Mr. Prime Minister, you consider it. Because I believe, Sir,

you are from St. Philip - you cannot swim either. But that is okay. That is okay.

So the more jobs thing in the economy - fine. But the less taxes - Barbados are taxed to the max. Mr. Speaker, a lot of the incentives that we were getting before have now gone through the window. People were getting allowances - they are gone. Persons are now receiving less pensions. They were getting two incentives in some cases - no, they are only getting one. And for companies to come in, it costs you less. And Sandals and so on get all these concessions, and other agencies in Barbados are just waiting because they are grappling. I have a tremendous problem with that.

It is okay, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member for St. Lucy and the honourable Minister of Housing and Lands should really consider, though, that he too will be in the area. Because he too lives in St. Thomas. And I would have expected him to make a better case for the residents, his neighbours and friends who live in the parish, and not to be operating in the silence and under the cloud of suspicion that he now operates in with this matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish for this honourable chamber to be brought up to date with the plans for what this acquisition will do. I want to hear about the environmental impact assessment. Since most businesses have got to apply to town planning and have got to lay the environmental impact assessment, and when we made those queries, Sir, Miss - I believe she is the CEO of Cahill - at the meeting in July at Sherburne Centre, declared: we have got an environmental impact assessment report, and it is so thick, and she put her hands like that, I cannot even let you see it, it is so cumbersome to be handled.

I know that when there is an environmental impact assessment report prepared, you can have access to it at a post office and in other government offices, so persons can go and peruse once they have concerns. I want this honourable chamber, please, to tell us if there is one, where it is, and how we can be able to access it, because we are proud Barbadians and we need to know how our country is being built out and what is in it for us as a people, or what is not in it for us as a people. Because the last thing we want is illnesses and things of that nature.

I heard, Sir, that this Cahill project is a piece of untried technology. I do not think that the people of Barbados are guinea pigs at all. Because the other places that have had it, we learned, Sir, are now out of operation. I heard of one in Canada that started up and stopped because of whatever the challenges were. The honourable ministers will know better than I, and therefore they can tell us exactly what to expect. And that is what this session is for. But we are not guinea pigs. The people of St. Thomas and the people of Barbados will not be anybody's guinea pig in a project of this nature that will cost, whether it be the

investors or Barbadians, \$350 million US or \$700 million Barbados dollars.

The Sanitation Service Authority, according to the documentation we received, was not even apprised of what is happening. I am happy to learn from the honourable ministers when they speak if the Sanitation Services Authority and the Environmental Protection Unit had any part to play in this project that is being designed for Barbados.

The honourable Minister of Environment in his response in the budget said Cahill will start in September 2015. That is a Hansard. I wrote it down that day. And therefore, if a project would have been so advanced in June and still there is a cloud that the people of Barbados do not know, something is definitely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am concerned for the future of Barbados in this respect. And while I know that certain waste-to-energy projects will bring about benefits, I would want to know if the Barbados Light and Power Company has been around the table in this communication. If the Light and Power has to take any position and what energy is generated to bring it into the grid - I would just want to find out. What role has the Barbados Light and Power Company played? What role has the Environmental Protection Department through the Ministry of Health played? Have they been brought to the table to look at this project that should have started a month ago and we are seeing nothing in the area?

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say I am afraid that it does not seem to me as though, if a project of this nature is started, that Barbados will generate enough garbage to be used in this project. I just want to know. I have never dealt with that before. I do not want anybody to tell me that I have been a teacher all my life so it is not my business. It is my business to educate and enlighten children, people and others. And therefore I would wish to know exactly what will happen if we cannot generate enough garbage and the government intends to import garbage.

I would like to know, Sir, what plan is there. We hear about bird flu. We hear about all kinds of diseases that are impacting on the outside world. If Barbados - and I am speculating - if Barbados has to import garbage, how will we get it here? Where in St. Thomas will it be stored? Because I am thinking of millions of tons of garbage that will come in on an annual basis. I want to know for the residents exactly what will happen. Already we have thousands of rodents in this place. And when you ask the Ministry of Environment, the Environmental Protection Department, there is a big newspaper article that says: out of rat poison. So by the time Cahill comes and we are in the garbage, what will we do in St. Thomas? What will we do?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this lovely country that we have - the honourable member could stand if Mr. Speaker would allow him - I have absolutely no problem. Mr. Speaker, Sir, all water runs off the road. But where does it go, Sir? It goes into wells, it goes into gullies, it goes into ponds and different areas. If this incinerator that is associated with the Vacluse acquisition for Cahill has to be put in place, I want to know what happens when our water runs into our reservoirs and different places and there is contamination. Because I understand that caustic soda will be one of the elements that will be used as well. And we know how poisonous the impact of that can be.

We heard, Mr. Speaker of Chernobyl in 1984. We learned of Bhopal. And we know how many millions of people have been infected as a result of what happened at Chernobyl and in Bhopal. And all like no babies are being born deformed as a result of whatever the contaminants were in the system and in the water. I want to know from the government, save us, the people of Barbados, from anything that will impact on us. That will happen as a result of a government doing a project. But not informing the residents or informing the people of Barbados, the citizens, as to what plan there is for this whole project. I am not in support of the project unless I am given information. Unless we have town hall meetings and we have other gatherings. Unless there is openness from the government on this whole matter. With the memorandum of understanding. With the Environmental Impact Assessment Report. And in all the other areas that people want to know. What is in it for us besides the waste of energy? What is in it for Barbados as a result?

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate at the outset. From the ministers. Who may not have received the letters. If they've gone into file 13. That I won't have a problem with that. I just want, as I have said here publicly today. We want to know. They want to know, meaning the people of St. Thomas and the people of Barbados. Precisely what there is in this project for the government. For the people of Barbados by extension. And how we can be a buy-in factor in it. To make a difference in what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to wrap up. I'm going to wrap up, sir. But I just want to say that I intend, sir, to put the government in a position where we will demand. Not just with my letter now. But we will demand more knowledge as to what is happening. The people of St. Thomas. I cannot speak for St. James South. I can only speak for those whom I have been given the privilege to represent. Although the Honourable Member for St. Lucy is a member of St. Lucy and voices St. Lucy. I will still look after his interests as well. Because I know he has concerns too.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by indicating. There have been now about six town hall meetings. Coming from residents in different locations across the country. In association with what is happening with Cahill. There have been two meetings by the Cahill folk. Who have indicated that they're ready to move with the project. But unfortunately, the government is not fulfilling its commitment to the memorandum of understanding. And I want the government to give us full disclosure as to this \$315 million US dollar project. Or this Barbados \$700 million project. Because at the end of the day, we do not want for the waste of energy to happen. But then our people drop down like flies. Or that we can't live in our homes. Or that we can't cultivate our lands. Or that we have to import water from somewhere else to drink. Because our water is contaminated. Or our lands are so contaminated we can't plant in them as we would like. And expect to eat healthily. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health shall have a concern for that matter.

And I want, sir, to ask the Honourable Members on the other side to give us clear information, precise and distinct information. I say honest but I wouldn't say that - information about this project. So that at the end of the day it is this Honourable Chamber that we are in - collectively the opposition here, the government there. But we can come together as a civilised people in the interest of developing and building up Barbados and working towards generation of employment. Ensuring that our environment is clean and the air is fresh for the residents of Barbados. If we are to buy into this, Mr. Speaker, then we need to have all the facts put on the table and explanations extended to us so that we know what we do not want to manage. Because this is the worst management of a government ever in my lifetime. And I'm not so young, so I'm not asking the Member for Christ Church South to tell me about managing anything.

I just want to say I respect the idea of what the government plans to do for waste energy projects. And I know that there are more in the pipeline. But we want to get adequate discussion, adequate information that will sensitise us so that when we receive that information we can go back to the people and help to allay their fears. But their fears have already been vented in the six town hall meetings. One at Content Pavilion, St. Thomas; one at Lester Vaughan School. The week later, one at St. James Secondary School; one at Christ Church Foundation School. And there was one other. Those are the residents of Barbados who felt we need to move beyond St. Thomas because this is going to have a spiralling impact on all of us in Barbados.

It is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that if the government wants or chooses to be naive about what is happening out there in the public domain, it will be an unwise step. Speak

with us, guide us, lead us as a government should so that we can then be an integral part. But I don't want the project to start and then be abandoned. Like I saw King Garden was. Like I see the five-storey location up in Vacluse for the last six months. Like I saw Lester Vaughan was. And as you might want to say, you saw Greenland. I do not want the abandonment. At the end of the day it is the taxpayers' money that would have been wasted. I want to know what are the returns for this government in respect of the project about these billions of dollars that we will have to pay out. That's what I'm understanding - over a 30-year period or whatever.

I just want to know and I want the commitment from the Honourable Members on that side, those who are part of signing the memorandum and those who are not, but will have to buy into it. Because you want the collective approach to be fed to the country. Say to us what is happening. And I'm sure, sir, the other Honourable Members on this side will express their concerns. Because the Honourable Member for St. James Central stands to have a serious impact. The Honourable Member for St. James North, you are a Member for St. Andrew, you are a Member for St. Michael North East and the other surrounding constituencies and communities will have a serious problem if they are not brought on board and made aware as to what the benefits are on the one hand, and the other negative impacts, if there are any, on the other hand. Let us see how we can weigh them out. In the interest of building a safe, just and comfortable Barbados, if you want to use such a word.

So I end, as I had started, sir, by asking the government to make sure that Barbados remains environmentally sound. It is socially balanced with its policies. Because this, for me, is not a socially balanced policy at all. That there is economically viable development. It may be for Cahill and those who will benefit, but it may not be for the residents of Barbados. That there are environmentally sound practices. Because what we are reading into the information from the Cahill representatives and from the rest of Barbados - all those persons who investigated energy projects - were not reading that it will be an environmentally sound or economically viable development.

And finally, and most importantly, I want this government in this particular exercise to say to the people of Barbados, yes, this is good governance. Three of us have signed on a memorandum of understanding, or all four. But at the end of the day, we've been able to expand and discuss and come to agreements after we have disseminated the information among others. We are all on board with this and we will go with it because it is to the benefit, let me say, of the people of Barbados at the end of it all.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will wish to conclude by asking Honourable Members on the other side, give us the information. It's not something that should be happening here, but give us that information. Let us develop the whole as to what is going to happen with this project. And that it will be a good investment on behalf of this government so that we know what the next steps will be in ensuring that we follow through, that we are the advocates to go there to see what is happening.

And more particularly, sir, I want for this government, through the Honourable Minister of Housing and Lands, give us word as to whether the Central Cricket Club will now become a thing of the past. Having for so many years been a bastion in St. Thomas and an incubator for raising young cricketers and the nurturing and all the other things that happen with it. And that our environment in the parish of St. Thomas and in the rest of Barbados will remain clean and fresh and livable at the end of it all. And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you for the moments that you have given me to express my concerns.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. James South.

Hon. D. O'N. INNISS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join this debate and give support to it. And unlike the other Member for St. Thomas, I am very clear as to what is on the order paper and what is the purpose of the matter before the Parliament today. And there is therefore no need to meander and wander all over the place. This matter before us, Mr. Speaker, really reflects upon government's attempt to compulsorily acquire, I think, 27.1 acres of land at Vacluse for the purpose of rolling out the government's waste management policy and programme here in Barbados. And certainly to focus on the green energy policy in particular. And as those who would have researched the paper ought to realise that as a government we have certainly focused in that geographical space on matters regarding a leachate plant, a landfill, the beautification of the landfill which will certainly benefit those in surrounding areas and of course a wind farm.

Mr. Speaker, this particular location was, to the best of my knowledge, identified by the former Barbados Labour Party administration prior to 2008, obviously, as the site for waste management programme and projects in Barbados. The same Vacluse, St. Thomas site was agreed to by the Barbados Labour Party administration as the site for waste energy and certain waste management programme and project in Barbados. And the Honourable Member of Parliament for St. Thomas today was the Honourable Member of Parliament for St. Thomas at that point in time and served in the upper echelons of the Barbados Labour Party government when that government agreed that the site of Vacluse should be the site used in Barbados for waste management. So it smarts a little bit. If

it was unparliamentary to say it's hypocrisy, well then I won't say. But Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a grave error - politically and otherwise - for the Honourable Member for St. Thomas to come here today and seek to -

Yes, Honourable Member. So when Vacluse would have been declared to be an industrial site or location, there was no Cahill. The Barbados Labour Party government never had any plan for any Cahill. Not that type of construction or development.

I am not referring to any Cahill because up to now none of them can define to me what is Cahill. I am speaking about a fundamental policy of how Barbados manages the collection and disposal of waste in this country. And I'm repeating that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas sat in a government that approved the same site at Vacluse for the purpose of solid waste management. And we went further, Mr. Speaker. There is a physical development plan which was conceptualised under the Barbados Labour Party and supported and approved under the Democratic Labour Party administration that included the same site at Vacluse for the purpose of solid waste management in this country. And therefore it is a grave error and hypocrisy to come today as an MP, having served as MP for many terms, to behave as though this is something that has been snuck upon the people of St. Thomas or Barbados under the cover of darkness by the Democratic Labour Party administration. Honourable Member -

Mr. SPEAKER: You're not allowed to accuse the Member of hypocrisy.

Hon. D. O'N. INNISS: That's parliamentary. I apologise Mr. Speaker. I said if it's unparliamentary we'll not use it. And since it's unparliamentary, I have not used it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point remains. Mr. Speaker, if we cast their minds back to previous attempts, all being very futile on the part of the former administration that deal with solid waste management, their track record really was about spending \$100 million of taxpayers' money on a Greenland landfill. So we have moved, Mr. Speaker, way beyond solid waste management model that focus upon a landfill. The previous administration, ably supported by the current member of Parliament for St. Thomas agreed to expenditure totalling nearly \$100 million for a landfill at Greenland that up to now only breeding mosquitoes. And therefore an enlightened government today has moved beyond that concept of the Greenland landfill thing and have sought to look at more contemporary ways of managing solid waste in Barbados, including using it to generate energy. I'm not going to get into any discussion today about Cahill and what does the Minister of Environment whoever to address. But let us wrap our minds around a fundamental issue that we have in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, why this resolution is so critical I believe is because at the end of the day we need to identify a physical space in Barbados where we can in a very holistic manner address all of the matters pertinent to the collection, management, separation, disposal of waste in Barbados and march towards a situation where as much of it as possible is recycled or used to generate energy. And that is the fundamental basis on which the government is operating. And Mr. Speaker, it is critical because today we are importing - at last year's rates that is almost \$800 million per year in fossil fuel - something that we have all agreed is unsustainable. And therefore, as a government, what do we do? Sit down and say, let us start small, borrow more so we can maintain that high level of importation of fossil fuel? No, we said that Barbados must move towards the point and direction where we're able to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel, focus a lot on energy conservation and focus heavily on renewable energy. And I fail to understand why the opposition - their party team - cannot give at least critical support to the government's renewable energy project. There is no government in this country that has focused as much as possible on it. And I speak to it because it's part of what the land is being acquired for in this country.

We certainly, Mr. Speaker, have taken initiative in ensuring in legislation - the Electric Lighting and Power Act, another piece of legislation - the paramount importance of renewable energy in this country. The government has also led by example in terms of the number of state agencies and bodies that are now using photovoltaic cells on the roofs or wherever to generate energy in this country. So we haven't just done the legislative reforms necessary for creating that enabling environment. We've also lived it and practised it. And led by example, the Ministry of Finance has been able to bring incentives to Barbados that has allowed for a reduction in the cost of the materials needed to provide for the photovoltaic systems in Barbados. There are tax concessions that were given for those who opted to invest in that particular aspect of it to bring the utility costs down. We certainly sought to reform the Fair Trading Commission and parts of the Ministry of Energy because they have critical roles to play in it.

So Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, let us disabuse our minds that this is about collecting garbage and dumping garbage in landfills. The world must look at things from the 5 000-foot level. It is part of government's policy to help reduce the amount of garbage we generate - one, to be able to recycle more; and above all, a part of the process is to generate energy. At the end of the day we can have our discussion over the Cahill Project and all the accusations here and there. My interest and the interest of the people of St. James South is about how do we make Barbados the most environmentally friendly society in the western hemisphere - and it's not beyond our reach. Have

all the excitement and arguments on both sides and back and forth and to eternity about these projects. But let us, at the end of the day, in a very sober time, reflect upon what we are seeking to achieve as a country.

Mr. Speaker, in respect of garbage generation in this country and management, can we focus heavily on the Sanitation Service Authority and collecting garbage and where you dump the garbage and these kind of things? We have to step back, Mr. Speaker, and go back to ground zero. It is about what we import in this country - the containers, for example, that things are imported in. It is our consumption pattern at the individual domestic level that is fuelling and generating the amount of garbage in Barbados. And the last report I saw, I believe back in 2005, was that Barbadians were generating about 1 000 tons of garbage per day. And for a resident population of 280 000 people, that's a considerable amount of garbage. I imagine 10 years later, it must be somewhere close to 1 500 tons of garbage per day. So before we start to talk about the SSA and landfills, let us step back and ask ourselves, what are we doing at the individual level? What is our role? If we want to make Barbados the most environmentally friendly society, it has to start at the individual level. It has to start with what we import and what we import them in in this country.

At the individual level, it has to be about what we recycle or can recycle at home. You know, there are people who produce food every day and you put it in the fridge and then the next day say, no food for your fridge, and toss it in the garbage. Those who can afford it, maybe in St. Thomas, but the reality about it, there are so many little things we can do at the household level. We can take our PET bottles, for example. Mr. Speaker, we don't have to throw those in the garbage. Those can be put to one side in a recyclable plastic bag and sent to a recycling plant. As a matter of fact, recycling companies in this country like BEES, who I always commend and praise for their outstanding work - I consider the entrepreneurs behind BEES bottling, they are my friends, but I will publicly say the entrepreneurs behind BEES bottling are worthy of our support. They are able to come and collect the bottles and those recycled plastics from our homes. So there's no need now for any Barbadian, regardless of your socioeconomic circumstance, to believe that you have to throw everything in the garbage. There's no need for us to take our newspapers and other papers around the household and just dump them in the garbage either. There are loads of things that can be recycled. And I'm sure that if each Barbadian makes a simple effort to reduce the amount of garbage they generate at the household level, we can bring our garbage going to the landfill or wherever down considerably in this country.

So Mr. Speaker, it has to start at that level. So let us, when we have discussions in Parliament about the SSA and

these kind of matters, stop looking at landfills initially or the SSA attorney and ask what we can do at our individual level. You know, Mr. Speaker, we talk about composting and whatnot. And I, in an attempt to make it a little easier myself too - I mean, I grew up in St. Philip, I knew a little bit of farming and whatnot around there. But you know, the tree branches and leaves and grass and whatnot, you cut them from around the property - those are things that can be used as part of your composting programme as manure, fertiliser some people call it, to be used around the grounds. But no, we believe in sending everything in the back of a truck up to a dump. Because as far as we are concerned, it is somebody else's problem. Mr. Speaker, it is our problem. It's not somebody else's problem. The garbage we generate is our problem. It's not somebody else's problem. And it's time that we in Barbados put aside the political divide and start realising that any damage to our environment does not discriminate in terms of political affiliation. These are bees. And if we are serious about leaving a healthier Barbados for the next generation, we have to start doing things better in this country when it comes to environmental issues, when it comes to garbage separation and management in Barbados on the whole.

So there's much that we can do at the individual level in respect of garbage generation. But having assumed we've moved beyond that and done our best at that level, this state must be commended for rolling out a renewable energy policy. And Mr. Speaker, one cannot say I digress away from the fundamental issue of the compulsory acquisition because as I was at pains to point out at the beginning - and seeking also to enlighten the honourable member for St. Thomas, who obviously is not familiar with the bill - that this land is being used as part of the government's renewable energy policy. And basically it's a fundamental effort to move away from a heavy dependence on fossil fuel. And even if tomorrow we were able to find all the oil offshore in our territorial waters, it will not deter government's policy in terms of renewable energy. It is something that we are committed to. Mr. Speaker, I consider it one of the most successful programmes of this government that I am part of. We are able now to get into the hearts, minds and souls of all Barbadians and ask them and get them on board to be part of our renewable energy policy. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is what will make a difference not only environmentally but economically in this society. And it's a commitment that we have made to the people of Barbados and will not be distracted from that.

So that is why, for example, today Barbados' praises are being sung all over the world in terms of sustainable small island development programmes. Our Prime Minister was able to go off to Samoa at the last conference and sign an agreement with UNIDO. And tomorrow - the Prime Minister won't be vexing me for saying this, it's public domain - tomorrow we will open the UNIDO Renewable Energy Centre here in Barbados. Yes, that's right. That's

right. That's right. The whole world has accepted that Barbados is moving in the right direction in terms of renewable energy. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization have manifested it further - fifth in Barbados, out of competition among the CARICOM states, have decided that Barbados is where that centre is to be located. And we want to get in here and be distracted by some minutiae. Mr. Speaker, we have serious business in this country to address - in this Parliament is where it must begin, correct? This is where the policies must be enunciated and stuck to. So therefore, that rolling out of that energy centre here in Barbados tomorrow, to my mind speaks volumes as to how the rest of the world is beginning to accept that when it comes to renewable energy, Barbados is a leader of the pack at the frontier.

So let us not get distracted by these matters at all. We therefore, Mr. Speaker, have come a long way. I believe that this matter before us today affords us the opportunity to engage in a sensible discussion about the direction this country is going. We have moved away from the policy of solid waste management as enunciated by the former government, which was to build a landfill at Greenland or to focus on landfills. Landfills are not sustainable in our context. Even larger countries like the USA - they have all the land - and Europe, they are all moving away from landfills. We can no longer adopt and maintain a policy of simply generating whatever garbage we want to generate, thinking it's somebody else's business and that garbage must be dumped in a landfill somewhere. Mr. Speaker, it poses great threat to our water supply system. The evidence is there. We don't need to bury our head in the sand about it. There's also the other environmental challenges. There's the occasional burning at the dump and the public health risks attendant to that as well. Aesthetically it is also quite unappealing. It also devalues the properties of those who may be in the vicinity. And we could go on and on.

And financially, Mr. Speaker, it is not sustainable. We are probably spending about \$40 million a year in solid waste management programmes in this country - for a country that's 280 000 people plus the tourists who visit. \$68 million, I'm told. \$68 million we are spending per year. And I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, we need to deploy more resources in the field of education. We must get into the hearts and minds of our young people at a very tender age that they can play a meaningful role in containing and reducing the amount of garbage generated in this country. We need to - just as they have at West Terrace Primary School in my constituency - a recycling, environmentally sound programme. We have children under the age of 11 being exposed to the rudimentaries, the fundamentals of recycling and avoiding generating garbage and whatnot. So when they get home, they're able to say to mummies and daddies, no, this is not what you do. We don't need to

throw away all these things. We can plant, do a little tyre garden, you know, we can take some of the offal generated in the kitchen and

perhaps use as manure. We can start taking the long grass and whatever and creating our own little compost at home. And then I'm seeing things happening around the communities now where people are putting up bins and they're able to put their recyclable materials in there. The separation of garbage. So we move way beyond the Greenland landfill. Those who want to take this country there, I say them resigning from parliament. No, we ain't going back there. You are doing a disservice to your constituents when you get into parliament and want to centre a debate like this simply around landfill and dumping the garbage in the sanctity of the island. I believe that area could be physically one of the most beautiful parts of the island. When we have waste energy facilities going that are practical financially, is sustainable - and I'm not going to get into any details and I leave that to the Minister - but when we have those kind of activities going with energy, et cetera, we are able to have a beautiful piece of landscape. It does not have to be an eyesore, it does not have to be a public health risk like Mount Stinkeroo.

I've never heard the Honourable Member for St. Thomas in her ten years as a member, the government of the day or even as opposition, talk about Mount Stinkeroo. Mount Stinkeroo was created by the Honourable Member for St. Thomas and her team. I wanted to go down to Greenland where the Honourable Member for St. Andrew - who by the way never has much to say in parliament on behalf of the people of St. Andrew but likes to push himself out and tell the people - the Honourable Member for Christ Church West said Greenland is monumental madness and got the then Minister Mr. Thompson to ferry. I would like the Honourable Mr. Nanju to come into this chamber to make a visit to Parliament. I would like the Honourable Mr. Nanju to make a short visit to Parliament and engage in the discussion that will show the rest of this island that this government has moved away from that monumental madness in St. Andrew, as he called it, into a more contemporary 21st century methodology of waste management as we have today.

These are the kind of issues that parliamentarians, if they care about their constituents, will come into this chamber and engage in. Not just popping your head every now and then to get marked present so you don't - we have serious business in this country to discuss - or popping in at lunchtime. Enjoy the peas and rice and the stew, yes, but you're hungry. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, in closing.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have five minutes.

Hon. D. O'N. INNIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to wind up now, Mr. Speaker. But I believe that we have a

wonderful opportunity to wrap our minds around how we make Barbados the most environmentally friendly society in the western hemisphere. And marching towards renewable energy is definitely the step in the right direction. Our discussion is not just about a landfill. We move way beyond that. That is all BLP talk. That's the old Greenland landfill issue. It's about moving now towards the modern society and the modern way of managing garbage and using the garbage to generate energy. Garbage is now not to be seen as garbage or a nuisance. It is a resource.

But Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to go back to my fundamental issue which is that it is not just about Vaucluse. It is what we can do at the individual level. This matter has to start in our homes about what we teach our children about generating garbage, recycling and managing at the individual level. It's about what we do as parents. It is what we do as communities. That is why I praise the folks at Westbury Primary School and those around the island who are making a difference. I commend even some of our critics over this project who have identified alternative solutions - the stakeholders and those of the society who inspire constructive criticism. They are offering alternative solutions at the individual and household level and community level. I am seeing now bus stops, shelters, bus shelters made of recyclable materials. A lot of innovation has taken place in Barbados. There's been a major transformation in terms of energy, in terms of recycling. And it is a march, Mr. Speaker, that will not be stopped. This government will not be detracted or distracted. We will stay focused because our commitment is to make Barbados the most environmentally friendly society in the western world. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. George South.

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join this debate and I rise to speak on this resolution with a heavy heart, Mr. Speaker. And I am mindful of a quotation used in the military and this comes from Lord Tennyson. And the phrase that I want to use in my preamble is from Lord Tennyson's poem Charge of the Light Brigade. And it says there's not a reason why, there's but to do and die.

This point came about as a result of the Crimean War. And let me pause, Mr. Speaker, to wish the Honourable Member for the City a happy birthday, because he understands what I'm speaking about. Happy birthday to you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I was rudely interrupted by the applause for no reason at all and the comments from the Honourable Member for St. James South who had the floor for half an hour. Anyhow, during the Crimean War back in 1845, this incident occurred

whereby 600 cavalry soldiers of the British staged an attack on the Russians who were prepared with artillery, and they staged an attack on open ground - something called the Battle of Balaclava. And one third of the British soldiers were killed because this incident became famous for both the stupidity of the charge and the order.

Mr. SPEAKER: In relation to the Honourable Member for St. George South - in terms of relevance. So in relation to relevance, the matter before the House is a resolution due to the acquisition of land at Vaucluse. So far I've heard nothing from the Member in relation to the resolution before the House.

The Member is allowed to do a preamble and I rule you out of order. No point of order from the Member. Please continue, sir. It's not an introduction, it's a speech.

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: Please continue. This incident became famous for the bravery and the loyalty of the British soldiers and for the stupidity of the charge and the order. And despite its dubious premise. But Mr. Speaker, my preamble is just to say that this Cahill debacle and this land acquisition - this 10.93 hectares, or 27.1 acres of land - this is the same amount of land, the exact acres that the Cabinet agreed to donate to Cahill Energy. And the reason why I use the preamble is because this Cahill debacle, Mr. Speaker, brings to mind this quotation. Because despite the dubious nature of the initiative, this Cabinet is being led to slaughter by the Minister of Environment, my good friend, who stubbornly refuses to listen. So that's why I use the phrase: there's not the reason why, there's but to do and die.

And though, Mr. Speaker, in the military, one is praised for bravery and loyalty, but in this House, we as members of this House ought to be praised for being good stewards of public funds and for taking decisions in the best interest of the people of this country and to safeguard this generation and future generations. And I will end with a quote from the poem as well when I am ending.

But Mr. Speaker, I heard the Honourable Member for St. James South in a speech that I think was kind of lacklustre because no one on this side is opposed to a green energy programme. We don't oppose a green energy programme. And I heard the Honourable Member for St. James South speaking about reuse and recycle and reduce. Those are good words. And that is what we want the Cabinet to focus on because that is in sync with what is good environmental practice as opposed to this Cahill project. This land is 27.1 acres that the Cabinet of Barbados agreed to donate to Cahill and is coming into this Honourable House under the disguise of a green energy programme.

Mr. SPEAKER: I remember. Also making a very serious charge because there is nowhere on this paper that there is any information about any donation. And also, sir, he is also reflecting on the integrity of the House when he said disguising. I don't have a problem with the use of disguise because he didn't say much more than that. And I don't know what his information is about the Cabinet. And therefore that's something on which I cannot rule. Please continue.

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the word disguise is parliamentary approved. I will use it again. We are operating this morning, Mr. Speaker, with a resolution to approve land disguised as the Cahill Energy programme plasma gasification project. And Mr. Speaker, what should be debated in this Honourable House should be the three documents. The private member's resolution that our leader, the Honourable Member for St. Michael North East, raised in this Honourable House to produce the three documents - the Memorandum of Understanding, the Implementation Agreement and the Power Purchasing Agreement. That is what we should be debating in this Honourable House.

These three documents signed on behalf of the people of Barbados committing the people of this country to billions of dollars annually should be made to present to Parliament and also made public documents to the people of this country. These are things that we ought to be doing. That's the debate that we should be engaging in. And Mr. Speaker, the only Memorandum of Understanding we should be signing, or that should have been signed, should have been the Memorandum of Understanding for the EIA study. And I wish to break my silence on this project effective today because -

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I remember.

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: I am failing to understand what his speech has to do about the acquisition of the land at Vacluse. It is in your hands, sir. What is the point?

Mr. SPEAKER: What's the point about it? I don't understand.

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Relevance. It is relevance I want to make. It is relevance - it is irrelevant, it is not connected with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I don't agree with you. Please continue.

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: And I understand because. Because I am often puzzled how the honourable member for Christ Church West achieved his engineering qualification. I am often puzzled how the honourable member for Christ Church West achieved his engineering

qualifications. I am puzzled because we are speaking about a green energy programme and you can talk about land. You can speak about reducing, recycling, reusing. You can speak about plasma gasification. And that is what I am speaking about.

Mr. Speaker, the Cahill project is a plasma gasification project. That is what it is - Cahill. And I wish to break my silence on it. \$700 million to burn 1 000 tons of garbage in this country. And we have moved away. When we looked at the west coast and south coast sewage project, successive governments followed a process whereby we did feasibility studies and pre-feasibility studies. You would have looked at all of the issues with respect to projects, what can go wrong. All of the mitigating factors, the risks. These are the studies that would have been done by successive governments. And the environmental impact study would allow these factors to come out. All of the mitigating factors. And it is no secret that there has not been an EIA, an environmental impact assessment, done for this project. And such a large project in a small country like this ought to have gone through a project life cycle stage before you sign three serious agreements. The Memorandum of Understanding, the implementation agreement and the power purchasing agreement. Those were signed. Those were signed. But what is more is that the cabinet would have had to have agreed recently and the Attorney General would have had to certify the resolution fit for cabinet approval and fit to be placed on the order paper. That would have had to be done recently. So you all are in it as one. We have taken up the taxpayers' money and we have used the taxpayers' money unwisely.

So now the EIA study calls for public consultation. And we have gone to Vacluse without a quarry line for the Cahill project. Because like I said, this 10.93 hectares is 27.1 acres. And we have gone to Vacluse to acquire this land without doing a social impact assessment as well. So you have not spoken to the members, you have not spoken to the residents in the area. And that is a serious thing. There has been no public consultation on this project. But yet, and I will keep repeating, we have signed three documents that bind the people of this country to billions of dollars. Projects must have sound and clear policy to guide development. And these projects - projects like this - cut across all sectors, not just the regulatory bodies. And the MOU I say should have been signed only to conduct an environmental impact assessment study. You do your study first. You don't come into parliament and announce a project. You don't go to a quarry line under the disguise of a green energy programme without doing your environmental impact assessment. This is a flaw. This is a flaw. And you, the government, have to answer to the people of this country now.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. James South spoke about recycling, reducing and reuse. He also spoke about the Greenland landfill which I can openly say was an error. We were wrong. And because we were wrong, that will give you the right to be wrong as well with the Cahill project. Yes, we need to elevate this discourse, the political discourse. We need to do it. We were wrong then and you are wrong now. But you have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to correct. You are wrong. You have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to correct. You are wrong with the Cahill project. Thousands of people in this country have voiced their opinion about this Cahill project. We need public consultation. We need a social impact assessment to be done so that the people of this country as stakeholders in this project can have a say. You don't go binding people to a Memorandum of Understanding and an implementation agreement and a power purchasing agreement. I will speak to that later because there is a role of the Fair Trading Commission as it relates to the power purchasing agreement.

But let me speak, Mr. Speaker, on the recycle and reduce and reuse because we have a growing recycling industry in this country. And I asked firstly what will become of our garbage recycling programme and those businesses that have invested heavily in recycling. You mentioned to me Bees Recycling. If we are going to burn 1 000 tons of garbage and between us we can only accumulate thus far 580 tons, where are we going to get the other 420 from? Mr. Speaker, many jobs have been created in the recycling sector. Many jobs have been created in the recycling sector. And I am glad that the honourable member for St. James South will recognise what he said earlier because he has clearly put the ball in our court to bat. And I hope the other members on this side - because he is saying to us that we need to reduce, reuse and recycle. That is what the honourable member for St. James South said to this honourable chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked the question: what will become of the recycling businesses in this country? I want the members of the government to answer that question. Tell the public what will become of the recycling industry where you take up all this garbage and you don't have a thousand tons to burn. So that 580 tons that you have to burn, that is part of the recycling with the plastic bottles and everything, because at least two schools - and I heard the honourable member, I will quote him as well because I have it in my notes - Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. James South said that at least two schools earn close to \$100 per week. And the honourable member for Christ Church East was patting him, telling him yes, at least \$100 per week through recycling. So you will be killing our recycling industry by burning all of the garbage. But I am finished there because we are talking about burning garbage. Burning green waste is not a good thing. I see the honourable member for St. John is looking because I don't

know if she really understands what I am speaking about. Because burning off green waste is not a good thing. Burning of green waste is not a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. James South said to us that green waste should be mulched and composted - composted, sorry - for farmers and household reuse to rebuild the nutrients in the soil, Mr. Speaker. And I am saying this is retrogressive. This is retrogressive. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the honourable member for St. James South, whom I agree with, we need to take our green waste and put it back into our soil as nutrients for our soil. That is part of the reuse. Composting the mulch. That is a critical aspect of the reuse.

Now, when we speak about the Cahill project, this green energy programme acquiring this land - and by now I hope the honourable member for Christ Church South sees the linkage between the Cahill project and the green energy programme based on my presentation. But he is so limited that he might not see it anyhow. Mr. Speaker, when you look at this Cahill project, there are certain aspects of the Cahill project that we ought to safeguard our citizens from. And there is something called synthesis gas. There is something called synthesis gas. And synthesis gas - syngas, the short form - has in it hydrogen that is flammable, carbon monoxide that is poisonous, and carbon dioxide. Now, Mr. Speaker, this gas is very unstable. Those of you who would have journeyed to Trinidad would have seen our methanol plants - those are located miles from civilisation, down north of Trinidad. Because this synthesis gas is very flammable. And when you look at plant operations, the challenge that will come with this plasma gasification plant, Mr. Speaker, is the whole aspect of unstable conditions. Because what you will be doing, Mr. Speaker, is impacting negatively our environment.

So you need to conduct your social assessment in the areas of Sharp Hill and Duke, Stanton Tree, Ridgeway, Arch Hall, Kerry, Bennett's, Sea View, Sandy Lane, Sunset Crest, Holders Hill - honourable member for St. James Central - Dunscombe, the honourable member for St. Thomas, Farmers, Lion Castle. These are all the areas - some of them I cannot mention all because I have a few other points to raise here. These are some of the areas that will be impacted negatively when you have unstable conditions with the plant as it relates to the synthesis gas, the hydrogen that is highly, highly flammable, and the carbon monoxide that is poisonous. So those residents will be affected when you have unstable conditions. And I worked at a plant for years and I know the biggest challenge you would have is the preparation of this feedstock for this gasification process. Any change in the feed quality and the consistency can affect the process and lead to the synthesis gas. So these are some of the challenges that we need to tell the people of this country that can impact our citizens in close proximity. Those areas

that I just mentioned - these are the things that this government and the cabinet should be focusing on as opposed to acquiring land under the disguise of a green energy programme.

And I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members on this side - we are not opposed to a green energy programme. Mangrove Vacluse might be the best place for it. Sorry about that. Because we ruled out that Greenland was an error. Mr. Speaker, Greenland was an error and we accepted that. And we want you to accept that the way you are going about the process of implementing this Cahill project is wrong. And it is probably not the best way to deal with our waste. And you must go about and find out what are the other processes that we can utilise to effectively get rid of our waste and also reduce our waste. Because the honourable member for St. James South seems to understand the processes because he spoke clearly about them.

Now, one of the other things - I can speak for a whole day on this, Mr. Speaker - one of the other things that we must safeguard ourselves against is water use, water usage. And let me say though, Barbados Light and Power had to do an EIA study for a 10 megawatt solar plant in St. Lucy at \$40 million. They had to conduct an EIA study and I don't think they have even gotten the approval to build the plant. But we are now committing \$700 million and we have not conducted an environmental impact assessment study. How wrong can wrong be? It is real wrong, Mr. Speaker. And the members of this government, they must take stock of what they are doing in this country at this stage. They must reconsider this project for the benefit of the people, the citizens of this country, the taxpayers.

But let me speak about the water usage, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to give you a simple example. For a steam engine generating 40 megawatts that has temperatures at 482 degrees and that uses 12 500 gallons of water per minute - for a steam plant just generating 40 megawatts with temperatures at 480 degrees Celsius, they use 12 500 gallons of water per minute just to cool a 10 degree drop, to cool from 50 degrees to 10 degrees in the condenser

after the boiler. Now I don't want to get into the technical areas because it might confuse some of the persons listening, but the reality here is that water usage on this project with temperatures of up to 3 000 degrees Celsius and higher - where are we going to get the water from? All of these things should show up in the environmental impact assessment study. We don't know the answers. We need documents, we need to review. Has there been a peer review of this process, of this project? Have you brought in stakeholders? Have you brought in technical personnel to review this project? Nothing at all.

This is totally wrong, Mr. Speaker. This is totally wrong. Where will this water be generated from? At a time of water scarcity in this country, where will this water be generated from?

Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable members on the government side to tell us and to tell the public. The honourable member for Christ Church East - he seems to have the answers. So he needs to tell the people of this country, and I hope he speaks today, where the water for this project will come from. This is a matter of great importance, Mr. Speaker. You have temperatures of over 3 000 degrees Celsius and a steam engine at only temperatures of 482 degrees Celsius taking 12 500 gallons of water per minute. And I stress that point. Where will this water come from? Where will this water come from?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also have to know how many gallons of water per minute will this plant be using. If you are using cooling towers, we need to know. And if the west does not want to know, I want to know how much water the cooling tower will be using on this project. We have gas to cool and also we have equipment to cool. Because the issue here too is that when we produce this syngas, there is something called residue where we cool this gas. Dioxins and furans - these are poisonous things that can come into our water system. Mr. Speaker, you need to wash that same gas. And when you wash that same gas, you have toxins that will go into our water system. Those are some of the challenges with this plant, Mr. Speaker.

But let me move on. The power purchasing agreement. The power purchasing agreement. This government has signed a power purchasing agreement that allows the cost of electricity to increase with the increasing cost of the project. This government has signed a power purchasing agreement that allows the cost of electricity to increase with the increase in project costs. This is a dangerous thing. At what rate, Mr. Speaker, will the electricity be sold? At what rate? And to whom will you be selling the electricity? Will you be selling it to Barbados Light and Power? Have you spoken to Barbados Light and Power about this? What is the role of the FTC in this? The Fair Trading Commission? What is the role? I am assuming that since Barbados Light and Power does not know, then the regulator, the FTC, does not know either. And Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that Barbados Light and Power does not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, I remind you your time will expire in a minute. But since I warned you later, I give you two minutes in which to wind up. Thank you, Mr. [Inaudible.]

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker. We can find a more economical way to address our garbage because we do not have a thousand tons of garbage for this

investment - \$700 million of investment to burn a thousand tons of garbage that we don't have. But Mr. Speaker, in closing, I open with the words of Lord Tennyson's poem 'The Charge of the Light Brigade': Forward, the Light Brigade! Was there a man dismayed? Not though the soldier knew someone had blundered. Theirs not to make reply, theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die. Into the valley of Death rode the 600 - into the valley of death rode the cabinet of this country. I thank you, Mr. Speaker. God bless.

SUSPENSION

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

RESUMPTION

Mr. SPEAKER: You are on Order number 16, I believe, and with that we shall continue. Yes, you are member for St. Michael West Central?

Mr. J. D. PAUL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to participate in the debate on the allocation of these lands for the purposes intended. And first of all, I think that we would want to compliment the government for trying to achieve an environment for Barbadians which will become, if we continue on the trends that we are going, much more hospitable to the environment that we actually experience today. Because I don't think sometimes that when we look at the whole issues surrounding the achievement of an environmentally friendly regime in Barbados, that sometimes we appreciate the changes that we need to make even among the ordinary citizens in order to achieve that goal. Because very often when we speak to the issues of the environment and greening, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that many Barbadians and ordinary Barbadians understand that it has to do with a change in lifestyle, change in the way we do things, the way we dispose of our garbage. And it is incredible really, that in an age where we have access to information that we can see what is happening today in terms of the change in climate, that there is a debate that is going on - although I don't believe it is any longer a debate - as to the true causes. And really it is the impact that man is having on the environment. And if we can encourage, as we proceed into the future, more environmentally responsible actions on the part of not only this government, but as we go into the future on the part of Barbadians, I believe that the initiative will actually benefit future Barbadians.

And that is why sometimes I'm surprised when I hear the comments in terms of the reasons why we advance in this, and we all understand that we cannot continue to proceed in dealing with the garbage in the way we have

done in the past. Because, you know, I want to outline something which I don't believe a lot of Barbadians see - garbage as being something that is a resource that we do leave untapped. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that we held a seminar not too recently, and this is within the agricultural sector, to look to see how we can actually utilise the benefits of composting to the point where it actually makes money. And I don't think that Barbadians appreciate that many of the things that we import - the peat moss that we bring in for potting plants and things like these - these are things which we import. And if we understand how that potting material is actually made, it is something, Sir, that can actually be made within Barbados. And that is what I mean when I say that fundamentally we are not appreciating the point that we need to change the way in which we deal with the disposal of garbage generally to make it more beneficial to the Barbadian community. And I think that we have to compliment the government, certainly, in terms of taking that first step to ensuring that we proceed in a different direction to where we were going in the past.

And one of the points I want to go back to - the whole point about composting - what we saw when we did that particular experiment is that the quality of the compost that you can actually make, which we use, for instance, to put in a lot of greenhouses, use for raising young plants and things like these, the quality of the compost that was produced was far superior to what we actually go and import. And, you know, this is one of the issues I think that we constantly need to address - how do we use the resources that are available to us in this country to reduce what we currently import, so that we make better use of the scarce foreign exchange, which I'm sure we want to make better use of. We do not need to use the foreign exchange that we earn in Barbados to import things that we can actually produce ourselves. And I'm saying that, again, if we can get a new attitude coming from Barbadians in terms of the way in which we treat garbage generally - kitchen waste or whatever - that we can achieve that. And I believe that is something, again, that we need to stress on, that we can do. And the responsibility in this regard just does not stop at government. Because one of the issues I find in the debate that constantly seems to come up is that government is called upon each time to make a large investment in an area where, if we had innovative enough persons within our communities generally, that is something - in a period when we are saying that we are so challenged in terms of finding employment opportunities for our young people - that is an area which can actually provide employment opportunities for young people: the whole area of composting.

And again, it goes back to the issue that was raised in terms of garbage separation. You know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I note that many times we travel to countries such as Canada, certain parts of the United States and England, and

we marvel at the fact that when we go there, you cannot even drop a piece of paper on the ground before being fined. And the strange thing about it is that the same Barbadians who actually would claim that they cannot treat their surroundings here any differently, will go up there and abide by the law. This is the strange thing. And I'm saying, Sir, one of the things I would like to see - maybe that we move to do - is to at least develop laws that would encourage greater respect for the environment among Barbadians. There is no reason why, for instance, we have spent considerable sums of money in terms of the whole area in Bridgetown where we are trying to clean up. There is no reason why we should be seeing garbage in the Careenage. I took a visit recently to the Cheapside fishing complex down there. And I, Mr. Speaker, was actually appalled to see within the complex the amount of plastic that you have within the complex itself, where it tells me that boat owners and the fishermen when they come in or whatever are dumping garbage over the side. And you can see that blatantly within the port itself. Now these are things which tell us that we do not understand that it is the individual actions of us ordinary Barbadians that are compounding the problems that we see today. That really is making it extremely important that we seek to initiate activities for the proper disposal of garbage as it is.

And I do agree the issue of the landfills is not going to work. Because what we are recognising is that because of the irresponsible way in which we deal with the whole question of garbage generally, the more garbage that we are generating - we are becoming too much in some cases like Americans. Because, you know, it is said that once something goes, we tend to replace things very quickly. If something breaks down, we don't look to fix it. We have this throwaway mentality. But we do not sometimes appreciate and understand that when we throw away something, it has to go somewhere. And very often, you know, commerce is a strange thing. It produces by-products. But the same people who benefit from the sales of those products - there is nothing in our legislation compelling them to find ways to deal with that. Government has to take on that responsibility. But also what we must explain to Barbadians is that at the end of the day, it is the government who now has to find additional financial resources to deal with that.

I always remember the debate on the question of the environmental tax that we impose. And when we have to remove it - it is a certain thing that we have to remove it - because I still believe that where we have businesses in Barbados that import commodities that when they are disposed of they endanger the environment, somehow we need to treat those commodities differently in our taxation system. And you know, this is the point. As developing countries - not underdeveloping, as developing countries - we need to understand that with a small land space as what we have, and if we are serious about the whole question of

sustainable development, it carries certain responsibilities and we have to be given certain flexibilities in terms of our taxation structures to allow us to be able to deal with those businesses that would import things inside here that they know inherently threaten the environment. But then we have to put in place things that mitigate against that. And I believe, Sir, that again, we need to look at the flexibility in our taxation to be able to give us the ability to put whatever necessary measures in place to deal with those things. Because at the end of the day, it does cost the taxpayers and government money to deal with that particular problem. Even when we postpone it, it has to be dealt with.

Even on the question of packaging, Mr. Speaker, the question of plastics is something that we need to look at in this country. We have talked about it. We have in many instances recognised the dangers that plastics hold. In developed countries today, you have a situation where they are recognising the dangers of plastic and the use of paper is now coming back in vogue. They are encouraging consumers now to be more responsible. Even businesses themselves are being encouraged to be more responsible in the type of packaging that they use. Today in Barbados, we continue to believe that the environment can continue to absorb the tremendous amount of plastic that we continue to pour into it. And there is no sense of responsibility on the part of businesses in this country to reduce it. But who gets to hold the bag that comes around? Government. And some of these businesses feel no sense at all of responsibility to assist government in that regard. We cannot continue to think we can live in a country and each of us do as we like, import what we like, even if it is a danger to the environment. And then at the end of the day, when we see it at our doorstep, what do we do? We run out and blame somebody else. But we imported it, we used it. And the other fundamental thing too we have to consider is that we are not even sure of the impact of what we are doing now on future generations. That is the thing.

So I think that let us get away from the debate as to whether or not what we are doing we are supposed to do - we have to do it. If this generation is going to live up to its responsibility, we also have to recognise that there are other things we have to do in order to ensure that we create the kind of environment in which Barbadians can feel that they can maintain at least their health, more so than anything else. And you know, the other thing too, Mr. Speaker, that we have to be careful of - we have to understand that we must look at new technologies in order to ensure that we can achieve these things. You know, I remember when the first discussion came in respect to solar energy, a lot of people did not believe it could work. A lot of people poured cold water on the idea of solar energy. And today we are seeing a different reaction worldwide. As a matter of fact, when we look at the decline in the price of oil worldwide, a lot of it too, I believe, has to do with the rise of renewable energies, the use of non-fossil fuels,

which I think has assisted in decreasing the demand for fuel oils generally. And that to my mind has contributed to the decline in the price of oil too, in some ways. But what it tells us is that if we are to be environmentally responsible, it means then we must be prepared to try new things. But I do agree that we should not do it in a reckless manner. We should ensure that we introduce necessary safeguards, as we have always done, to ensure that what we are introducing is not something that will cause even further problems than we are now experiencing.

That is why in this whole debate - and I know the opposition is constantly coming with this thing - the speculation at best is rife. And the sad thing in that debate, I have not heard one thing from the opposition that says, at the same time, let us look, let us get an independent assessment of really what it is we are talking about. And even they themselves demonstrate that they have not even done the research. They themselves demonstrate that they do not even know, when they talk about the whole new technology, what they are talking about. What you see being whipped up in Barbados is a scare tactic among ordinary Barbadians that tries to exploit people's ignorance. That is what is happening, and I think that is unfair from both government and opposition. What we need to see is a more reasonable debate that looks at the pros and cons, that people understand. Not only that, the attempt also to tarnish people's reputations. You know, it is unfortunate that even at this time in the politics of Barbados that we find a situation where in order to win an argument, we have to seek to denigrate without any proof, with only rumour, just innuendo. Just innuendo. And you know, I recognise that a politician is the easiest person to tell a lie upon and give it wings and let it fly. Because everybody wants something that is juicy. Everybody seems to want to believe a lie, even when it stares them in the face.

I really think that we have come to the point in this country when we are looking at these things, we need to adopt a responsible and mature approach that suggests to Barbadians that we are seeking alternatives to the problem of garbage disposal that we have to face. Because it will not go away. Because as long as we continue to push growth as a means of developing economies, there will be new products coming on. There will actually be new types of garbage coming in place that we have to develop ways to deal with. We recognise too that the landscape itself in Barbados is challenging. Nobody wants a garbage dump in their backyard. Not one. I would like to see one near St. Michael West Central, because right now the garbage that they had - I thank God that they had actually closed Rogers Quarry, which used to be used as a garbage dump. You don't want it anywhere near you. But the problem that we have to come home to is that if it doesn't go near you, where do you put it? And not only that, we forget the power of the community. And that is where I think that we

as representatives of the people need to recognise that communities themselves and the actors in communities can help to change the debate, can help to change the focus, can help to change the attitudes. And that is why I think that you have your community groups, you have your churches, you have your schools.

And I think that the member for St. James South commented on the fact that within Westbury's school in his constituency, there is a garbage separation programme where you separate your plastics, you separate your paper, you separate your metals - all these things. But that is something I believe now should be written in - that programme of garbage separation should be written into the programme of as many schools as we can in the island. Because, you know, we talk about the fact that schools are a learning ground, they are a teaching ground. But schools are a learning ground and a teaching ground for healthy habits. And we talk about the clubs that we have here, like the 4-H, ISCF or whatever. This is a place in which we can actually start to teach young Barbadians healthy habits of garbage separation. How do you do it? And not only that, we appreciate that you can make money from it too. These are things that I think that we need to look at instead of getting into the debate or trying to demonise persons for trying new ideas, for trying new things. This I believe, Mr. Speaker, will be quite healthy.

And in addition to that, one of the things that we need to recognise is that again I stress on the point of creating new ways of earning income, because let us face it, technology is changing in a modern economy. What is happening is that new jobs and new types of jobs are being created. And you know, I heard the thing about garbage and bringing garbage from different countries. You know, one of the things I believe is that we do not give credit to the intelligence of our people. We seem to think that the civil service that we had 20 years ago or 15 years ago is the same as the civil service that we have today. So in other words, the Chief Town Planner is not the same Chief Town Planner that we had 20 or 15 years ago - it is a different town planner with different ideas, not only that, subject to different influences. And we get on as if the people who used to approve planning provisions are the same - different things altogether again. You know, that is simply not true. Because sometimes what we don't understand - we know that even to put up a structure in Barbados and it does not meet Town Planning provisions, what happens? You take it down. And it was not too long ago that we saw Town Planning going and knocking down buildings that were not done properly. And the same people who were around then in the civil service doing these things are not there now.

So it may be a type of madness, I call it madness, for people to go and convince people that a government could go and sign an agreement that at the same time is not

subject to the same protocols that any other agreement in this country will be subject to. If I go and build a house, I have to carry the plan to Town and Country Planning. If it says no, it is no. The Prime Minister has no influence in that. It is no. It has to meet certain technical specifications. And we know that. We know that. So why do we run around Barbados trying to cause panic among the population - that somehow some malicious deed is about to be done, that somehow we have thrown up Barbados? In truth and in fact, all we are trying to do is to rationalise the way forward when it comes to the question of garbage in this country. Why is it that we are doing it? What do we seek to achieve when we do that? Because in a sense, when we do that, all we do is we end up pouring scorn on the very people who at the end of the day we depend on. Because it is not the 30 members of parliament inside here that are supposed, Mr. Speaker, to see that those laws are enforced. It is the civil service that, Mr. Speaker, we know - we know that they would tell you right around that Barbados has probably one of the best civil services in the region that ensures that our laws are upheld without fear. Without fear. So again, are we pretending that has changed so drastically under this Democratic Labour Party administration? It has not. And they know that. So why walk about this country spreading fear, trying to exploit people's weaknesses? Why are they doing that?

And you know the strange thing, Mr. Speaker, Sir, when they get on - if they do it and then they come and say it is not me - it is like somebody getting caught with a hand in the cookie jar. But you see, they don't understand that they had ink in the cookie jar and the red is not showing, it comes out with the finger. They don't understand that. So we have to be careful about the messages that we are sending to our people. Because what we are trying to achieve is a behaviour change. It is a behaviour change that we are trying to achieve with our people. But that behaviour change, which I will add, Mr. Speaker, is necessary because, for instance, today we are accustomed to taking - when we finish our garbage in the house, we are accustomed to taking everything, kitchen scraps, everything, putting it in one bag, tying it up, putting it outside. We don't care what is in it and we expect the Sanitation Service Authority to deal with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have three minutes to conclude.

Mr. J. D. PAUL: Thank you. Put it outside. We don't care what is in it and we expect the Sanitation Service Authority to deal with that. You know, compare that now - if you are in other countries, you know, in other countries that don't tolerate that. I hear people who shout the hardest: oh, we need new laws on the environment, we need to put in these new laws. And I am hoping that if and when we introduce those new laws, that the same people who have been out there clamouring that we need to do something

different in this country, that they will be the most vocal supporters of that type of initiative. Because what it will do, it would ease the situation. It would at least see less garbage going to the landfill. It would also see at least more people being able to benefit from the point of view of composting and utilising it, not just talking about it.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, one of the other areas - I want to say this too. I believe again that those businesses that are in the area of garbage separation, I think that this government needs to support them. Because very often we see in our total expenditure a lot of money being spent on a lot of things. And I believe that we need to look at the area of how we need to support more businesses that engage in areas which, from a long-term point of view, will strategically help to develop other business opportunities that can expand as we go into the future and also provide more employment opportunities at the same time. Because even in that respect, it would also represent a revenue-earning means for this country. And I said that we need to look at it and take advantage of those types of opportunities. And we also need to use the government's purse to assist those businesses that want to move in that direction. Because we all know that many businesses were started in many countries by government helping them along. And if we have to identify resources to help businesses who are in the area of garbage separation and the whole area of greening the environment, I think that it is our responsibility to help them to do that.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can be in no doubt as to the necessity of what is being done. We can be in no doubt of the fact that we need to at least start to change the way in which we treat our garbage. We also can be in no doubt that it is the responsibility of each and every Barbadian to be part of that. And therefore, we can only say that let us support the efforts of the government in terms of trying to resolve the difficult issues of the day that we face in terms of the management of garbage. And we are hoping that with the proper use of the facility on -

which these lands will be - sorry - on which will be erected on these lands, that we at least are now making a step, a step towards introducing into Barbados a new way of thinking, of managing our garbage in a more responsible way, and that all Barbadians will benefit. And we need again, Mr. Speaker, sir, to remove from our minds, in necessity, to seeing that when a new idea comes up, to look to denigrate the idea and seek to have a healthy debate that lets us find out in reality the pros and cons of the new systems and let us work together to ensure that even when we are introducing it, that we can introduce it in a responsible manner. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to make the contribution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. James Central. I am obliged.

Mr. K. D. SYMMONDS: Mr. Speaker, sir. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this resolution is seeking to allow the Ministry of Housing and Lands to acquire 10.9 hectares of land at Vacluse, St. Thomas for the Sanitation Services Authority to implement and execute a green energy programme. That land, sir, it would be equivalent in terms of measurement to 27.1 acres. Now, as I listened to the member who just - the Honourable Member who just took his seat - I was able to distil three points. The first, that he is concerned that speculation is rife and he labels the opposition as being the party that should stand guilty for spreading this speculation. He condemns the opposition because apparently, according to him, we do not know. And he feels that there is a need to know the pros and the cons of those matters surrounding this particular acquisition of land and following logically thereafter. And third, sir, he feels that the opposition has in some way been injurious to or has denigrated people's reputations.

Now, sir, I say that as a point of departure because if the government took its role seriously, then there would be no need to be worrying about speculation in this matter. There would have been no excuse for or suggestion of denigration of anybody's character. There would, sir, have been no issue about knowing the pros and cons, as it is put, because the government would have come to the country and explained to the country in a measured and reasoned way, via the mouths of ministers responsible, what exactly the government is intending to do, what agreements it may or may not have signed, what is the purpose or the purposes behind these several agreements which I will come to. They would have removed any need for any suggestion about clarity being brought. To the extent that there is a lack of clarity, to the extent, sir, that people can be accused of not knowing the pros and cons, it cannot be the opposition that has to explain the pros and cons because it is the opposition that has been asking for the government, through its front bench. And indeed, sir, when I listen to the member who just sat - sitting as he does on the backbench - he is, though he speaks the language of supporting the Democratic Labour Party, implicitly supporting the opposition in what we have been calling for: the removal of the obfuscation of issues surrounding this matter, lending clarity of purpose and direction to this matter. And it is something that only the government and the government alone can do.

No, Mr. Speaker, sir, I want to take this Parliament back to the budget debate where unfortunately, unfortunately, this country had to be alerted to what was transpiring. Not from the government itself, not from any of the ministers empowered to speak on the front bench on the part of the government. But the country had to be alerted, sir, via the presentation of the Leader of the Opposition in reply to the Budget. Yes, my boss. And the reality is, Mr. Speaker, sir, that in reply, not a word was said, not a word was said by most of the members of the

front bench. In fairness to the Minister of Finance, he rose in stalwart fashion, as he is given to do, in order to try to put the appearance of some clarity to what was transpiring. And I recall well the Minister of Finance, in his wrap-up in the budget, indicated that the project had not yet started. He said that town planning rules had to be approved and had to be applied. I understood him, therefore, to mean that the Town Planning Department had not yet given permission to proceed. And he went on, sir, to substantiate that view by saying that nothing can start until the town planner says that they can start. And the minister responsible for town and country planning signs off - and that is the Prime Minister of Barbados. So the Minister of Finance led us to believe that all would have been well, that any suggestion of there being a stealthy or underhanded approach which was failing to come clean and be transparent in this matter was not something that the Democratic Labour Party was contemplating or that they would be guilty of.

Not satisfied with that, the Honourable Prime Minister of the land was then carried on the front page, I believe, sir, of the Advocate newspaper. I remember the date well. It was the September 14, 2015. And he was reported - and he did not open his mouth to disclaim the report - but he was reported as saying that in relation to Cahill Waste, the energy project, no decisions have been taken on the issue and there is no need for any alarm. So once again, at the highest levels of the Cabinet, this country was told to repose confidence in the goodwill of the Democratic Labour Party and in the process that the Democratic Labour Party would preside over to ensure that all would be done in keeping with not only the rule of law, but good taste in governance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, I want to make it clear because I sat through the contribution of the member for St. James South. And, sir, notwithstanding his tendency to drift into high-wire acts and comedy, the reality is that he made a couple of points which have to be rebutted. There is no issue on the part of the Barbados Labour Party with a green energy, a green economy. There is no issue on the part of the Barbados Labour Party - nor has there ever been - with the idea of pursuing alternative energy as a course of development in this country. There is no issue, sir, on the part of the Barbados Labour Party with the issue of renewable energy. And this is not a debate, and it must not be interpreted as being a Barbados Labour Party position, that all we want to see is an approach which sees landfills in Barbados. Nothing could be further from the truth. This, sir, is about governance. And that is the issue that the Honourable Member for St. James South declined and did not condescend to make contact with. It is a question of governance. And when the Leader of the Opposition spoke in her reply to the budget, sir, her issues were raised on the same question of governance. And it is to that question that we must return.

Because, Mr. Speaker, sir, after all the assurances given by the Prime Minister and indeed by the Minister of Finance, we are coming here today to be told that we are dealing with a resolution to acquire 27.1 acres as agreed to by the Cabinet. But we have not yet been told that the agreement by the Cabinet was on the same day and in the same Cabinet paper that agreed to authorise the Sanitation Service Authority to enter into negotiations with Cahill. Why not? That is the question. That is why people speak the language on the streets of stealth. That is why people feel that issues are being hidden under a bushel. Because the country has, with one voice, recoiled in horror at the proposition that was put before this country - that we could be entering into agreements, and in fact had already entered into agreements, in which we will be seeing the light of importing garbage into Barbados. In which we will be using a plasma gasification plant, as the member for St. Thomas has accurately portrayed, that was capable of burning at a temperature which is a few degrees lower than the temperature of the sun.

People have recoiled in horror at the idea of the change to the landscape that is required in my constituency. And I said this in this place during the budget debate. Where people have to go through from 5 a.m. until 9 or 10 at night - and now later - without water, we are being told that a few miles away, a stone's throw, there will be lagoons dug out for the purposes of facilitating this plant. Whereas we all know in Barbados there are good Christian Barbadian folk who cannot bathe, who cannot eat and drink, who cannot prepare the elderly in their home, make them comfortable, send the children to school. And it is not about St. Thomas voting BLP or those parts of St. James Central affected voting for the Barbados Labour Party. We know that this is a problem - it is a chronic water shortage in Barbados. That in the constituency of St. John for the last five or six weeks in Messiah Street, you cannot get a drop of water. We know that. And we are saying, sir, that part and parcel of this agreement - which not a man on the front bench of this government has condescended to speak to - is the fact that the agreement commits to holding back pools of water to fuel this furnace, pools of water to cool this furnace, this man-made furnace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, we speak about the question of governance and unfortunately the issues that we were told to be comfortable about continue to trouble this country. You know, the Democratic Labour Party has to be very careful about how it proceeds. I do not prosecute professionally - I tend to defend. But the preparation of a brief, sir, requires that you look at what the other side's case will be. When we look at the Democratic Labour Party's manifesto, sir, for 2013, under the rubric of energy, at page two, they say, sir, the following: we will allow a private sector company, through an appropriate bidding process - hear the word, sir - through an appropriate bidding process, to have access to the existing landfill to

extract the landfill gas for the generation of electricity. So that you can concede, sir, that the Democratic Labour Party, as it presented its case to the people of Barbados in 2013, conceptualised of a waste-to-energy process. But more importantly, what the Democratic Labour Party purported that it was committing to was that it would go through an appropriate bidding process - not a process in which you would wake up one morning and hear that a company from God knows where, run by God knows who, in God knows whose interests, named Cahill, will arrive here, be signed on with an agreement that four Cabinet ministers support, and that there has been no bidding, no process that allows for there to be competition.

And in fact, that is why we have called - and indeed, on the night when she made her reply to the budget, the Leader of the Opposition called - for the full disclosure of all of the agreements which are allegedly signed by this government. We have heard of an implementation agreement, we have heard of a power purchase agreement whereby the light and power is expected to take off the electricity produced, we have heard of a memorandum of understanding. We want the government to produce the documents. We want the government to govern in the context of the transparency that it held itself out to the people in 2008 and said this will be the way in which we will walk - that there will be transparency in the public affairs of this country. That is not denigrating anybody's character, Honourable Member, Mr. Speaker, sir, through you. That is not casting aspersions on anybody's character or demeaning their reputation. That is to say that we want good governance. That if you are going to sign on to a document that will have millions of dollars in terms of the implications, then that you should do so in a manner that is consistent with transparency. That you hold the hand of the public, who for the first time is hearing about a furnace that can burn at the temperature of the sun, that you say you are bringing in a machine called a plasma gasification plant, that when you look at it, it is taller than a 747 jumbo jet in terms of its measurement. That you cannot move it from the Bridgetown port to where you want to carry it in St. Thomas unless it takes down wires all across Barbados. But you cannot roll it along the streets of this country because it is wider than most of the streets in the land. These are the things that the government's ministers should be saying to the country and telling us how you plan to do this. But they sit, Mr. Speaker, sir, in stony silence.

And the only person who speaks on these matters, sir, is a lady whose name is Claire Cowan. I have not met the woman. If she was before me now, I would not know her. But in fairness to her, she has held herself out as being the representative - I believe the chief executive officer - of this mysterious amorphous entity known as Cahill. I hear more from her than I hear from the Prime Minister of the land on this matter. I hear more from her than I hear from the Minister of Energy on this matter. I have heard more

from her than I have heard from my friend, the member for St. Michael North West, the Minister of Finance, on this matter. But I have heard him in defence of her, though these days her more recent pronunciations are not in defence of him. And I sense that there has been a parting of the ways. I sense that. But again, the member who took his seat before me, sir, does not want me to speak to those things because I would be speculating and speculation is already rife. And you would be getting into things where you cannot speak specifically to the pros and cons. So let us speak, sir, to what we know.

We know that there was a generic environmental impact assessment. That there has not been a specific - and I say has not been, using the date that the budget was delivered, up to that date - because the following day is when the Barbados Labour Party was forced to speak to the country, because the government did not condescend to take the country into its confidence. Up to that date, sir, to the best of our knowledge, information and belief, there was no specific environmental impact assessment. Has there been one? Because the government has come here to acquire land which, by the way, the Minister of Housing has not told us will be transferred over to Cahill free of cost. That is the understanding that we have. It is not for me to stand up here and say that the country should have been told so this morning - that we can spend millions of dollars in a compulsory acquisition of land, but that the land is going to be handed to Cahill free of cost. Free of cost. Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, we need to know if there has been the specific environmental impact assessment and if so, when was it done and what have been its findings? The government cannot presume that they can continue to go down this road.

I have had the painful experience once before. And I have said to the member for Christ Church East, who is my parliamentary representative for the time being, and I have said to him, with great reluctance, I had, sir, to lead the charge in terms of defending the constituency of St. James Central, where once again, without environmental impact assessment, without town planning permission, an effort was made to do a land swap which would have seen - had it not been for my intervention - an incinerator, because there is a passion on this side for burning garbage, an incinerator being implanted in the bowels of Hoyte's Village in St. James.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I want to also ask the question about the Town and Country Planning permission. I am glad to hear that members have found voice, even though they have done so from their seats. But I want, sir - Mr. Speaker, sir - I want to raise the issue of the Town and Country Planning Department.

Please keep it down. I will not hear the member, please. Sir, let us have some order. We have to be candid.

The Member for St. Thomas, the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, spoke today about the fact that a government department - and she did not name the department, but I will - the Department of Town and Country Planning was written. And it was written in the month of July. And at that time, the letter that came back - if any of the Honourable Members has it while I am on my feet, please pass it to me because I would like to make it a document of the House. This country must understand what is happening to it. While they lie comfortable in their beds, believing that they sleep under a comforter of democracy, they must understand, Mr. Speaker, sir, that your government was capable of coming here and giving assurances - as I just indicated, through the mouth of the Prime Minister and through the mouth of the Minister of Finance - but that the Town and Country Planning Department wrote back to say they had no application. There was no application before Town and Country Planning. But we are here about an agreement signed, a memorandum of understanding in place. We are hearing, Mr. Speaker, about a power purchase agreement, an implementation agreement. And that is why the opposition cannot be charged with speculation. The opposition has a duty which we are discharging. We are saying that the government must produce - and produce with immediate urgency - those agreements so that the country can understand what it is being committed to.

Mr. Speaker, sir, if I only have five minutes, I am going to say this: there is the issue of recycling. And I do not want for a moment for this government to believe that it is off the hook. This country cannot accept a Cabinet that comes here one after the other and gets up - you heard the member for St. James South, I will hear others - talking about recycling as though it is something that the people of Barbados must just do. What is that? I heard the member for St. Michael West Central today, sir, speaking of this recycling.

I am much obliged to you, sir. Yes - sir, my constituents, Mr. Speaker, sir, in Arch Hall that stand to be affected by this, and in Bennett's that stand to be affected by this, and in Redmond Village that stand to be affected, and in Sea View, Mr. Speaker, sir, and in Hoyte's Village, Mr. Speaker, and in Saddle Road - all of those people, thousands of people that stand to be affected - would much prefer if this government would take a little time. If you could nudge the Attorney General to do a little bit of work. Bring a piece of legislation, sir, that allows for there to be a recycling process in Barbados in which every resident should have recycling bins; a framework for offices and office complexes and restaurants and malls to have recycling bins; legislation, sir, that encourages or mandates that there is a requirement for bagging certain things in a certain manner and putting them out on certain days for there to be collection of various types of refuse so that the recycling process can be done in a systematic way. You

cannot seriously speak the language of recycling if you are going to just get up and say there should be recycling.

This bunch before me, sir, to your right-hand side, are the government. They are the government. In case they do not know it, they are the government. It lies with them and them alone to bring such legislation to the land. It is when that legislation proves to be ineffective that you can then go this sorry route of spending millions of dollars and talking about having these plants that burn at the heat of the sun and so on and so forth, and put people's lives at risk. But the basic things - I heard a member here today, sir, on that side talking about what happened in Canada. Well, nobody waved a magic wand and allowed it to happen in Canada. A government in Canada went into the federal parliament and passed the necessary laws which make recycling processes a way of life on a day-by-day basis in that jurisdiction. What is so difficult to get that between the decorative hairs of the heads of the members on that side? You cannot seriously be trying to solve these problems if you have not done the homework, the first steps.

When I spoke in the budget, sir, I spoke the language. I said to this House that we continue to be the impediment to progress. This Parliament is unfortunately being used as an impediment to the progress of the country. The member who is the Minister of Finance knows that what I am saying about recycling is correct. The Minister of Energy knows that what I am saying about recycling is correct. How pointless is it then to speak in this whimsical and fanciful way about - we should have recycling. Well, you cannot just have it. You have to make it happen.

The Minister of Energy did not say it, sir, in fairness to him. But I also want to say that the other offensive part of this, sir, is that Cahill, according to the understanding that we have - and this is nobody spreading speculation; I agree that there is a need to know and that is why I am asking for the production of all the agreements - but according to the information we have, sir, this country is about to hand over not just the land, but they are going to do so free of corporation tax, free of value added tax. Property transfer tax will be non-existent for this transaction. Withholding tax - non-existent. Import duties, sir, will be fully waived. And the import duties, as we understand it, will include the garbage that will be imported into Barbados, inclusive, sir, of tyres and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sir, on top of all of that, you are going to change the topography of Barbados. We have a Minister of Agriculture who I understood at one time to be keen on planting yams and eddoes and cassava and sweet potato, who is now going to be a minister for king grass and river tamarind. And, sir, this demeaning, psychologically self-defeating nonsense is being foisted on the thoughts of this country as though we must just stand idly by and watch it happen. I do not see how that is

possible. I do not care how important the burning of refuse may be in the minds of anybody. I challenge them to explain to me how many acres you are going to put into king grass. And if you have an overabundance of king grass in any year, who are you exporting it to and for what money? If you have an abundance of river tamarind, who wants it and what will you get for it?

So, Mr. Speaker, sir, the reality is that this process is absurd in the extreme. It is haphazard, it is improperly thought through. The governance process has been atrocious to say the least. And I want the government to get off of its high horse. I am begging the member for St. Michael West Central - who otherwise spoke well - to get this thing out of his chest. Nobody is trying - it is like a bit between his teeth, sir - nobody is trying to spread meaningless speculation or idle speculation. There is nobody who is interested in denigrating any member's reputation. To the extent that may be suggested, it is certainly not in me. But what I am asking for, sir, is that there must be clarity of purpose and that the country must hear - not from Claire Cowan; nobody in Barbados -

elected Claire Cowan. Hardly anybody in Barbados. No. We need to hear from the elected members of the government of this country who have a duty, sir, to stand in the breach of. On behalf of the people who for the short time remaining they continue to represent and serve to defend and promote the best interest of the people of Barbados. I am obliged to you. Mr. Speaker, sir.

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

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Sorry, sorry, Mr. Speaker, sir. Thank you very much. And I had not intended to join the debate. And I don't want it to be said that the very ferocious - very ferocious, yet clearly very empty - presentation of the Member for St. James Central is what provoked me to speak in this particular debate. Because having known the Honourable Member for some considerable period of time, I have become accustomed to knowing when he is really very serious in his presentation, when there is content that he wants to get over, and when he is just really trying to put up a particular impression. I shouldn't say a show, because it would reflect poorly on the Honourable Member. But when he is trying to impress somebody - on this occasion, I don't know who it is he was trying to impress. But he did his bit and he tried his best, at least, to give us the impression that he was so very deeply concerned with this particular matter.

What, of course, troubled me was, apart from his naked and unsubstantiated speculation on so many aspects of this particular matter, his uncanny ability to wrap it around a degree of illogic in terms of his own presentation. But I am not here to try to pull him down or anything of

that sort. Other members on the other side are quite capable of doing that.

For me, what I am a little concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is the basics of this debate. The first basic of the debate is what the resolution is on. And we have to go through these things. I believe the Honourable Member for Christ Church East will speak, and the Member for St. Lucy - the Honourable Member, the Minister responsible for the resolution - will also speak to it. But we have to debunk certain things, and I take a little time to do so with the few minutes I have.

The first is this: this resolution is not any Cahill resolution. In fact, this land acquisition resolution is something the acquisition now is being negotiated and discussed locally - long before there was any suggestion, discussion or input of any kind. Cahill has nothing to do with that. In fact, it speaks to an overall government policy, some of which dates back to the last administration, if not certainly in their intent to create a space within Barbados so specifically designated for this type of activity. But because of their inconsiderate actions in relation to what they were proposing to do in the overall solid waste integrated management programme of Barbados from way back - in fact, it started from a previous Labour Party administration, went into a Democratic Labour Party administration, we left office, and then it came back into their administration - and it has gone on and on and on. So that is how long this matter has been going on.

The Honourable Member for St. James Central knows this because he very carefully read my comments in the budget. So he must have known that I gave an entire exposé on this particular issue. I went through from Greenland and came right the way down through the sustainable recycling centre - all of these. I even spoke in that debate, Mr. Speaker, sir - perhaps a lot of people did not hear it because it was very late in the night - about the fact that that administration, when they were in office, that party when they were in office, brought regulations, had regulations drafted for the introduction of a tipping fee to pay for the sorting. Not even saying recycling, because I know if it is a full recycling thing the Minister can deal with the technical details, but certainly for what would have transpired in relation to the collection of private garbage to be taken to a recycling centre located in the space.

What I did not say then was that that was part of an entire plan by the last administration to move us from a stage of publicly managed integrated solid waste management to a private sector solid waste management programme. In fact, my very clear recollection and understanding is that the Cabinet almost broke up - the last Cabinet of the last government - over the issue of how that matter was being handled in relation to a potential

privatisation of sanitation services in Barbados. I know that came after the whole charade of the Greenland experience. That Greenland, of course, having come subsequent to the other charade of Mount Stinkeroo in St. Thomas. Very promises were made by the last administration in office and in opposition. When they got into office, one of the first orders of business was that they were going to close Mount Stinkeroo. It never closed. In fact, they went from Cell 2 to Cell 3 and Cell 3B. Because of course nobody wanted to be at the time honest enough to say to the country that the volume of refuse and garbage which we were producing was so substantial and was growing at such a rate that landfilling in Barbados was becoming a very unsustainable option.

And that is one of the reasons why they drove around the country and ended up - and I am saying this to the benefit of the Member for St. Joseph, because I know the Member for St. Joseph is very keen, has always been, has spoken, even though he may not have acted, in relation to what is happening in the Scotland district - they ended up in Greenland proposing to do a landfill. I am not going to go through all of what has happened because the public knows, and we have on record evidence to show, that the Barbados Labour Party, against the best advice, went to Greenland, spent near \$100 million Barbados dollars in a failed experiment to introduce a massive landfill in an area that was considered not only unstable but certainly unsafe and unacceptable to experts for landfilling. \$100 million which, frankly, if it had been spent on the rehabilitation and enhancement of the Scotland district area of Barbados, we would not have to be lectured by the Member for St. Joseph about what the government should be doing up there. And quite rightfully so, because it is an unstable area - about one eighth of the land space of Barbados, they tell me - and investment in that area is critical. Of course, now that the government has very little fiscal space to do so, we are being told that we should do it. When in fact \$100 million was spent in a dump that has not yet even received the toffee paper and is up there breeding mosquitoes.

From the last administration we had to deal with it. They then came down, Mr. Speaker, sir, and they put together an arrangement with a private investor - a local private investor. And I must congratulate the head of that particular company for having received an honorary doctorate of sciences from the University of the West Indies for his contribution to business and generally to the community in Barbados. And they came up with an idea to do a recycling centre. When this administration came to office, the centre was already built. The economics of the centre were already decided. And the throughput - in terms of what government was committed to giving to that centre in terms of garbage to go through there - all of those things were predetermined, because nobody is going to build a factory of that nature and spend that kind of money unless they know how they are going to get back their investment.

The income, the negotiations, all of the fundamental factors - costs, financing - all of those things have to be ready. And then you fine-tune them after, even if you finalise the negotiations. But those things had to have been ready for the investor to have gone ahead and started.

I am not going to say - and I am certainly not going to produce any froth or false fury to make the point, as some Honourable Members seem to think they should do - that that was done on a bold arrangement, a PPP basis. I don't know; maybe it exists. I have not seen it in the Ministry of Finance or any other ministry. But maybe it exists that a public tender was done for the construction of that particular facility. We are being hammered - but you don't remember, St. James Central, St. Thomas and others, I presume, will come and do the same thing - that we entered into a negotiation with a Canadian company to do a waste-to-energy plant without public involvement, without a public tendering, when in fact they did the very same thing with the same recycling plant.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, sir, I could even go further if you want to go away from the recycling plant. I would like to know who in Barbados - which ordinary citizen in Barbados - can tell you they were involved in the bolt arrangement for the prison or even the highway. Who was involved in Highway 3S, or whatever the company was called? And I think some of these were Canadian companies too, certainly not Barbadian companies. I don't know what concessions they got, because I am going to get to that, because I think it is important to set the course.

The Honourable Members have asked for transparency and governance and openness. We must speak with one tongue on these particular matters. We should say: you got that wrong. I know - when you start to speak, as the Honourable Prime Minister says, the truth is not like milk; it don't spoil. When you have to point out these things to them, they don't want to hear it. You are criticising this government for entering into negotiations with a company and not involving Barbadians, not taking Barbadians into your confidence. Whose confidence was taken on the prison? Whose confidence was taken on the highway? When one member said the prison was \$350 million Barbados, somebody said no, it was \$350 million US. Whose confidence was taken on this matter? And I can go down the list one by one. And my position in this matter is: is it really possible for the devil to frown on sin? I don't think so.

The point that I am making is this. Investors come to Barbados - proponents, as we call them - many with all types of ideas in areas, some of which we may need, some of which we may not be in need of. But they make proposals. Somebody came to Barbados and said: you have a garbage problem, you have a land problem because you are a small island. We want to propose - we understand that

you are interested in doing waste to energy. We have a technology, or we are familiar with a technology, or we can get access to a technology called plasma gasification in this case. And they make claims, as all investors do, on many things. No investor is going to tell you: I have a technology, I have a proposal, and it is the worst proposal in the world or it is the most unsafe technology in the world. They will tell you it is the best. You have to do your own research. You have to speak to people who are in the business to make a determination as to whether, one, what they are saying in terms of the technological capabilities is accurate or near accurate or possible; two, whether or not it is safe or relatively safe; and three, whether it is affordable. And I say to this Parliament today, from the best of my knowledge and from my involvement, all three of those basic principles were examined and found to be in the positive or plus column.

And let us take them. The issue about health and safety. Now, I have watched this debate on the Cahill matter jump all over the place. It has gone from a land acquisition - that four ministers entered into some secret deal - and the imputation, Mr. Speaker, sir, is to impugn the characters of the ministers. You know how this thing goes: you don't say it openly, but you make the insinuation so that it is carried on blogs and all these places on the Internet, that somebody got some money for something, to try to say that there is some underhanded thing. And in fact one member - I believe it is the Leader of the Opposition - said that these ministers or these people who were involved got their retirement funds sorted out on this matter, that we went someplace sequestered and came up with a deal which nobody else in the Cabinet knew about, nobody else in government knew about, only these four ministers. And that we did not tell the country about it because the country only came to know about it through the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition.

I said in this Parliament that the government of Barbados was in negotiations and had concluded the preliminary negotiations for the possible investment of US\$350 million in a plan to do plasma gasification waste-to-energy in Barbados. Now, I do not know how it can be claimed - almost a year later, in fact more than a year later - that this administration is about hiding something from anybody, when I got up in this Parliament and alerted the Parliament. At that time, the Leader of the Opposition, in her reply, launched into the company, launched into the company's principals and launched into the technology, saying that the technology was akin to Agent Orange - a very dangerous carcinogenic chemical substance that was used during the Vietnam War. A whole set of scare tactics. And that was not enough. It was not enough to give the imputation that the ministers were receiving some ill-gotten gain from it. It was not enough to say that we were hiding - even though we announced on the floor of Parliament that we were in negotiations. But then they went to the fear

factor, to give Barbadians the impression that we went and cut some secret deal to bring some cancer-causing agent to affect the people of Barbados.

Remember: they said they had no evidence that the company ever did anything or was involved or knew anything about any such thing. Of course we had people who came here and did projects for the last administration - you could not even find where their offices were. We had a man who tried to build a set of buildings up at the industrial estate in Christ Church, who were subsequently charged or involved in some skulduggery which the last government entered into negotiations with. I don't blame them, because if somebody comes and they present a clean record as much as you can check, and it turns out that the person is not the most straightforward, and you find that out *ex post facto*, well then of course you have to deal with it accordingly. You didn't tender the prison. You didn't tender 3S. Yes - the prison was in fact tendered, and the files will show - a public tender, not a private tender. I remember. Please continue.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I don't know how the point can be taken, because at the end of the day there was more than one person or company that submitted bids on waste to energy in Barbados. That is simply a fact. And it will come out even greater as we tell you. You have to wait, let them talk, let them expose the hand, and then you deal with it accordingly. There are other companies who not only tendered, but we will hear in time. That is gotcha politics. But that is what they want to play - gotcha politics. But I am not playing gotcha politics, Mr. Speaker, sir.

So the company makes its presentation and, like all other investors, they ask for duty-free concessions. What is new about duty-free concessions? All foreign investors who come here - or the vast majority; very few of them don't - ask for duty-free concessions. In fact, they go to the provisions of Cap. 67B and elsewhere. And some of them don't even go through it properly - they copy it back and they ask for everything, including things that don't even relate to what they are doing. Mr. Speaker, sir, they ask for these things because that is part of the business model. A company says: I am bringing \$300 million in investment. I want to get concessions. I want VAT waivers. I want duty waivers. I want excise tax waivers. I want exchange control permission. I want this, I want that. Some ask for permits for foreign people to work in the companies. All of these things they ask for.

You would get the impression, Mr. Speaker, sir, that we are giving to Cahill more concessions than we have ever given to anybody else in the history of Barbados. You know, they brought the same argument with Sandals because they didn't want the Sandals investment either. So let us see. But you know what? They had to play a little edge game there because they didn't want to offend Mr.

Stewart. They didn't want to offend him, so they had to play it carefully. But yet they said - I know you all well - they didn't push too hard on that. But they started to say we gave away the earth. Now when the investment comes, the company is built, the property is rebuilt, the workers are there, the investment is coming in, the foreign exchange is being earned - we hear no more about it. They drop back. Finished with that. Same thing with Cahill. Same thing. The Cahill they are going on about - then, Mr. Speaker, they start now on the land again. The government doing a secret deal, you know, so we sneak into Parliament. I don't know how you sneak into Parliament - a public Parliament that is carried live on the Internet for the whole wide world - to give 27 acres of land for one plant. What are we doing with 27 acres of land to put one plant on?

And this is what it is saying. This is Bougainvillea Hill. This land is for the government's green energy programme. That involves waste to energy. It involves the SSA building the SBRC place. It involves the wind farm. It may involve some solar too. It involves all types of green energy applications. But yet the only subject matter that they could discuss in this resolution is the whole issue of Cahill.

Then, Mr. Speaker, sir, they start off or run off again on a tangent. This is the most unhealthy thing that can happen in Barbados - destroying the health of Barbadians. Back to the scare tactic again. You see, they are going from finance to governance, back to scare, to health, to land grab. Now this is nuclear, burning as hot as the sun, and they can kill everybody in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, sir, all of the - and you can go and check it, and those Barbadians who are interested can go and check it - the World Health Organization, the Pan American Health Organization, the UN, the EU, wherever you go: the safest and cleanest technology for waste to energy in the world today is plasma gasification. But you declared - you and your leader declared - that this can destroy the whole of Barbados. I haven't got a chemistry degree, so I cannot say what the people said on the website. But you have a chemistry degree and you can say that it is going to destroy Barbados? Rubbish. Absolute rubbish. Absolute rubbish. When the technology is proven technology that has run for more than ten years in some places without one incident.

The problem is that because of the gotcha, one-upmanship politics of the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition generally, even before the government had a chance to properly engage the public on the plant and on the process - having not been able to deal with the budget I delivered - they ran out with the smut, they ran out with the innuendo, they ran out with these scare tactics to get attention.

And I say this finally, Mr. Speaker, sir - this is the other point. You cannot - if you want to build, if Minister

Jones has any of his people in the Ministry of Education working with a school principal, wanting to put up a prefab building for a library for a school in Barbados, you are going to get Town Planning permission. You have got to get Environmental Division, Public Health, Environmental Division permission. You have got to get EPD permission. You want to tell me you are going to put up a plant in Barbados with an advanced technology such as plasma gasification, and anybody in government can sign a deal to give somebody permission to set up a plant without going through the process of getting Town Planning approval, having the social assessment, environmental impact [Inaudible.]

assessment, the social assessment, EPD and all of those together. But that's the point. They get the stage of application because they all run out into the public, giving the people the impression that the government was doing something by stealth to destroy them and cost them billions of dollars. You did not even wait for the process, Mr. Speaker, sir, to unfold.

And I am saying, sir, as I conclude, because I can see you drawing. I am saying that it has to be a dark day in politics when development in this country is being stymied, investors are being harassed and scared away from this country because you have an opposition party that is a government in a hurry. Not a waiting. They are government in a hurry. In fact, I understand that some of them are already calling the leader of the opposition Prime Minister. And it didn't come from me, it came from one of them over there. They are already calling the leader of the opposition PM. In a hurry. In a hurry.

So we are going to block. We are going to block, obfuscate, destroy, pull down anybody in the government, any investor coming here, whether it is Sandals, whether it is Cahill, whether it is with the new company, what they call Deltro - I don't even know who name is Deltro. All of these people we are going to create a maze of uncertainty and suspicion among Barbadians so that this government can get no project off the ground, can get no jobs created, can get no investment in this country, so that they can go back to the public and say the government has done nothing. That is the game plan of the Barbados Labour Party. But we will stay focused and push ahead with what we have to do.

And that, Mr. Speaker, sir, is instalment number one. Because I will have more to say on this matter. Because if they can run out or try to run one of their MPs out of this House, who got in here by dint of her hard work and the votes of the people, they will run anybody out of anything. They can run out, but they can't run this Democratic Party out of office. It will not happen. So, Mr. Speaker, sir, with those few words, I thank you very much, craving your indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Mr. D. D. MARSHALL: I think that everybody in earshot would have been amused at the speech of the Minister of Finance. But one of the things that I think should set off alarm bells is - and I don't know that he really intended to expose his tactic in this way - but the Minister of Finance, in describing clearly his approach to politics and the approach of the Democratic Labour Party to politics, is as follows. You got to let people talk. Let them talk. Let them expose their hands, and then I will come back.

Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the people of Barbados signed on to a government by ambush, a government by stealth, a government by surprises. I have always felt that when the people of this country selected a government, they went through, for the most part, a reasoned process. And they expected that their politicians and their parliamentary representatives would do the same. But what the Minister of Finance has disclosed now is the attitude of the Democratic Labour Party, which is - I remember - that's -

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute, please.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Member.

Mr. D. D. MARSHALL: Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Minister of Finance has now exposed the soft belly, the unpleasant looking underbelly of the Democratic Labour Party's approach to governance in this country. And it is not about taking people into their confidence. Instead, ma'am, it is about allowing people and their concerns to fester, allowing misinformation to be disseminated and to prevail. And then, after all the people have spoken, the government will come back. Now, you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is like the Minister of Health allowing everybody in Barbados to get sick so as to find work for himself and the hospital. That is the attitude, ma'am.

I want to remind the members on that side that in 2008 they came to this country with a manifesto talking about something which up to now has remained ephemeral and difficult for them to grasp, something called good governance. Madam Deputy Speaker, in their manifesto, they said that good governance has eight major characteristics. The first one is participatory, which says that people have a right to participate in the decision making processes of government. That is completely lacking in relation to the Cahill Project. The second one, they said, is that it is to be consensus oriented. Well, I want to tell the members of the Democratic Labour Party, the members of the executive, this country, the government,

that far from consensus, the only people who support this project are the people on the front bench. And I have a funny feeling, Madam Deputy Speaker, that it does not even have the full support of all the members of cabinet.

Their manifesto also said that they would be accountable to the electorate. But when you say let them talk, let them talk, let them expose their hand, then that is not an attribute of being accountable. And they can go on, ma'am. Transparency. Transparent in all its decision making processes. There is nothing about this that is transparent. Responding to the need of voters, the Cahill Project gets a zero again. Effective and efficient, another big zero. Equitable and inclusive, another big zero, and follows the rule of law. I venture that is perhaps the biggest zero of all. So an administration that set out in 2008 that it will run this country based on eight pillars of good governance has, in perhaps the single largest public sector project ever to be embarked upon in the history of this nation, thrown their manifesto commitment, their solemn pledge, completely out the window. And that is why we are here, ma'am, because they believe that we should sit here and mouth off and even be ignored. And after we have spoken, then the Minister of Finance will somehow come and save the day. Not in this case, ma'am. Not in this case.

It should distress every single Barbadian that the speech to introduce this particular resolution into Parliament lasted a mere 90 seconds. A mere 90 seconds, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is a disgrace. It is a disgrace. The speech of the Honourable Member demonstrated only that he could read the resolution laid before this chamber. Madam Deputy Speaker, we have had land acquisition resolutions in this chamber where the introductory speech by the Minister of Housing and Lands would have gone on for half an hour, and you are probably acquiring 1 800 square metres of land someplace in Checker Hall. A little piece of land, ma'am. But we are asked to approve a resolution, Madam Deputy Speaker, where the Minister of Housing has not even seen it fit to explain to this chamber what the land is going to be used for, Madam Deputy Speaker, if it is a piece of land for national housing. You just hear how the government did this and intend to do that. And we can get 900 houses on this little piece of land and all kind of palaver comes from the Minister of Housing's mouth and from all the other ministers. Palaver, ma'am. We get palaver. We get palaver on the slightest thing. But on this important resolution - a resolution that is going to take up 27 acres of land to put into the Cahill Project - the Member for St. Lucy decides that he is going to give Barbados nothing. We will get no details.

It is evident, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the Minister of Housing and Lands views the people of Barbados with great disdain. And he views the Parliament of this country with great disdain. Because in his mind, we do not deserve anything more than to hear that this land is

to be used for the green energy programme. That is it. But this part of the green energy programme - since 2008, this administration has been mouthing off about green energy. Green energy here, green energy there, the next thing. But we are being told that 27 acres of land are being acquired for the government's green energy programme.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, out of that stalwart presentation, we are being expected to believe that this project has nothing at all to do with what is now called the Cahill Project or the Cahill plasma gasification plant. Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, if the Minister really wants to tell us that this land has nothing to do with Cahill, that this land is not going to be the site on which the Cahill plasma gasification plant is going to be constructed, the Minister should come out and say so. But the Minister dare not say so because he will be asking the people of Barbados to accept some unholy and unbelievable coincidence - that the exact same amount of land that has been promised by this government to inject into the Cahill Project in the exact same location is a different piece of land to what we are here to acquire today.

I happen to be aware, Madam Deputy Speaker, that the location in St. Thomas is currently a scrap metal location that the government is thinking about acquiring - shutting down yet another recycler. Shutting down yet another recycler. The Minister - the current Minister of the Environment - when the SBRC's project was open, said this plant is capable of diverting a thousand tons of waste per day. But now we are being told that yet another recycler is going to have to close.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Barbadians are not fools. It is disgusting that the Democratic Labour Party should come in here today and not tell the people the truth. This is the parcel of land that we have told Cahill we are going to put into the project. If they are so gung-ho about this project, if they are so satisfied that this is the way Barbados needs to go, then, Madam Deputy Speaker, I have to ask, why the obfuscation? Why the subterfuge? What is so shameful about confronting this chamber and saying, yes, this is the Cahill lands? The government has agreed to put it in. Cahill has told everybody that the government of Barbados is going to put in 27 acres. It is this 27 acres, ma'am. The government must not treat us as fools.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are being asked - minister after minister has stood up and said this is not about any Cahill project. This is not about plasma gasification. The Minister of Housing and Lands wants us to think that this is just a small land acquisition for something vague called green energy. The Minister of International Business wants us to believe that this is about green energy and recycling. The Minister of Finance, Madam Deputy Speaker, took us on an excursus through Greenland into tipping fees, back to Mount Stinkeroo and

then back over to the Scotland District. Madam Deputy Speaker, this is nothing more than smoke and mirrors. Madam Deputy Speaker, Greenland is now a part of Barbados history. It is a part of Barbados history. And while the Democratic Labour Party wants to mire its limited intellectual capacity forever in the past, Barbados has to orient itself towards the future. So they can talk forever until Greenland comes. They can talk until the cows come home. They could talk until Greenland takes more than a toffee paper. And if the Minister of Finance is concerned about Greenland breeding mosquitoes, he should talk to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health, not to this chamber. But we are being deflected. They want us to talk about green energy and recycling, plastic bags and so on.

Then, Madam Deputy Speaker, all that this debate is about is the government's decision to enter into a \$700 million-plus project or contract with a company called Cahill Energy. And the government can turn it however they like. At the end of the day, ma'am, it is a foolish thing to tell me that you are going to acquire land to do a particular thing, but want me not to discuss the thing itself. If you are acquiring land to build a sugar factory, then I ought to be able to discuss the sugar factory. If you are acquiring it to build a race course, I should be able to discuss the race course. And the government should be frank enough to give us particulars. So this debate is about Cahill and the project through and through.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, this project is going to cost more than \$700 million. The Minister of Finance has said that it is not going to cost the taxpayers of Barbados any money to build it. And that is true, or based on what we hear, that is to be the case. But the Minister of Finance also knows that a company is not going to troll the international financial markets to find \$700 million to build a project in Barbados unless it is guaranteed a rate of return. Now, I am not talking, Madam Deputy Speaker, about the incentives, but the fact of the matter is we know - we know - that we cannot provide enough feedstock for the plasma gasification plant that is intended for Cahill. And that is exactly why, in the Memorandum of Understanding, or whatever it is that was signed, the company insisted on the right to be able to import waste from other territories. Now, if that is what the government is intending to do, they should, following the principles of good governance, come and say to Barbados: we plan to incinerate other people's garbage - other people's plastic, other people's refuse - in our fair land. If that is what you intend to do, then say it. But do not beat all around the bush, because the people of Barbados deserve more. When you were knocking at their doors day after day in the last election, none of them at all anticipated that any of this would come to pass. Because you promised them that you would be open and transparent, and you were going to consult them about everything and they would know everything that you were

going to do. And now that you have an ideal opportunity to show what good governance is about, you want to cower behind the chairs on the front bench.

Madam Deputy Speaker, every government has a solemn responsibility in the discharge of its duties. A solemn responsibility. I am quite sure that the Democratic Labour Party really cannot expect the people of Barbados to take them seriously. Notwithstanding that we have been talking about this plasma gasification plant for a little while - you know, in the lead-up to the 2013 general election, the Minister of the Environment and Drainage in the DLP's performance document said the achievements of the Ministry of the Environment and Drainage include the construction of a \$400 million waste-to-energy plant at Vaucluse under the build, operate, lease and transfer arrangement. Now this is not the Ministry hopes to do this. This is a statement of the Democratic Labour Party saying the achievements of the Ministry of the Environment and Drainage include - not the planning, not the conceptualisation - the construction of a \$400 million waste-to-energy plant at Vaucluse. Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, at its very genesis, this government clearly and flagrantly lied about what it had done. If you say you have constructed it, carry me or anybody to Vaucluse and show us where it is. This is the Democratic Labour Party's document. It is a document of the House for the election.

But this administration - this administration - we now know, Madam Deputy Speaker, is characterised by what the Member for St. James Central is now calling gotcha politics. Let them talk. Let them talk. Let them expose their hand. But the government clearly is not serious, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was saying that anytime the government intends to do a project of any significance, they really ought to take seriously the fact that they are the custodians of the taxpayers' money. They are the custodians of the taxpayers' money in this instance, ma'am.

The Minister of Finance has proposed - and it is now undeniable - that the company that they have entered into this arrangement with has absolutely no track record. And not even the absence of a track record on major public sector projects - it has no track record of ever having built any project at all. Now the Minister may want to say, but that is because it is a special purpose vehicle. Well, let us look at the individuals behind the special purpose vehicle and tell this chamber what major or minor public sector project this particular company or any company in its vertical stream has ever done. Not one. Not one.

It is true, Madam Deputy Speaker, that when the desalination plant was done, that particular special purpose vehicle had never built a single thing in its life because it was a special purpose vehicle. But you know what? It was a \$35 million project which included the cost of construction of a reservoir. And the individuals who had

invested in that SPV had been in the construction industry in Barbados far longer than most of us were born. So they may never have built a desalination plant before. But the fact is this, Madam Deputy Speaker - it was a company that had done many significant projects in this country. And at the end of the day, those individuals were not going anywhere. Those individuals had no place to run and go. They delivered on that project. A \$35 million project.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, this government wants us to agree that we should run headlong into this project at this huge cost. The company has no financial backing, Madam Deputy Speaker. If you check on the Internet, ma'am, if you look on the company's website, you would see seven news stories. Every single one of those news stories relates to the plasma gasification plant in Barbados. There is no story about a plant in Bermuda, New York, Dubai, Singapore. There is no story about anything anywhere else, simply because Barbados is this company's guinea pig. We are this company's only client. And having put our fortunes in the hands of this entity that has no experience, no track record, no money, no staff, no nothing, then we get the wonderful news that the project has been funded, flipped, and that they are looking for buyers.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I do not know how the members of this administration can sleep at night. I do not know how they can. It is bad enough, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they have entered into a project - and if there was any doubt that these people knew nothing at all about waste energy and plasma gasification, you only had to attend any one of the town hall meetings or the public meeting that they had at the Lloyd Erskine Sandiford Centre. One man said that this project is good for small islands. And somebody asked him, well, what other small islands have it? And he said Japan. He said Japan. So you know, Barbadians are no fools. You rake up a hodgepodge of people who are salivating at the amount of money that can be made from this, and Barbadians are to be led to the slaughter. Madam Deputy Speaker, I discovered that the Barbados Light and Power uses 21 million gallons of water per day to cool its plant. 21 million gallons of water per day. That water comes from the sea. 21 million gallons of water per day.

Now, in a situation, Madam Deputy Speaker, where the Barbados Light and Power uses 21 million gallons of water a day, I have to ask whether it is not reasonable for us to conclude that the plasma gasification plant - which burns, and they cannot deny it, it burns at an extraordinarily high temperature, close to the temperature of the sun - how is effective cooling going to be accomplished at that site and with what water? They certainly cannot intend to pump it from the sea. And when you consider the fact that there is no feedstock, Madam Deputy Speaker - you know, the Prime Minister has sought to give the people of Barbados comfort: it cannot happen unless I say so, because I am the

minister responsible for this and the minister responsible for that, and they have to go to town planning and all of these things.

You know, I wonder - and I do not know, but I am led to believe - that the Prime Minister sent a letter to a lady named Claire Cowan in March of 2014 where he would have told her that he was delighted to have met with her on February 28th. And he goes on: as I have advised you, Cabinet's approval for the project has been obtained. The Prime Minister is left to say whether in fact he wrote such a letter. But I believe that letter is there to be seen. And the Minister of Environment and Drainage has written similar letters. The Minister of Agriculture has also written. Everybody - everybody - is writing to this lady saying, I want to give you comfort. I want to give you comfort. But you know what? Not a man on that side has reached out to hold the hand of a single constituent of mine, or a constituent in St. Thomas, or in St. George North or South, or anywhere in Barbados, because they felt that our constituents needed assurances and comfort. In the reckless pursuit of this project, they are prepared -

to commit and to bind the fortunes of this generation of Barbadians and generations to come. And they want to thank those investors, whoever they are, for their kind consideration and their cooperation. But somehow the approach to the minister of finance isn't. I have to talk to the people I am elected to serve.

Madam Deputy Chair, I don't know in what school of governance or politics the member, the minister of finance and his colleagues were burnished. But I would have to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they fail. And they have failed the people of this country woefully. They are the government. And the constitution and laws and traditions of Barbados vest them with responsibilities. And as much as we cry out on this side, at the end of the day, Madam Deputy Chair, the buck stops there.

But I want to remind the members of the government that it is one thing for the buck to stop there. But they must not be so single-minded in their focus on accomplishing a particular task that they do not pause along the way to find out what Barbadians want. It isn't about what the 13 or 14 members of their cabinet want. It doesn't matter what their backbench wants. At the centre of this entire process has to be what the people of Barbados want. And the attitude of this government - the attitude of this government - clearly is: we don't care what you want. We have decided that this is what we're going to do. And four of us ministers, we are signing it and we don't care.

Madam Deputy Chair, there is no doubt that Barbados has an important imperative to meet. It is about safeguarding our environment for future generations. But I beg the members on that side: do not let the future of

Barbados be reduced to an experiment in the science lab, manned and headed by a company called Cahill.

You know, they can criticise the prison all they like. Prison went to tender. Tenders were invited. It was an urgent project. There was a huge town hall meeting in St. Philip. We mobilised contractor after contractor. Ministerial statements on the prison were made both before it was started and during its construction and after. There was no sleight of hand. There was no subterfuge. The prison came in under budget. The Barbados government got a refund from the prison contractors and the Prime Minister praised it. I see no fault with this. I am happy to have been in an administration that understands what consultation is.

But I regret that this administration is treating the people of Barbados like the solid waste that they would send to the landfill. That is what they are doing - treating the people of Barbados like the solid waste they would send to the landfill. In other words, you and your views do not matter.

But there is always a day of reckoning, Madam Deputy Speaker. There is always a day of reckoning. I hope that Barbados' future is not consigned to the dunghill of anybody's experimental technology. Because when those countries decide they are going to shut down a plasma gasification plant, as they have done in Europe, they have been able to weather the financial storm and the other fallout. We do not even have the capacity in Barbados to monitor on an hourly basis the gas and so on that is going to be expelled from the plant. We cannot monitor it, but we are looking to welcome it. This is a disaster waiting to happen. Madam Deputy Speaker, I am obliged to you.

SUSPENSION

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting be suspended until 4.30 this evening.

The question that the House be suspended until 4.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Christ Church East.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: Deputy Speaker, I enter this debate at this time to see if I can kind of guide it back to where it was intended to be at the very beginning. So let me start, ma'am, by referring to the resolution. But I want to refer to the resolution in the context of the Cabinet

paper, since that was referred to. And it was said in this House that at the time when the Cabinet approved the acquisition of this land, that it also approved the handing over of land to one company called Cahill. And you know, Madam Deputy Speaker, the framers of the rules of the House must have been struck with a stroke of brilliance when they prohibited members of the House from referring to some as hypocrites. Some endowment of wisdom must have fallen on them because they must have known that in the process of dealing with the business of this House that there would be those who behave in a way that would lead to an easy conclusion, that they could not sit on the railing of truth, no matter how cemented it was, because there is no such truth that such events happened.

The resolution, when it was brought to Cabinet said this paper seeks the Cabinet's approval of a resolution preparing the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land comprising of approximately 10.93 hectares, or 27.1 acres, located at Vaucleu, St. Thomas for the Sanitation Services Authority to implement and execute its green energy programme. And that this programme is designed to facilitate the effective and efficient management of the solid waste and other activities related to the preservation of the environment. Now, so the resolution today is about allowing the government to pursue a set of policy initiatives that are designed to assist in a progressive management of solid waste within the context of green energy.

Now, clearly, members on the other side who have sought to refer to the government's green energy programme clearly do not understand what it is, because waste to energy is one of the components of the green energy programme. Landfill gas to energy is another component of the green energy programme. And what landfill gas to energy is, is where the technical experts go into decommissioned cells and extract the trapped gases from within the cell that would otherwise be released as greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Now, when we talk about greenhouse gases, we understand that greenhouse gas emissions is part of the global conversation of the day. And what the global conversation is insisting is that greenhouse gas emissions is primarily responsible for the rise in climate change, a phenomenon that is now proven to be real and is impacting on societies all over the world, including small island developing States, including countries that still practise landfilling. Where the landfill is really an open sepulchre for the release of greenhouse gases. And greenhouse gases impact the atmosphere to the extent where not only your air quality is contaminated, but the ozone layer is also contaminated, which is affixed between earth and sun to slow down the impact of the greenhouse gas emissions on the lives and the well-being of citizens.

Now the landfills in Barbados are responsible for 16.7 per cent of all greenhouse gases emitted in this country. Associated with that of course is transportation, where the emissions of vehicles on our streets also contribute, and contribute in excess of 60 per cent of greenhouse gases in our environment. So what we are trying to do really as a government is to set in motion a progressive, ambitious green energy programme that will allow us to address the issues that will impact upon not only our generation, but generations to come. And we can't sit by and wait for some magical wand to be raised that would allow these things to go away. A progressive government seeks to put in place systems that will allow us to address these issues that will give rise to a corrective action either through mitigation or adaptation that will allow us to be able to bequeath to the next generation a safer and better environment. That's what it is.

Now I understand the mood of the opposition because don't forget we were supposed to be a one-term government, remember that? And further than that, we were supposed to be suffering from implementation deficit so that we were not able or would not be able to achieve the targets that we've set as a government. But I now understand why those false prophecies were made. Because there was a process, and is a process, in place to interrupt the government's ability to execute its programmes. Absolutely. That is what it's all about and that is what this is about.

Because let me say this, the goal post has been shifted. It's almost off the pitch. They started by suggesting - the Leader of the Opposition, by suggesting - that with this Cahill waste to energy prospective arrangement that people's retirement packages were secured. Now that is what you call a hypothesis that you establish. And now you go out to seek to make your hypothesis work or make it true. Then it moved from there and it went to the technology. And everybody started talking about the technology of this gasification system. How it's going to be some catastrophic nuclear collapse and that there would be Asian orange. And today, lo and behold, I heard about Chernobyl. Chernobyl. And we are not in the business of nuclear science or we are not in the business of any nuclear activity. The Chinese just agreed to spend over one billion or three billion dollars in helping England to set up nuclear plants. We're not setting up any nuclear operation. But you know there's a danger in flying out to accelerate accusations against a government when you yourself do not even understand what the technology is about. When you yourself do not even understand what are the implications of the technology. When you yourself has a record of all of the iniquities you now try to cast at the feet of this government - you have perfected.

While you were in office, I heard somebody out there saying, I remember when they were running through

this country talking about the 8 per cent cut. For years, for years they tried to write in - and perhaps they wrote into government - on the notion that the then Democratic Labour Party cut salaries by 8 per cent. Then it wasn't. There was nothing wrong with them. Year after year after year repeating that. But now that this government is calling them, if you want to assess what is fit and proper in the execution of government business, bring your record to this House. Let us compare records. The hundred million dollars at Greenland is just a footnote in history. Can you imagine that? A hundred million dollars.

So let me say what we agree to. I believe both of us agree to this principle: that we have to find a viable and sustainable solution to treating waste in this country. We agree to that. The opposition and government. I believe we have to find a sustainable, viable way of treating waste in this country because waste is growing at an exponential rate. In 2005, there was generated in Barbados 1 000 tons of waste per day. And we are now doing a new waste audit to determine what the current rate is. And I agree with the Minister of Finance that we have to be somewhere above 1 500 tons per day.

But beyond that, what is influencing the growth of waste in Barbados? One earlier speaker talked about the consumption patterns of Barbadians. And clearly when you begin to talk about waste and waste generation, you have to look at consumption and what are the patterns of consumption among the population. And we know that we are a heavy import consumption society and therefore that in itself generates a high quantity of waste through packaging, et cetera. What we also know is that with a continuing growing tourism industry where more and more tourists are coming onto the island, that in itself also contributes to the generation of waste on the island.

What we also agree on, I believe - opposition and government - is that Barbados is of limited land space and that we cannot continue to build landfills around the island. Now in Europe, only recently European countries agreed that by 2025 all open landfills will become a thing of the past in Europe. And Barbados is really in line with that thinking. As a matter of fact, in some cases they've just made their declaration. We have already put systems in place through our green energy programme to ensure that by 2020-2025, once we build out our systems, that we should be able to also move to the closure of open landfills.

So the waste to energy option is a critical option in the green energy programme. But there are others. There's the landfill gas to energy facility, which I heard an honourable member on that side reading from a manifesto, saying that this government promised that it would follow rules of tendering for the landfill gas to energy programme and that here we are advancing a treatment option and that we are not following the tendering rule. And the truth is

that the landfill gas to energy programme is distinct and different, Madam Deputy Speaker, from the waste to energy programme. Distinct and different.

But let me say this again. The programme was tendered and those who responded did not meet the pre-tendering requirements because they could not deliver the desired technology that was advanced. And the Ministry of the Environment, advised by the Sanitation Service Authority, was asked to bring another paper to Cabinet because the tenders did not yield the suitable results. And there are some people in Barbados who are part and parcel of this objection to this project who have an interest in the project. And we know, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they are doing everything they can to frustrate the government's effort to put this in place because they have an option that they want the government to consider and they had a chance to bid on the project and they did not. So that when you hear about this - we didn't tender, we didn't do this - we did. That is a bunch of fairy tales left to those who have vivid imaginations that produce fairy tales.

I've asked the technical people at the SSA to make sure that they gather their documents because all of the people who tendered were written to after a time period had elapsed and asked if they were still interested in continuing their pursuit to provide this project for the government. And none of them responded. That's a fact. That is a fact.

So I am not going to let the Democratic Labour Party - Madam Deputy Speaker, let me say this - the Democratic Labour Party is the government of Barbados and we are going to determine our journey. Absolutely. And the Labour Party will not be allowed to tell us how to do our business. Let them go and decide how to run their business in their party. They can't come and tell us what projects to pursue and why we shouldn't pursue a project. And all over the place snooping and trying to encourage public servants to break the law. And the public servants are laughing at them because when they talk about transparency, those public servants were around when they were in office and they are laughing at them. And they will continue to laugh at them. So I don't pay them any mind.

So that's two projects on the green energy complex. The third project is a wind farm. That's the third one. And the fourth project is a solar project that will yield up to about 15 to 20 megawatts of power. Now they say that we don't talk to the Barbados Light and Power. Part of the latent power supply programme is to allow for the inclusion of 60 megawatts of energy into the grid. That's part of their declared programme. We have had conversations - I heard over the weekend, in a spirit of utterances, let me say utterances - that the government of Barbados is engaging another Canadian company and that there has been no conversation with the Barbados Light and Power. That is a lie. It is a lie from the pits of hell. And

if they want the truth, as they're claiming that they want the truth, but I am convinced that their ways have been so iniquitous that they cannot recognise the truth when they see it.

We have had sit-down conversations with the Barbados Light and Power on any project that we're doing that refers to energy. We've sat down with them. They've come to the ministry and met with us. We have met with them at the headquarters of the Light and Power and we have had discussions. They are on the same page. And any issues that they raise, we have been discussing with our colleagues in the Ministry of Energy and we've been able to work across the table to come up with a workable plan. So it is not true. And you know, there are some people in the press who pick up whatever they hear and run with it and carry headline stories. The truth of the matter is that they probably need to do a little bit more journalistic investigation because if they had investigated that allegation, then they would have known that the Barbados Light and Power has been in consistent conversation with the government on matters related to renewable energy. It's a lie. It is a lie.

Now, so you have waste to energy, you have landfill gas to energy, you have wind energy, you have solar energy. And one of the other exciting green energy programmes up there is also the greening and landscaping of the entire landfill. Now, I hear members in here - and I don't want to single anybody out - but I hear members on the other side talk about this government trying to turn Vaucleu, St. Thomas into the waste capital of the island. Look, they sat in Cabinet and their government agreed to a physical development plan that identifies the same location as the location for the development of an integrated solid waste management programme. They sat there. Not only did they sit there for that, but all of the promises made to the people in Arch Hall.

I heard the honourable member and representative for St. James Central talk about his Arch Hall, our constituents and so on. And by right you should. It is your obligation to do that. But please remember - I don't know if you were there because remember that you served in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs where they would not even let you close to the files - but let me say that the truth is that they promised the people in St. Thomas. And that's why the framers of this document must have known that things would be uttered that the word hypocrite could apply to. And as a result, they protected the House from the use of such terms.

Madam Deputy Speaker, they promised the people to take care of the stigma. You know that for the first time in many, many years, when you pass along - even though the ultimate solution has not yet been birthed - when you pass along Highway 2A you do not smell the kind of putrid

smell that you would have during the times of the Barbados Labour Party's government. And they promised. They promised that they would have moved the landfill. They promised that they would have taken care. As a matter of fact, they went as far as to pay residents some money to keep them pacified.

Mr. D. D. MARSHALL: Incorrect characterisation of the process of law in Barbados. The residents of Arch Hall were awarded damages under a lawsuit filed against the Sanitation Service Authority. Those damages were paid. It can in no way be considered as being any kind of hush money. It was the duty of the Crown to settle the damages and the people got what they deserved.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I never said hush. I never said so. I said that they were paid monies. And I think that the honourable member for St. Joseph is confirming that they were in fact paid money. Now to characterise it as hush or whatever is the matter for them. It's not my words. Anyhow. Let me proceed.

So we understood from the very beginning that in order to resolve the matter at Mangrove Pond, we would have to come up with a solution that could completely remove the need for having an open landfill. Look, let's face it, Barbados. Listen, if you agree that we should accept the Greenland model, and that is to pump \$100 million into a project after the cries and the warnings of the residents of Shorey Village, led by a man called Rugged - Old Rugged - who went to his grave fighting against that project. Mr. Goddard, another crusader. Richard Goddard, another crusader. All of the people down there - you all may not want to hear it, but it is the record.

The government of Barbados of today has not invested a single penny. Not a single penny. And the truth is that any money spent in the preparation of documents, in the preparation of agreements, et cetera, are monies that will be reimbursed by the proponent. Not a penny. And Barbados has to wake up and stop believing this foolishness that the government of Barbados is saddling taxpayers with \$700 million. You know who has saddled taxpayers with money and had no recovery plan for the money. The Barbados Labour Party has saddled taxpayers with \$100 million that cannot be recovered under any circumstances. And no wishing it away as a footnote in history, you understand.

Madam Deputy Speaker, they spent the money and more than that. When the geotechnical studies were being done and the soil movement studies were being done - and I have in my office reams of documents indicating over a period of time that the soil at Greenland was not stable and that it was ill-advised - they brought rock stones from Canada and carried them down to Greenland. Rock stones. I have just had an expedition done in Greenland and I'm

going to make the copies of the photographs and documents available to this House in due course. All of the infrastructure that was put in has now fallen to pieces. The poles, light poles have fallen down. The roads - you can't even get past through the roads. The fencing has fallen down. Everything down there is in shambles. And the residents of that area advised the government then not to put the investment there. Including the honourable member for St. Andrew, whose words have now become etched in infamy - that it would be total environmental madness to carry a dump down there.

So the opposition can talk Cahill all they want. Taxpayers ain't got a thing to pay. Not a cent. Not a cent. And I am telling you now that until the government receives all of the requisite sign-offs on the project, the project will not happen. But if the government receives all of the requisite sign-offs and it is shown by the relevant authorities, including the Town and Country Planning Office, that the project is a viable, necessary project, then the opposition will have a fight on their hands because we are not allowing them to dictate government policy. You all could not dictate your own policy. You ain't dictating ours. You're not the government.

I heard it said - when we won the election, well, you all won the election, but we still got the power. Well, they may have got the power with some people, but when they got the power to run this country, understand that. And until the former Prime Minister of Barbados of the Labour Party gets up in this House and says he accepts full responsibility for all of the iniquity and sins -

committed while he was prime minister. But any ending there, you know, it didn't end in there. It didn't end in there because I am challenging now the opposition. I'm challenging the leader of the opposition because the leader of the opposition does not respond to anything. And she doesn't really come in here. I challenge them that if they want to have a debate on transparency and if they want to have a bit on corruption, bring your files and come because we have a litany of projects. And I challenge down to the Auditor General who did special audits to come. And I challenge the Public Accounts Committee to put on their agenda items dealing with Greenland, the prison, St. Leonard's, Trieste, Crab Hill police station. Oh, Lord. And I could go on and on.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Honourable Member.

Mr. D. D. MARSHALL: The government actually has the majority on the Public Accounts Committee. So you don't have to challenge himself. He could bring it if he wants.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: I challenge the Public Accounts Committee to put them on. Don't challenge it. Encourage it. You can't guide me. Encourage it. You cannot guide me.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Address the chair, please.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: Madam Deputy Speaker, you can guide me, but not the members in St. Joseph. So all of their misinformation that they are putting out there, as confessed in this House today by the Member for St. Joseph, all of the misinformation going out there about KHIT - look, this government has a programme. It is called the Green Energy Programme. If Barbadians want to have a landfill in their backyard, come forward and say so. St. Andrew, come forward. St. Joseph, come forward. St. Philip, come forward if you want a landfill up there. Christ Church, St. John, St. James - any parish in this country who will say to this government, we want you to build a landfill using the Greenland model in our backyard, we will come and do it. But I know my Prime Minister will not allow us to respond to that because he understands, as a person who is heavily relied on by the United Nations in conversations and meetings on sustainable development, he understands - the Honourable Member, the Right Honourable Member, understands the implications for this.

But we must sit here and allow every time we come up with a project idea, the opposition to pelt rocks at us, to throw darts at us, to run out in public and to keep a lot of noise in the public and keep the country in a stalemate in terms of its progress. It's not going to happen. It is not going to happen. We are not going to break the law. And if we are told by public servants that we respect and listen to - remember when we came into office, we found public servants in the most dilapidated conditions. And the leadership of this government had to take it upon itself to go and build buildings and to make accommodations suitable for our public servants. That's why I tell you, when you run around out there like Little Red Riding Hood, talking about wolf, wolf, wolf, wolf, the public servants are laughing at you all because the public servants were in the same place they are now when all of the racket was going on. So don't come around the place thinking that you are going to write into government because you are trying to stall this government. This government will not be stalled. Will not be stalled. We are going to press ahead because we know that the programmes and services that we are seeking to provide are programmes and services that will take us forward.

You know what? We had a consulting group look at us, look with us about this green energy programme. Right now this country is saddled with about \$700 million a year in the importation of fossil fuels. And we know that these projects will yield significance in terms of our production

of energy. The country's target has been set at 29 per cent of its energy by renewable sources by 2029. And I believe that we are going to be able to eclipse that target once we stay on track.

But I had an analysis done based on 31 megawatts of power produced by the green energy programme - what that would mean in terms of the country saving on barrels of oil. Madam Deputy Speaker, follow me. Our waste-to-energy facility will generate the equivalence of 54 000 barrels of oil in energy. That is 54 000 barrels of oil that the country will not have to purchase in order to supply its energy consumption. Understand where I am going? Understand here with me - 54 000 barrels of oil, the equivalence of a waste-to-energy plant. So the waste-to-energy is not some airy-fairy, high and mighty concept. Let me go further. The landfill gas-to-energy facility, once it comes into being, will generate the equivalence in energy of 15 500 barrels of fossil fuel. If we pursue and complete Irwin Farm, that will generate the equivalent of 14 000 barrels of oil. And the solar farm would generate the equivalence of 1 900 barrels of oil. In other words, the energy produced will be able to cause us to scale down by that number of barrels of oil - which, by the way, oil is on its way back up and most people are sure that it will get back to the hundred dollars a barrel where it was. And that is why the government must not stop on its programme. And that is why Barbados must understand that what we are trying to do is to come up with a template that allows us to reach for energy efficiency and energy independence by creating a menu of projects that allow us to achieve this kind of outcome.

You know what the result of that is by calculation? That if we go through with this green energy programme, we will be able to generate 31 megawatts of energy. And that 31 megawatts of energy is equivalent to 85 400 barrels of oil per year. That is what we are trying to do. We are not trying to bamboozle the public, carry them down some long and lonesome road. We are seeking to put in place a green energy programme that will revolutionise - and the opposition knows it. That is why they are fighting so hard now.

They went up in Waterford. The opposition leader was up there walking about, stepping over cow dung and all kinds of things. As I have been told, there is a pond up there that we are working with in connection with the botanical garden. There were ducks in the pond. When she left, the ducks disappeared. And I understand she almost fell in. They led the opposition up there, searching, snooping, peeping up under the government's programme. Something, of course, that - well, maybe I should continue.

So I am saying, all I am saying, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that the country must wake up. Let me make this final point. They brought in a scientist and when they

searched the World Health Organization, his name was listed on the blacklist. He is a quack. We brought in a world-renowned scientist by the name of Dr. Ali who went on VOB and discussed plasma gasification. And the only thing that the people at VOB could say was, well, we are really confused because we were hearing that it was bad, and now you are giving us a scientific perspective.

I heard this morning the Member for St. George South talking about syngas. As a matter of fact, they are so far out they do not even know the difference between king grass and elephant grass. They do not know the difference. Elephant grass is that thin grass that grows in ponds and usually lies down a lot. Cane grass is that tall grass that grows with joints like sugar cane - very high. That is not - oh dear, please. It is that tall grass that usually grows in areas like Borden, through the Scotland District, all through the valley. Because, Madam Deputy Speaker - because the root type of cane grass is of such that it holds soil together.

The Member for St. George South talked about syngas. Yes, Honourable Member.

Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND: During my presentation I made no mention of king grass nor any grass. I made mention of synthesis gas - syngas. Madam Deputy Speaker, I made no mention of grass in my presentation.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have two minutes left. Honourable Member, please wrap up. Thank you very much.

Dr. the Hon. D. S. LOWE: The Honourable Member for St. George South did speak to syngas. Well, I would not associate you with grass. That is the truth.

So in any event, I ask the public to consider the following. We have to be a progressive society that pushes the envelope to ensure that we achieve development that is sustainable. I have no difficulty with anything that the opposition says about engaging the public and talking. This project is not even off the ground. It has had two or three town hall meetings where the public has been engaged. But when you set up a straw man and you decide that you want to shape the colour of the truth, there is nothing that anyone can say, including perhaps Christ Himself, to turn you back from your hypothesis. And I am proud to be a part of this government. I give my full support to this resolution and I hope and pray that this government will stay focused and will continue on its path to progress. Thank you very much.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member for the City. Thank you.

Lt. Col. J. D. BOSTIC: Madam Deputy Speaker. I am happy to enter this debate at this point in time, coming after the Honourable Minister with responsibility for the

environment, because my presentation is going to focus on some of the environmental issues associated with the green energy programme. I must say that I am a little disappointed that the Honourable Minister did not see it fit to address some of these issues, issues that I consider to be pertinent, to be relevant, to be very important. But I want to start by saying that I have observed over the last few hours the fact that, as a result perhaps of the lack of specificity displayed by the Honourable Member for St. Lucy in tabling this resolution, not only some members on this side might be confused by the resolution, but it seems to have bamboozled others on the other side as well. And I say that, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I have sat here today and I have heard some members articulating the view that this has nothing to do with Cahill. And then there are others that are speaking and referring to Cahill. So there seems to be some confusion on all sides.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me clarify one matter that has been referred to this morning. The opposition, Madam Deputy Speaker, does not have a difficulty with the green energy programme of the government as it relates to recycling, reducing and reusing municipal solid waste. Any difficulty, perhaps, has to do with phase four of this, which we will come to shortly - phase four dealing with the transformation or the conversion of waste to energy. I believe it is called recovery. And I say so boldly because it was the Barbados Labour Party government back in 2007 that developed the first national green economy policy in the Caribbean - one of the first in the world. That is fact. The policy was not operationalised, not because in 2008 the people of Barbados exercised their constitutional right and changed the government. So therefore, the Barbados Labour Party cannot and would not have an issue with a green energy programme.

I want to remind this Honourable Chamber also that the Barbados Labour Party between 1994 and 2008 implemented strong environmental policies dealing with the greening of the highways, for example, legislation to protect the marine environment, the construction of community parks and beach facilities and so on. So this is really a continuation of work that was started by the Barbados Labour Party administration, with the exception of what appears to be the direction that the government is going with regards to the conversion of waste to energy. But it is the greening programme we are talking about.

I also want to, in responding to the Honourable Minister of the Environment, state that we acknowledge - we know that we have a waste problem in this country. That is a fact. But even Dr. Hugh Seeley also recognised that although we are developing a wasteful society, as he puts it, we also have a very effective waste diversion and waste recycling programme. It is a programme which I believe has started to bear fruit in this country. We still have a long way to go, but I believe that great progress has

been made in this regard. And that is something that perhaps we ought to focus on as well - the whole idea of recycling, reducing and reusing municipal solid waste.

I want to focus on the environmental considerations here because matters relating to the economic viability of the green energy programme, or indeed governance of this programme, are matters that can be resolved in time. Yes, if there is an issue with the economic viability, even if it takes successive generations of Barbadians, it can be dealt with, it can be paid for. If it is something to do with governance, it can be dealt with at the end of the electoral term when the people of Barbados decide to make another change. But environmental considerations are of such magnitude that you may reach a point, if you have an issue, where it cannot be retrieved - it becomes irretrievable. And I would have expected that the Honourable Minister of the Environment would have touched on some environmental issues relating to the green energy programme.

We have a responsibility as a country. Barbados is signatory to several treaties dealing with the environment - there are at least a dozen, including the 1989 Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and their Disposal, the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. So this is a responsibility, a commitment, something that we should uphold, something that we should always consider when we are going into any sort of development which has an impact on our environment.

But I would say even more importantly, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the fact that Barbados has a legacy. To protect and safeguard this legacy, we must. It is a legacy resulting from the Rio Summit back in the early 1990s when attention had been focused on the precarious state of our planet and on the urgent need to restore the balance between man and nature. As a result of this, Barbados and the Caribbean, along with other small developing states, successfully negotiated the Small Island Developing States Conference that was held here in Barbados, where environmental issues were placed firmly on the agenda. And this was not an easy feat, Madam Deputy Speaker, because a lot of the larger countries were not in favour of such a designation, such a grouping of small island developing states. And we had to fight hard as a country and as a region to try to have this on the agenda in order to safeguard our environment.

I also refer to the hemispheric Ministerial Conferences on Defence that were held - the first one in Williamsburg, followed by Bariloche in Argentina, and also Cartagena in Colombia - where the militaries, following the lead of their civilian counterparts, also issued instructions allowing the militaries in the region to include within their task the protection of national environmental

assets. These are things that were fought for, not easily, because once again the larger countries could not see things of a security nature that were not purely militaristic. And the Caribbean, led by Barbados, fought to have these things on the agenda and fought successfully. So it is a legacy that we must protect because we have come to be known in the international community as a country that stands up for matters relating to the environment.

Moving from the international now to the national. This present administration - if one is to look at some of the things articulated by the leadership - the Right Honourable Prime Minister, for example, stated that a degraded and unhealthy environment is a threat to man's very existence on this planet. The Right Honourable Prime Minister also stated that the contest with nature, which characterised man's relationship in earlier times, has now become a contract with nature in our times. And one of the main pillars for the development of this country articulated by the government to its political organ, the Democratic Labour Party, in the manifesto is the pursuit of environmentally sound practices. And so one would expect that the Honourable Minister responsible for the environment would certainly have mentioned something about the environmental impact of phase four of the green energy programme when he was speaking during the last half an hour to 45 minutes. Instead, we heard a lot about Greenland and all kinds of things in the past. The problem is that we have an issue confronting us right now that requires action from the government.

Now, I have read - and I decided, in terms of this green energy programme, I have never spoken to it before because I believe in conducting my research so that when I speak in this Honourable Chamber, I do so from an informed position. And a lot of the literature that I have read, a lot of the professionals, have expressed concerns about the negative impact on the environment in relation to plasma gasification. Let me be honest also and say that I also read quite a few who had the opposing view. That is true. My position here, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that we ought to err on the side of caution. And as a small island developing state, as a country of a mere 430 square kilometres, which ranks us about 201 out of 234 countries in terms of size, as a country with a highly dense population ranking us at number 18 in the world, we must have serious concerns in terms of the impact on our environment of any sort of project, whether it is plasma gasification or any other form of green energy project that we may be pursuing. And so this is something that we really ought to pay serious attention to.

I think all of us in here would agree that this technology is new internationally and certainly very, very new from a local perspective. And I think it is incumbent on the government and the Honourable Minister responsible for the environment to speak to the issues

relating to the environmental impact of plasma gasification. To the average Barbadian, it is something new. And we owe it to our people and to ourselves to get as much information as possible so that people would be comfortable with what the government is seeming to want to do. This is important. I think it is absolutely necessary that the government does what I am suggesting. And the fact that there are a whole heap of plants around the world - and if you go online you can read for yourselves - that have been closed for whatever reason in Florida, in Canada and other places, this is something that really should grab the attention of the authorities before we make that step.

I also want to look, Madam Deputy Speaker, at the impact of phase four - as I call it, if it is not Cahill Hill - that is the conversion of municipal solid waste to energy, phase four of the green energy programme, on our water resources. What is the impact on our water resources? Barbados has been listed as a water-scarce country. In fact, I believe we are in the top 16 countries in the world when it comes to water scarcity. We are in the top 16, and within those 16 countries, almost half of them are from the CARICOM region. So this is a regional problem - water scarcity. I do not know all the technical implications, but I think we need to look at this to see what is required to cool a plant of that nature. What does it require from the Water Authority in order to satisfy the needs of a plasma gasification plant? I would like the

Honourable Minister to be able to tell us that. Madam Deputy Speaker, when I made the statement with regards to the environmental impact, I recall that it was stated that a general environmental impact assessment was not done. I am not sure what happened subsequent to the debate in this Honourable Chamber, but there was a general environmental impact assessment; however, there was no location-specific environmental impact assessment. And I would like the Honourable Minister to say whether or not a location-specific environmental impact assessment - meaning that for the specific site - has been conducted by the authorities and what the results are in terms of moving to phase four of the green energy programme.

And this is something, Madam Deputy Speaker, that ought to occupy the attention of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, because the environment is critical to the sustainable development of our country. And so without taking any more of your time, Madam Deputy Speaker, I really would like for us as the leaders in this country on both sides to honour the commitments made when we signed all of the treaties relating to the environment, to safeguard and protect the legacy in terms of what we tried to do to push environmental issues on the international map as they relate to small island developing states. However the government decides to come to this Honourable Chamber to state its position in terms of plasma gasification, at the end of the day I pray to Almighty God,

for the country's sake and for the people's sake, that it will be an environmentally sound decision taking into account the fragility of our environment. Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank you.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Member for St. James North.

Mr. E. G. HINKSON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I enter this debate in a situation where the Government apparently doesn't know its hand from its feet, from its head. We had an introduction this morning by the Honourable Minister of Housing that lasted approximately 90 seconds - just basically repeating the words of the resolution. No explanation whatsoever as to what this land was being acquired for, except to say that it was pursuant to the Government's green energy programme. I think that his introduction was an act of total disrespect for the people of Barbados - highly educated, in spite of the policies of the last two years of the Democratic Labour Party to undermine the educational base of Barbadians. Highly educated people, respected as such all around the world, intelligent, who could understand. But yet a presentation lasting 90 seconds without any explanation.

We got successive presentations by various members on the front bench that sought to confuse, that did nothing to clarify what is this land being acquired to do specifically. Then we get the intervention of course by the Honourable Minister of Finance who says it is to be used for a lot of things - a waste energy programme and windmill and an administration building for the Sanitation Service Authority. A leading member of Cabinet confused the issue even more because, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have a separate resolution on the order paper of this Parliament to acquire land in the same general area of Waterloo - but a separate piece of land - to put a five-storey building for the SSA for administrative purposes. So this 27.13 acres of land comes before any SSA administration building when there is another resolution for that. So the people of Barbados, including the parliamentarians on both this side and on the other, are even more confused after that.

But let us deal with facts, Madam Deputy Speaker. The fact is that the Cabinet of Barbados on February 27, 2014 agreed to acquire 27.13 acres of land at Vaucluse for Cahill. That is a fact. That 27.13 acres of land by mathematical calculation equals the 10.93 hectares of land for which compulsory acquisition approval of Parliament is being sought today. Another fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that the Right Honourable Prime Minister of Barbados within a week of that Cabinet decision wrote to the Chief Executive Officer of Cahill Energy by letter dated March 3, 2014, headed Cahill Energy Barbados Limited Waste Energy Facility at Fort Lewis, St. Thomas. First paragraph - he goes straight into the matter. Straight into the matter.

He writes: "I write in reference to the meeting held in my office on February 28th to discuss the caption matter." In other words, the day after the Cabinet decision, and now he is putting it in writing - presumably what he told them on 28th February, the day after Cabinet had approved. "I have advised you Cabinet approval for the project has been obtained." And I know the Prime Minister's signature, ma'am. He and I were at law school together 32 years ago. Frundel J. Stuart. This is his signature.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Honourable Member cannot refer to a document in parts. He either has to make it a document of the House or desist from referring to it at all. So the Honourable Member is totally out of order. The document must be made a document of the House or he cannot refer to it at all. That is so, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. E. G. HINKSON: Can I continue?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are required to make the letter a document of the House.

Mr. E. G. HINKSON: Yes, it is. Yes, it is. I do that. Proceed.

On the March 15, 2014, Madam Deputy Speaker, a picture of four members of Cabinet and a lady subsequently identified as Ms. Claire Cohen - whom the Prime Minister wrote to less than two weeks before - and ironically, ma'am, in the middle of it, a flag of the sovereign country of Barbados. One I could identify: the Honourable Minister of Finance. I could identify to his left the Honourable Minister of Housing. And then to his left, a Minister of State who is unelected - not elected by anybody in this Parliament, not by anybody in this country, never having asked anybody for a vote. But he is here as well in this picture. And lo and behold, right next to the lady, to her right, looking very cuddly, the Honourable Minister of the Environment - and the Barbados national flag, of which we are so proud and of which we give due respect and pledge allegiance to - right in the middle, ironically, of a sellout of this country that we love so dearly.

Now we should be debating, Madam Deputy Speaker, today the private member's resolution laid before this Parliament on 28th August this year by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. You know, ma'am, because the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto of 2008 speaks to transparency and good governance. And the Honourable Member for St. Joseph, my colleague, read out the principles - the eight characteristics: participatory and accountable to the electorate and transparent in all its decision-making. Yes, 2008 - the one in which they rode into government on the backs of the people of Barbados. That was what this manifesto said. Effective and efficient government following the rule of law and equitable and inclusive governance. And we were to have, Madam

Deputy Speaker, regular press briefings following meetings of the Cabinet of Barbados. I have never served in the Cabinet of Barbados, but the Cabinet of Barbados meets every Thursday. Has anyone seen any regular press briefing following any Cabinet meeting of Barbados within recent times? Press briefings by ministries and departments to inform Barbadians of major developments and changes. Well, if this is not a major change - the approval of 27.13 acres of land for Cahill to do a waste energy plant, plasma - we have heard all the implications of that today, affecting constituencies, at least four of them, including my constituency in St. James North. If that is not a major developmental change, I don't know what is.

The publication of details of agreements and contracts involving the Government and its agencies. And why then is the Government of Barbados reluctant to share with the public of Barbados - one of the most highly educated peoples in the world, one where in terms of percentage one of the highest percentages of any budget globally has been spent on the people of Barbados every year over the last 50 years; it used to be about 23 per cent, now it is down to about 16 per cent on the education of the people of Barbados - so we are people who could understand and comprehend. Why then have we not had the benefit of seeing any of the documents that were signed - the Cahill agreements, they call them - on the 15th of March last year by these four ministers of Government? Why have we not had the benefit of seeing the implementation agreement, the power purchase agreement signed by these ministers? What is so secretive about them? What is it? A government is elected to hold office on trust for the people of Barbados. It is not their private entity. It is not as if they are signing an agreement to purchase a piece of land in their own name - they are signing on behalf of the people of Barbados. And we need to know.

Even after this debate today, after about seven hours of this debate, we in the opposition and the people of Barbados - and I am sure some people on the Government side - are still at a loss as to what has happened. We know that such an agreement should be signed off by the Solicitor General of Barbados, the public servant responsible for these legal matters, as is also mentioned in the Democratic Labour Party manifesto as something that will happen as a matter of course. What we heard today was that there was a meeting with the Solicitor General. We have asked for any written legal opinion of the Solicitor General on this particular issue. Was there a legal opinion on the issue? Did the Attorney General of Barbados, the person constitutionally mandated as principal legal adviser to the Government of Barbados, also write any written opinion? If so, where is that opinion? What did it say? This is not the way to run a government. Even in ancient Greece, the rulers used to have what we would call town hall meetings in the square with the people, with the

citizens. And here we are in the year 2015 as an opposition party having to call for documents which a government eight years ago committed itself to the people of Barbados to produce, to render themselves accountable, and to run a transparent government.

On this basis alone, the people ought to reject the Democratic Labour Party wholeheartedly and comprehensively at the next election, because they have broken a fundamental tenet on which they were elected almost seven years ago. You know, but the Democratic Labour Party cannot even be truthful with itself, because in its book *DLP Performance 2008–2012*, at page 24, under the Projects Undertaken by the Ministry of the Environment and Drainage - in other words, under the mandate of the Honourable Member for Christ Church East - the Democratic Labour Party in this book, which is a document of the House, has admitted that the Ministry of Environment and Drainage has done nothing positive in this country. Because the very first bullet point that it says the achievements of the Ministry of Environment and Drainage include is something that has not happened - it is a fairy tale of magnificent proportions. The construction of a \$400 million waste energy plant at Vacluse under the build, operate, lease and transfer arrangement. But that has not happened. That is a figment of a very fertile imagination of people in the Democratic Labour Party - clearly something that is misleading - and that is in their promises and performance book as something that was done, first bullet point, an achievement under the Ministry of the Environment and Drainage. This is a Government that cannot be trusted.

And the crowning point in today's debate so far, Madam Deputy Speaker, as far as I am concerned, was the statement by the Honourable Minister of Finance - and that only echoes what the Right Honourable Prime Minister has already said. You know, you let all the talk come in, all the talk, you don't say nothing, you run a government by silence, and then you respond. That is not the way to treat the citizens of Barbados, who in their confidence - whether we feel it was misguided or not - who in their confidence in 2008 and then in 2013 elected the Democratic Labour Party for the time being to be responsible for the political governance of this country. You don't run a country that way, by saying that people talk and you don't respond, and then you respond. This is totally uncalled for.

Still, after seven hours of debate here today, we have had no indication from any member of the Cabinet as to what will be the cost of this land - over 27 acres of land. Will it cost the Government \$5 million to acquire? Will it cost the Government \$10 million to acquire? How will this money be paid? Especially in light of the fact that the Government cannot even pay people a little \$5 000 after 10, 15 years when land is acquired - where will the \$10 million, or whatever it is that it will cost to acquire this

land, come from? That has not been answered. I thought that would have been answered by the Honourable Minister of Housing who presented. But then, after all, 90 seconds is too short a time to answer such questions.

How will we deal with the water problem? We understand it will take tons and tons of water to finance this project. Where is that water going to come from, in view of the fact that almost half of the persons in Barbados right now are under severe pressure in terms of water? People wake up in the morning - no water to cook, no water to bathe, no water to tend to the animals. Where is this water going to come from? How is this project going to work? I thought that by now, having heard from three - yes, three - of the four who signed; in fact, all three who are elected, the other one, as I said, never having asked anybody for a vote for himself - yet having heard from all three of the four signatories to these agreements, I thought that those kinds of questions would have been answered for the benefit of the people of Barbados.

How much more land will be required in the mangrove Vacluse area for this green energy policy that we are hearing about from the Government? We already have a resolution for more land - acquisition of more land for the building of the SSA administration. Would more land be needed as well?

AN HON. MEMBER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I have heard the Honourable Member misleading the House. I have heard the Honourable Member misleading the House, and the other members on his side who know better have not corrected him - making the point that we are before this House: one, he is anticipating; and two, he is doing it wrong, because he said that we are coming to this House for more land to acquire land that we have already acquired.

Mr. E. G. HINKSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, that is an example of the confused minds of the Democratic Labour Party, because what the Honourable Member just said really and truly makes no sense in any logic - in terms of Latin, Greek, English or Spanish.

But the Barbados Labour Party, as the Honourable Member for the City said in 2007, developed the first national green energy policy in the Caribbean - one of the first in the world. Unfortunately, due to the vagaries of democracy, we were not given the chance to implement it. Such policy, though, was recognised internationally, because the then Minister of the Environment received a global prize from the United Nations, largely for conceptualisation on behalf of the Government for that policy. And we were going to take the steps to operationalise it.

All of us in here agree, Madam Deputy Speaker, that we have a waste problem in Barbados that needs to be addressed. We on the opposition have not sought to deny that and say we don't need to address it - but it is how we address it. How we address it. You cannot be bringing in something under subterfuge and under the darkness of night when we are dealing with 280 000 Barbadians living here who have intelligence, who can make an input. Why sign an agreement on March 15, 2014 and then have a Right Honourable Prime Minister telling you 19 months after that it is not a done deal and that nothing can be done without his approval as Minister of Town Planning? Why then sign the agreement? Why then sign the agreement? We don't know what it was. Why not have the town hall meetings before and engage the people of Barbados? We have not had any town hall meetings organised by the Government of Barbados up to now. The only town hall meeting organised was organised by Cahill at the Lloyd Erskine Sandiford Centre. Cahill is not responsible - electorally or politically - to anybody in this country. The people of Barbados elected the Government. And really and truly, as far as I am concerned, it is an insult of the highest proportions to the people of Barbados for Cahill to have organised the town hall meeting and not one word out of the mouth of any member of Cabinet with responsibility on this issue to say: let us engage the public in a public forum. Come and let us have a conversation on this issue. See what is the best way to deal with this. Come and tell us what you are proposing at Vacluse. Come and tell us what is this waste energy project that, as far as we have been made aware, has not been successful anywhere in the world, with plants being closed down all around the place. Why is Barbados being used as the guinea pig for this operation?

How much money will it cost if we are now to get out of what these four ministers signed? All of that is part of the conversation that the people of Barbados are calling on this Democratic Labour Party Government to have with them - and they are entitled to it, not only in terms of normal rules as they operate in terms of governance today, but by what the Democratic Labour Party 2008 manifesto, on which they rode into office, said: good, honest governance. That is what this manifesto says. Environmentally sound practices - that is in the 2013 manifesto. How do we know whether this green energy programme and environmental practice being proposed here at Vacluse is sound, when no one besides the Honourable Minister of Finance - and he got it wrong - has attempted to explain it in any measure?

We have heard today a lot of fluff from Honourable Members on the other side about the previous Barbados Labour Party Government giving contracts to build a prison and to build a highway without full disclosure and transparency. But I really and truly thought - as I believe many Barbadians did - that the Democratic Labour Party

came into office saying that what the BLP did was wrong, that the BLP was doing wrong and was a bad government and needed throwing out. But now we are hearing justification from Cabinet ministers, including the high-ranking Minister of Finance, for what they are doing by saying that they are merely copying the previous Barbados Labour Party administration. And then we want to know why some people are so frustrated and turned off by the political system. We are here in 2015, many of us, most of us reasonably young, university educated - we are here to make a change in the system, not to condone the system and to try to seek cover by saying this is what the previous Labour Party Government did.

And even on that, the Honourable Minister of Finance is misleading - misleading the House or misleading himself. There were expressions of interest by the previous Barbados Labour Party Government - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, then Attorney General, and then the Honourable Member for St. Joseph took over that Cabinet responsibility. There were expressions of interest which were sent out for the construction of the new prison as well as for the highway. And as the Honourable Member for St. Joseph said, the construction of a prison was an urgent task. They also had expressions of interest for the plant in Brighton that the Williams group of companies got. And as was said, that is a group that has been in the construction industry for almost 50 years. Thirty-five million dollars. We are talking about a US\$400 million project here given to a company of which we know of no track record whatsoever anywhere in the world. It is as if they dropped out of the sky.

and come down here and meet with somebody in the Barbados government and say look, we want to do this and they've been given the green light, you know, but with that kind of behaviour, why would the Government of Barbados. And I heard, I listened carefully to the Honourable Member for St. Michael West Central. Why would the people of Barbados not feel that there's something corrupt, something that is not right about this deal? It is not the Opposition that has given the people of Barbados that feeling, you know, it is the Government, by their actions, by their lack of communication, that has made the people of Barbados feel that there is something that is not right, something that is corrupt.

In this whole affair, the Democratic Labour Party Government has itself to blame and itself alone to blame because of the general feeling universally by the people of Barbados on that particular issue. Who are these people we are dealing with? Madam Deputy Speaker, is the principal of Cahill, who received this letter from the Right Honourable Prime Minister. And I must say she's a very lucky person because the Right Honourable Prime Minister of St. Vincent can't receive any letter from the Right Honourable Prime Minister of Barbados. The Right

Honourable Prime Minister of St. Vincent wrote the Right Honourable Prime Minister, who at this time is Head of CARICOM, two letters and has not got a response yet. So this lady is honoured really and truly to receive this letter.

But is this the same lady, Maria Claire Cohen, who last month has had legal action instituted against her in an Ontario court for \$1.6 million for failure to pay a mortgage, and for whom the plaintiff is asking for possession of the property of which he took out the mortgage? \$1.6 million. And she has failed to pay.

We talked earlier today, the Hon. Minister of Finance, about people who come in and who have been given contracts and we don't know anything about them. Is this the same person - filed in the Ontario Supreme Court on September 3, 2015? We need to know all of that because we are only here holding office, or the Government is only here holding office on trust for the people of Barbados for the time being. And we need to know if there will be a Barbados for our grandchildren, some of whom not yet born, after this Democratic Labour Party Government leaves office.

You know, this whole affair. And I would say that this is one of the saddest days in my time, my short time so far in Parliament, where a resolution has come to this Parliament on the basis of a Cabinet decision made some 20 months ago. There's no doubt about it, the facts speak for themselves. But yet even now, there's been lack of transparency and accountability and good governance by the Democratic Labour Party front bench on this issue. And really and truly this should be a shame. Starting from the presentation by one of the most senior members of this House - someone who has been in here over 20 years, could not speak for 90 seconds on the issue, could not define what this land is being used for, what is the public purpose, could not defend it either. We will wait to hear his wrap-up to see if he will answer the questions that we have raised. We would wonder if his wrap-up will be more than the 90 seconds.

But this is a sad day for the Parliament of Barbados and shows that really and truly the Democratic Labour Party manifesto in 2008 and in 2013 is not worth the paper that it is written on. You could throw it away in the garbage. I'm obliged, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: I note that the Minister of Housing wants to close the debate and I want to say from the outset that this honourable resolution speaks to the acquisition of land at Vacluse, St. Thomas. And it states the purpose for a green energy programme. And of course we have heard in the course of a day that this programme is for a wind farm and of course a solar project. There is no mention at all of the name Cahill. It is only incidental, as I understand it, that Cahill is also asking the government to

provide a further 27 acres of land. And the government of Barbados have said that they will provide by agreement a further 27 acres of land at this site if agreed for the Cahill project. It is coincidental that these two things, two projects, need in total 54 acres of land at St. Thomas.

Now we have to be very careful because in land acquisition you have to state the purpose. You have to state from whom you are going to buy the land. It has to have a public purpose. As far as I understand it in my day, most of the time when you do an acquisition, you have to carry out the study, you have to seek the residents' opinion. But of course the public purpose and Act 228 - does Mr. Speaker speak to this? - the public purpose must be clear. The Minister of Housing and Lands must carry out a number of acts before it comes to Parliament. He must do the surveying work. All the surveying work has to be done. The various sections of the law have to be applied. And finally it comes here with a description. I have not seen the description of this first one. But of course the government has said that in this instance this particular land is for a wind farm, for a solar project and for other green energy programmes which the government is looking after.

And I want to say that the government's environmental programme, the waste-to-energy programme, is one in which we have to support, because every country has garbage. Every country must look after its garbage. It is a fact that most constituencies will not want to have garbage from one particular constituency in their constituency. And this has been an ongoing problem for a number of years - each constituency feels that they are not to have garbage in their constituency, but it has to be somewhere in Barbados. So we have to develop this programme in order to provide a clean Barbados.

Now, members today have said that this really represents - and it is because we need to be clear about what we are doing - I have said before that the government must be able to point out to the public, must be able to point out to the opposition and to Parliament in general, the purpose of these various acquisitions. And it has to be clear. I think the Minister of Housing must set out a clear path as to how he is going to treat these various acquisitions. And of course the cost - I have not heard anything to do with the cost of these acquisitions. Now if it is a private treaty then it does not come to Parliament. But of course the Acquisition Act should also clearly state what is the valuation of these two parcels that you are about to acquire. Because as I understand it, you have to come back here to acquire a further 27 acres of land, because you are saying that this is not for the Cahill project - it is for another project.

Now we want to find out if you have really consulted the residents of St. Thomas. That is my biggest concern. Have you been talking to the people of Arch Hall? Have

you been talking to the people of Redmond Village and the people of the surrounding areas - Richmond Hall and all these? Because this is where it comes. Now we take these things for granted. But I am of the view that the residents must be consulted for the green energy project that the government is initiating. There must be careful study done. Now I know in past years the residents of Arch Hall were compensated when there were problems at Mangrove, St. Thomas. And the government needs to look at what happens if the residents in this area are affected - because of not only the after-effect of the plant, but what about persons who feel aggrieved that they have to move? I know the Compensation Act is important. You need to compensate people if they were living in the area before. Many times we had to move persons because of the highway passing through near their homes or because they had been living there for a number of years. What type of compensation are you going to give to residents who have problems? The government has to look at this. You may very well end up having to compensate a large section of the people within the catchment area. And I want the government to take these matters into consideration - the level of compensation for persons living upwind or downwind of these programmes which the government is initiating.

Now I want to speak not necessarily on this particular resolution, but also on other acquisitions that may come in the future. Now if the government says that this is not for the Cahill project, I believe that it is not for the Cahill project - I can agree. You are saying it is coincidental. And of course new information came to the Parliament today. All along we were led to believe that the Cabinet of Barbados did not sign off on this particular resolution. We heard today that a letter came from three senior persons that Cabinet approved this Cahill project. So therefore it has been done by Cabinet. So therefore all Barbadians can agree that this project has Cabinet approval - has Cabinet approval - from what we gleaned today, because nobody mentioned the fact that it was not approved by Cabinet after a letter was made known to us today.

Now I want to find out - because it has to come - if the government agrees, because Cabinet: we live in Cabinet government. We live in a situation where the Cabinet approves papers that were submitted by the Ministry of Environment, and Cabinet sits down and goes through these various things. After the civil servants have their say - in my day we had to go through the BPC, we had to go through a special selection of Cabinet ministers, and then you have a number of technical people who go through this - and before it comes to Cabinet you must have the Town Planning permission. And I want to find out from the government and the minister when he wraps up - because I know he is going to wrap up very shortly - if indeed this Cahill project had approval from the Attorney General, if it

had approval from the Solicitor General, if it has approval from the Town Planning Department. Because it seems to me that it is agreed by Cabinet, and of course we are now waiting to find out if indeed you will continue to have discussions with the people of the area.

Of course I am told that there were no discussions. I am told that the people of St. Thomas did not have any type of discussion on the project as of yet. Now I want to find out if and when these discussions will come off. I want to hear that. I want to find out if an EIA study was done and by whom, and if there was any agreement on these things. I want to find out from the government what happens if the Town Planning Department does not agree. Because even though you have a Cabinet paper, a Cabinet paper sometimes will say we agree subject to certain studies. If any money was paid to the developer, if any technical studies were provided by the developer for such a plant.

Now I have heard a lot about Cahill Energy and the plasma gasification plant. I have heard a lot about it. But I want to find out if the government is satisfied that such a plant exists in the Caribbean. I know that a plant exists in Bermuda - there was a small plant in Bermuda for waste-to-energy. But I am not sure if this is this type of plant, because that was in existence, I believe, over 20 years. I have heard from the minister on the side that we are leaders, we are the leaders. But I want to find out if the studies have come in to show that this plant will be successful, and who will monitor the plant. Has the government set up a team to monitor this type of plant in Barbados? Have you been able to set up a technical team to monitor? Because Barbados must be told that the plan is on stream and the government must level with us today. Okay, you have agreed to the project. You are the government. You have agreed to the project. Then we want to level with Barbadians.

But before it gets off the ground, I want to be able to say - we do not want to hinder the government's project. The government has agreed to this. Let us therefore set up the various studies so that the public be aware. Keep the public in your confidence. Since the Cabinet of Barbados has agreed, and the government must say this as of now - the Cabinet of Barbados has agreed to this project - let us therefore let the people of Barbados come to an understanding. We do not want to go back to the beginning. We want to be able to fit into the project where the studies are completed, where Barbadians understand that this is what is happening. And we want to be able to not only examine the project, but we want to be able to know that this project will not be harmful to the environment of St. Thomas. That is what we want to do. We want to be able to see that this project, if it gets going, satisfies the majority of people. Because you know you are not going to satisfy 100 per cent of the people in St. Thomas. But I am sure that if you have the majority - I know in some countries, Mr.

Speaker, you have to be able to carry out a vote on this project. You must have a type of situation where people say, well, yes, we believe that this project will fly. We believe that it will be helpful to us.

And what would the residents of St. Thomas get in return? Because there are some projects where you have to be able to provide better roads, you have to be able to provide better health services, you have to be able to provide greater social services for the people of the area. I know, for example, when we had a similar project - I am not talking about compensation now, but I am talking about the social benefit that would be derived. For example, I know years ago a plant was put down at Workman, St. George, for garbage collection and the residents were given proper compensation in terms of roads, electricity, social services and the like. So I want to find out if the government will meet the people of the area and discuss with them what trade-off they will get in order to satisfy. Because it is unfair to expect the people of St. Thomas to take our garbage for all those years and now to bring a new plant and to take a further 54 acres. Because that is what the government is saying. The government is saying we are not putting the plant here - we are taking a further 27 acres. I understand the Minister of Housing to say this. Another 27 acres is going to be acquired out of Vacluse. And therefore we expect all that area within Vacluse, which is in the centre of the island, to be either for green energy or for the collection of garbage. What are we doing here?

And therefore a careful study, Mr. Speaker, will have to be done. A careful study will have to be done. And I call on the Minister of Environment to come to the people of St. Thomas, come to the people of St. Thomas and discuss with them all these problems. You have to be able to do it. I want to hear from the persons because obviously it is going to have an effect on the water resources of Barbados. It must have an impact. So all these studies must be done. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to ask the government as of now to put on the table everything. Let us know what effect it will have on the residents. The effect on the groundwater reserves. What effect it will have on everything. We need to know these things so that you do not have speculation.

As we have seen today, the government has not come out clean and clear and said everything. But we want them, as of now, to give us the full picture of their plans for that area - the entire area, 54 acres. And also to let the country know, because we have heard a lot about this - not from the government, but speculation. And we know what speculation will cause. It has caused a lot to be said about Barbados' environmental studies. It has caused a lot to be said about the technology that is being used. We have heard that the technology being used will generate heat greater than the sun. We have heard all these things but I have not heard a word from the Minister of the

Environment. Do you realise what this plasma gasification plant will do if the heat is almost the temperature of the sun? This is serious business and the government has not said a word on this - they have kept themselves secret.

And we have now learned today for the very first time that - all along I was told that only four ministers signed this thing. Though I learn now the four ministers may have signed a document, but this has Cabinet approval since 2014 - March or February. And therefore since March 2014 I want to find out if the Solicitor General has signed off on it, if the Attorney General has signed off on it, and what agreement has come to the fore. Because since then, Mr. Speaker, since the government has signed off on this, I have heard that the major player may very well sell the project - that this project is not necessarily going to be undertaken by the person who got the contract but is being sublet. Now what does this mean? I cannot say sold because I do not know if a person can sell something that they do not have. I am not sure if one may say sold, but this I know - do you mean assign the benefits? Whatever benefits the person may get from this project - but it is a serious matter and the government has to look carefully at this, because this person may very well sublet it or assign the benefit to somebody else, and it causes a real problem.

So you need to look at this, and I hope that since 2014 - it is now a year after Cabinet has signed off on this - that we can come back and the government should look at this project once again to see if it is still viable. Maybe it might have been viable a year ago but today may not be viable again. So Cabinet may very well have to relook at this project to see, Mr. Speaker, if it is still a viable project today. Cabinet can go back and look at the viability of the project a year after 2014 and very well go back and say, well, this is not a viable project anymore because the majority of Barbadians do not want it anymore. But I want the government to come and tell us up front these facts. Tell us these facts.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I would like to hear, Mr. Speaker, that this government comes to the fore and treats Parliament with respect. I want to see the government treating Parliament with respect. Put all your facts on the table, because too many Barbadians have heard about this. Barbadians abroad have been complaining about it. Barbadians all over the world have been complaining about it because they were misinformed by the government in the first case. So the government needs to come and put itself on the table and give - the government cannot misinform the public. The government has to come and tell us about this. What project are they

involved in and if it is still a project and if it's not a project they must still say so. All these deals that we have heard about, yes I've heard about these deals. I don't know anything about them but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that

we need to put the record clear. It is true. Too long - I have said this before - we have been pointing fingers at one another and they don't like it. Since 1950 both sides have been pointing fingers at one another, especially when it comes to dealing with the large contracts, and we need to address that. That is why one person some years ago felt there was a need for a Contractor General in these cases to look at a project, to probably cost them and to ensure that Barbadians get value for money, I believe. Of course, we have put that in place too. Yes, we put that in place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have said my bit. I believe that the Government needs to look at this project, the Ministry of Housing especially, and what they are doing in that area. If you are going to acquire 54 acres of land - that is almost a plantation - let us know. But the Government have said they are not putting Cahill here. And we will hold you to that. We will monitor it very carefully. Very carefully. Because we intend to ensure that we hold the Government to its feet. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, we are here discussing land in the location of Mangrove in St. Thomas, an issue that has been before this House for many years. It dates back so far, sir, that I can remember who used to sit on this side for the Government of Barbados when Mangrove - when the dump was located at Mangrove - because the honourable Member for the South at that time threatened to take the Government to court. And that, I remember, was the late honourable Mr. Bernard St. John. And they had to pull out of Franklyn's Land and they ran before any planning to Mangrove in St. Thomas and created a dump on top of a hill. And today now we as a Government have to correct this problem.

Because the first time we ever heard about a sanitary landfill in Barbados was when the honourable Member for St. Michael West at the time was the Minister of Health - the late Branford Taitt - where he had to come and develop a sanitary landfill after the Barbados Labour Party had created an environmental problem at Mangrove, where the people of St. Thomas - the same people who were told, you know, at the time they were in Government and St. Thomas was represented by a member of the Barbados Labour Party - when they created that environmental madness where you could have seen, sir, the soil being carted up the hill and dumped on that hill at that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have done now is that this Government, after hearing about a green energy policy by the Barbados Labour Party in 2007 - which was done two days or two months before the election - we had to come to Government and put a policy in place. And this policy that we are speaking to today, sir, is a waste-to-energy facility,

a landfill gas-to-energy facility, a wind farm, a solar farm, a leachate plant, a building and office building complex, a workshop. That is what we speak to. And I am here in this House as if this is the first time that we are speaking to these things in this House, which is not true.

What I am hearing from the Barbados Labour Party is: do not do anything at Mangrove. Allow the leachate to go into the water system and poison the people of Barbados. That is what I am hearing from the other side. Do not do anything. Do not solve the problem. Just leave it there. Let the water system be contaminated and leave it like that. And what I am also hearing from the honourable Member for St. Joseph is that he is saying that the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. And that is why he introduced the letter written by the Prime Minister to the lady at Cahill.

And Mr. Speaker, you would not believe that that letter did not stop there. That letter said, and I quote: "Our due diligence practices required that the agreement not be submitted for review by the Solicitor General's office, by the Attorney General's chambers, and receive that entity's certificate in order for me to proceed to the signature of an agreement that binds the Government of Barbados." But you would not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this was fought this far. Part of that letter gave one the impression that the Prime Minister only wrote a cabinet decision. And you would not believe that other men and women will come in here and read part of a letter to mislead the public of Barbados and would not continue to tell the public the rest of the letter. Publish the whole letter for the public to see how the Leader of the Opposition - as in opposition today - behaved. I am not talking about the opposition because somebody must lead, unless you are saying that you all are leaderless. But I am saying that they came in here and gave the impression that the Prime Minister wrote a one-paragraph letter to the lady speaking only about the cabinet decision.

And the honourable Member for St. George North had the whole letter in his hand. The honourable Member for St. Joseph had the letter in his hand. The honourable Member for St. James North had the letter in his hand. But they read one paragraph. Read one paragraph. So I could only come to the conclusion that they knew. Yes, but they knew.

Mr. G. A. CLARKE: The Member is misleading the House. There was no need to read the letter. The Member just quoted that a letter was in existence and that the Cabinet of Barbados agreed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Member. No point of order from - please continue.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member is saying that they were misleading the House. That is not true. What they did was to undermine the Leader of the Opposition because they wanted to bring this letter to the public's attention to show that what the Leader of the Opposition was saying was not true. And they knew that we were going to call on them to make it a document of the House, and once the letter was made a document of the House, the full evidence would come out that the Leader of the Opposition was misleading the public and the country. Because they knew what the Prime Minister said in his letter. Do not ever be fooled that they did not understand what they were doing. They were using a dagger in the Leader of the Opposition. That is why they exposed this letter. And they wanted us to grab it and to make it a document for the whole world to know and to show how the Leader of the Opposition was misleading the public on this particular matter.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, you heard it here today that I introduced this simple debate and I said to the House how it was all a green energy policy. The whole of Barbados knows. Everyone knows that a green energy policy - they know. Everybody knows what they are about. So I did not have to come in here and spend a whole day.

But you know what was interesting, Mr. Speaker? A fisherman called me. Mr. Speaker, please - honourable Members, let the Member speak. Honourable Members, please, Mr. Speaker. While all of this was going about, the length of my introduction this morning, a fisherman from Oistins called me and he said it is quite obvious that when they went to Oistins on Friday night they did not understand why they were going to Oistins and that they did not have the interest of the fisher folk at heart. He said: imagine they are complaining about you taking 90 seconds to introduce a bill. But in those 90 seconds I hooked all the Blue Peter sharks on the other side, because you did not need any bait. You just hooked them with the 90 seconds. That is what the fisherman said. Because imagine I spoke for 90 seconds. And those 90 seconds excited them so much that every one of them took more than 90 seconds. Imagine that - an empty hook with no bait - and all of them, every one of them, every Blue Peter shark among them, bit the empty hook. Not a piece of bait. I had not put any bait on my hook, but every one of them bit. So I hooked them.

So, Mr. Speaker, sir, it is clear, sir, that this Government is on a good path and the direction that we are going is the right one. You know, I have always said to people that if you think negatively, you can only see the negative things of a project. But if you think positively, you can see the positive things even in the negative. They have allowed me to recognise that if they are walking around telling the public about us that we have a water problem and they are saying that we need so much water for this project, then it means all that is left for us, if the

project comes, is that one of the things we will have to say to the person bringing the project is that they will have to put in a desalination plant to get the water to supply the particular project. And on top of that, after having the desalination plant, the surplus water will come to the water system and we will not need to be a water-scarce country anymore. That was their argument. That was their argument. They put up an argument.

And now I am hearing that in order to operate this plant that you have to build on the landfill, the recycling plant is not on the landfill and the water is nearly going to St. Philip. So I do not understand the logic. So, Mr. Speaker, water - do they not realise that the Blue Peter sharks provide fodder for the fishermen? Because out of what they spoke to, sir, we were able to take some common sense from what they were saying and we were able to discuss it and come to sensible conclusions.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that they need to tell the public that they have not only misled Barbados on Cahill but they have even misled Barbados on the contents of the Prime Minister's letter. Because they came in here and gave the impression that the Prime Minister went and behaved like a Blue Peter shark - saw the bait, bit the bait - when the Prime Minister behaved like a lion shark: saw the bait, ignored the bait, and ensured that he was able not to bite at the bait but to give an appropriate response to a question asked of him. But all of these Blue Peter sharks over here, Mr. Speaker, bit at the empty hook. And now you can look at them, because no one listening to what they said today - no one in Barbados - would get the impression that they were the ones up and down Barbados prior to the conference promoting Cahill. Because even the honourable Member for St. Thomas this morning gave the impression that she is now supportive of Cahill but all she wants are the facts. I do not have a problem with that. All she wants are the facts. And the other Member for St. Thomas is telling me I have not given the facts. I am here to acquire a piece of land for the Government's green energy policy. And the other Member wants me to speak on Cahill as if the other Member does not understand what a policy is. This is not a project, ma'am. This is a policy, ma'am. You do not understand that there is a difference between a policy and a project. And a project is part of a policy. And you were a teacher.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you speak now we hear, sir, that they are even saying that we might import waste. Everybody knows that this Government has turned garbage into a raw material. And if the Barbados Labour Party cannot appreciate - no wonder they do not understand - that garbage is now a raw material under this Government and they should have respect for garbage and not treat it as something that you ignore. There is a significant value to garbage. We need to invite them to go on international conferences and to see how the rest of the world has treated

garbage and has now treated it as a raw material and converted it into something useful. But it is clear that the Barbados Labour Party do not understand these things and they expound on things that they are not qualified to speak on.

I have heard a lot, sir, about how this policy will impact on BEST. This policy will not impact on BEST because everybody knows - no, they will not impact on BEST - because everybody knows that BEST pays and treats garbage as a raw material because they actually buy it. And I cannot see how anybody that has an item to sell will start selling the item to give it to somebody else that is not paying for it. So you see, logic is something that the opposition must understand. When we are here, they must be careful. They must come and present their arguments and recognise that if they want to argue, they must bring logic to the table. And that is lacking. Because it is clear that BEST need not - they need not worry - because they have a policy in place that will always allow them to get what they want.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much more we can help these people, sir. And another - hold on, hold on.

Mr. SPEAKER: You know that is unparliamentary. I am glad - I appreciate that point. Thank you. Withdraw.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: I have withdrawn that, sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Okay, fine.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: You know, I can start debating. You know, senior members don't debate juniors. Mr. Speaker, sir, I try to offer you a little respect that you don't deserve and you have not appreciated it. Mr. Speaker, sir, we were told here, sir, that we are about to close another scrap metal person. Sir, that is not true. You can call it what you like, sir. But what I would say, sir, is that Scrap Man has - what we are doing here today will not affect Scrap Man. It has nothing to do with Scrap Man's land. The same light they gave Beast and whoever they are in the public - no, he said whoever they are in the public - you were warning ones in public that we are about to close on. That is not true, sir. Neither are we about to close on Scrap Man because Scrap Man will still be in this place. So I do not know, sir, what is happening and why they have to go to that line, sir.

But what I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that it is clear that now that the Opposition recognised that they have misled the public, even though they tried to do it in here again today, sir. And it is clear that the policy - the energy policy of the Democratic Labour Party - is not only working for the Democratic Labour Party, but it now has buy-in on certain members of the Barbados Labour Party.

And that is why they try to distance themselves from the Leader of the Opposition. And that is why they requested of this side. And I am asking this side to give them the information because it is clear now that they want to be party to whatever we are doing and that they want to distance themselves from the Opposition Leader. And I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that once we give them the information as they have requested, that they will join us publicly and tell the public that they have been misled and they have now recognised that there is potential.

And the argument that they gave the public, sir, that we are too small - can you imagine that after all of 50 years of free secondary education, they are telling us that new technology, that we are too small for new technology? And not only that, what is even more ridiculous, they said - one of them, the Honourable Member for St. George North - I have not seen that anywhere in the Caribbean. And I had to remind him that we are leaders. And I heard the other Member for St. George North saying that if he had seen it somewhere in the Caribbean, he would not have a problem. So in other words, Barbados must be followers. We cannot lead. I want you to know that we led on sugar cane. Yes, small Barbados led on sugar cane. And that is why we had the West Indian Cane Breeding Station in your constituency. So how can you have that in your constituency and come in here and ask us to follow other people? So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I do move that this resolution do pass.

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

Mr. CLERK: Order Number 22, sir. In the name of the Honourable Minister, Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs, to move the second reading of the Anti-Terrorism Amendment Bill, 2015.

ORDER NO. 22 – ANTI-TERRORISM (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2015

Mr. SPEAKER: Honourable Attorney General. Thank you.

Hon. A. D. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long in my presentation on this Bill, as we are going to have to come back sometime within the immediate future to do some further amendments to the Anti-Terrorism Act. The Financial Action Task Force over the last couple of years has been focusing in particular on terrorist financing. And the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force, of which we are a member, in an evaluation of our anti-money laundering regime - in particular with respect to the treatment of terrorist financing - found that there were some deficiencies in our law. And as such we agreed that we would amend our laws to simply put, Mr. Speaker, ensure that it is clear that terrorists and terrorist

financing is more easily addressed, and in particular that the freezing of assets with respect to terrorists or terrorist financing is more easily achievable.

And that simply put, Mr. Speaker, is why these two amendments to the Bill have been brought before this Chamber. As I said, it is just so that Barbados - assuming that this Bill is accepted by this Honourable Parliament - would be seen to have brought its anti-money laundering regime in place with respect to internationally accepted standards with respect to terrorist financing. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and the Bill was read a second time.

Hon. A. D. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee for further consideration of this Bill.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. J. D. PAUL, Chairman of Committees, in the Chair.

COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The House is in committee.

Clauses 1 - 7, inclusive, were called and passed.

The Schedule became the Schedule to the Bill.

On the motion of Hon. A. D. BRATHWAITE, Mr. Chairman reported to His Honour, the SPEAKER, the passing of one Bill in Committee without amendment and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. D. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as the Anti-Terrorism (Amendment) Act, 2015.

Mr. CLERK: Order Number 18, sir. In the name of the Honourable Minister of Housing, Lands and Rural Development, to move the passing of a resolution to approve: (a) the change of the public purpose for which the parcel of land situated at Vacluse in the parish of St. Thomas in this island was compulsorily acquired by the Crown, in accordance with Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, Chapter 228, from the construction of an abattoir to the construction of an administrative office building; and (b) in accordance with Section 5 of the Crown Lands Vesting and Disposal Act, Chapter 225, the lease to Bolt Solutions Inc. of the said land for the construction of an administrative office building.

ORDER NO. 18 – RESOLUTION – CHANGE OF PUBLIC PURPOSE AND LEASE OF CROWN LAND AT VAUCLUSE, ST. THOMAS, TO BOLT SOLUTIONS INC.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. Our Member for St. Lucy, Mr. Kellman.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House seeks permission to change the public purpose for which a parcel of Crown land at Fort Lewis, St. Thomas, was compulsorily acquired by the Crown in accordance with Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, from the construction of an abattoir to that of office accommodation, and the granting of a lease of 3.354 hectares at the site of Crown land at Fort Lewis, St. Thomas, to Bolt Solutions Inc., in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Crown Lands Vesting and Disposal Act, Cap. 225, to facilitate the construction of an administrative office building for the Sanitation Service

Authority. This acquisition dates back as far as 1991, and at that time it was agreed that an abattoir would have been built. But subsequent to that, the Government built one - one was built at Balls, in Christ Church - of which the Government is part.

Prior to that, also, by letter dated February 26, 2001, the Sanitation Service Authority advised of the need to urgently relocate the northern depot from Fort Denmark in Speightstown, St. Peter, to give way to a tourism venture - very important, sir - taking place next door. It was indicated that funds were available to build a new depot at Waterloo, St. Thomas, on lands acquired for the Sanitation Service Authority. However, that would take three years to complete, so a temporary location at the site at Chacora Great House was identified as suitable.

The Cabinet meeting held on July 25, 2002 did not approve the interim location of Chacora land to be used for that purpose, and agreed that the facility should be located on a parcel of land measuring 14.235 hectares at Vacluse that had been acquired for the construction of a transfer station and other facilities by the Sanitation Service Authority. It was also agreed that there would have been an arrangement between Mortality Caribbean Limited and Caribbean Consultants Limited, and they were awarded a contract for the design, build, finance and transfer of a five-storey administrative building at Vacluse. That contract was awarded. Town planning approval was given, and at a meeting on the April 9, 2015, Cabinet agreed with the terms and conditions of the lease, which would be for 22 years, and which was accepted and agreed. So with those few words, sir, I do beg that this resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: The seconder of the resolution. You are ready to speak. Thank you. Yes, you are. Member for St. Thomas.

Miss C. Y. FORDE: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would just wish to make a few comments and queries. I support any venture, sir, that will help to enhance the environs of workers. I just wanted to find out for the Hon. Minister, in a situation such as this where there is this rush and then a halt in respect of this particular project. We know that the ground breaking started in February 2014. Nothing else was done until six months later with the project until August 2014. It is a problem. I want to know if it is a problem similar to what the Barbados Water Authority had when the Finance Minister did not act with speed on matters that were reliant on his signature.

The contractor, I understand, sir, was expected to provide one third of the funding, that is \$9 million. Well, the Government would have provided the two thirds of the total amount. The contractor would have started his work on the project since February 2014. But, sir, work has halted there for a while. As a matter of fact, as I passed that area that we used to call the wash down, I was amazed to see the kind of massive structure going on there again. Another project coming into our environs we know nothing about.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I was never invited to any groundbreaking or any other aspect of the Government's plans, except through the Honourable Minister of Education with matters to do with schools and so on in the constituency, or the Honourable Minister of Culture, Youth Affairs and Culture. I do not receive invitations from any other Ministry. It is not in keeping with this Government's protocol to extend invitations to us on matters of this nature. But I am not going to be digressing on that.

I know that the work has stalled and the Government, I understand, has not honoured its commitment or its pledge. Now I am concerned, sir, that I know there were many organisations and companies, business companies and otherwise, who would have applied previously to Government and the Town Planning Department for permission to erect high rise facilities, whether they were office buildings or what. And of course, the Town Planning did not accede to those requests. I know that some houses have been built at the Grotto. They are high rise. And I wonder if this is a relaxation of Government's policy so that others can come and get the opportunity, because we acknowledge that the space on the island is limited - rather than spreading out, facilities, houses or businesses or whatever going up will make a difference. So I am not questioning that. But I want to find out, sir, if that is a policy that has been relaxed now.

And of course for the Honourable Minister to indicate to us if the Government has met those obligations to put systems in place to recommence the construction - why does this project remain on pause for such a long period of time? Will there be legal liabilities that will flow as a result of the termination of the project? It is now 18 months before Government has sought to acquire the property. Until now, what traffic management facilities will be put in place in that area? Because we will appreciate, sir, that if there are over 200 people going there to work every day, the conditions of the road, the narrowness and of course the way that the road is now, it really requires a good paving. The rain is falling, holes are opening up. No materials, we are told, coming from Bagatelle because of the economic situation.

And I am trying to determine what plans Government has for the traffic management in that area. How can a structure accommodating workers be constructed right in the middle of a facility that is now determined for this in an industrial area? How are all these people going to be living and existing near the mangrove landfill there? The SBRC, the Scrapman, the Cahill project that is in the making and so on? I really am not understanding what plans there were for this.

I just want to find out from the Honourable Minister as well - what were the costs to mobilise, then to demobilise, then to mobilise a plant of that nature? And when we pass and see a massive crane on the site for the last six months, who is going to bear the costs? It really is a tremendous cost to the Government and we are suffering. In Barbados, we cannot get an allowance, we cannot get a salary increase. People have lost their work. Many do not have anything to eat. Many days come. Something is definitely wrong with the plans of this Government. And I want to get some answers, sir, because I am concerned.

Who is responsible for the cost? Is it the Government or Bolt Solutions Inc., as has been indicated in this resolution? What makes it so attractive for Government to want to be focusing on the intense attention of building a headquarters? We have the Water Authority headquarters, we have the police stations for so many millions out of the National Insurance money. And we are hearing building, building all the time, but we are not getting the benefits, especially for the ordinary builders who require some kind of job to be able to help other persons who are artisans and others to get opportunities for working.

There is a lot of slab work, what do you call the houses, the precast work happening and a lot of our artisans who would have had proper training, who would have worked for many years, persons who would have been building blocks - their businesses are not doing much. Small businesses are hurting as a result of these massive companies that are getting these contracts and they are not

getting the subcontracting trickling down to the ordinary man in the streets. A lot of young men are on the blocks. They cannot get a job as a general worker because everything is locked down tight by these big conglomerates. And therefore I have a problem in understanding what is going on.

I know that the public demands answers, Mr. Speaker. And I am not going to be making any big thing about this except to understand what is happening in our country. How do you take all these people and put them in an area that is industrial and then do not talk to anybody about it? I trust that the necessary tests and so would have been done because we know that St. Thomas - sections of St. Thomas are also in the Scotland District area and the land is prone to slippage in some locations. I trust that all of that has been done. The last thing I would want is for the taxpayers' money to be put in a project and then anything happens that will not only impact on the funding that would have been used, but indeed on the lives and the well-being of those who are in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Honourable Minister to please tell us exactly what the situation is in reference to this construction at the Vaucluse location. And I want to know exactly what would the taxpayers get beyond standing or watching a building go up and hearing nothing about it.

I said I would close as I began. I support any venture to ensure that workers are housed in facilities that are environmentally friendly so that they can be as productive as possible. The workers of Barbados deserve the best. But why the haste at this time when our economy is in a tailspin and all of us are suffering as a result of what is going on in this country? I just want for the Honourable Minister to answer those few simple questions and give us an understanding so I can better speak to the residents who are asking questions about the facility that has been going up - that even I could not tell them about until I heard what is happening here. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, the Honourable Member for St. Lucy.

Hon. D. St.E. KELLMAN: I am glad that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas, who is the parliamentary representative for the area, asked those questions. What I would like to tell the Honourable Member is that I think that she is rather fortunate. One considers that today we are debating capital projects that will bring economic activity not only to the country of Barbados, but will also bring economic activity to St. Thomas. And I, as the Honourable Member, do not understand how this will occur.

It is quite obvious that with the number of people working in the area, that is a golden opportunity now for those persons - especially those who live in Sharpe Hill - to provide certain services to the people in the area. So the Honourable Member for St. Thomas does not recognise that there is an economic activity that will come to the area. Then the Honourable Member must understand that with more people moving into the area and more people not having places to buy lunch and so on, there are certain services that can now be offered by the residents of Sharpe Hill to this complex.

And not only that - when one considers the number of different businesses that are moving to this location, I think it is a wonderful opportunity for the people not only from Sharpe Hill, but from also Arch Hall and also Redmond Village and so on to move in. They want to consider the number of bodies that will be in those areas and the economic activity that will be created in those areas. So, Mr. Speaker, sir, with those few words, I beg that this resolution be passed. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Thomas recognises the economic opportunity that will not only come to the country, but will come to her constituency by the movement to this particular area.

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

PAPERS

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of this Honourable House the following papers: the Loan Contract Number 3389/OC-BA between the Government of Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank for the Enhanced Access to Credit for Productivity Project, June 19, 2015; and the Loan Contract 3390/CH-BA between the Government of Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank acting as Administrator for the China Co-Financing Fund for Latin America and the Caribbean for the Enhanced Access to Credit for Productivity Project, June 19, 2015.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, sir. With that we have come to the end of Government Business for the day and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, November 17th at 10.00 in the morning.

The question that the House be adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 10.00 a.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

CONTENTS

MINUTES

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE.....1

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE.....1

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. D. E. BOYCE.....2

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

ORDER NO. 16 – RESOLUTION – LAND

ACQUISITION ACT, CAP. 228 – COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT VAUCLUSE, ST.
THOMAS, FOR THE SANITATION SERVICE
AUTHORITY GREEN ENERGY PROGRAMME...2

Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, 2, 3, 5; Miss C. Y. Forde, 2, 3, 5;
Hon. D. O’N. Inniss, 9, 10, 12; Mr. D. G. Sutherland, 13,
14, 16; Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, 14.

RESUMPTION

ORDER NO. 16 (resumed)

Mr. J. D. Paul, 17, 20; Mr. K. D. Symmonds, 21; Hon. C.
P. Sinckler, 24; Mr. D. D. Marshall, 28.

RESUMPTION

ORDER NO. 16 (resumed)

Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe, 32, 35, 36, 37; Mr. D. D.
Marshall, 35; Mr. D. G. Sutherland, 37; Lt. Col. J. D.
Bostic, 37; Mr. E. G. Hinkson, 39, 40, 41; Mr. G. A.
Clarke, 43, 46; Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, 46, 47, 48.

ORDER NO. 22 – ANTI-TERRORISM (AMENDMENT)

BILL, 2015.....48

Hon. A. D. Brathwaite, 48, 49.

ORDER NO. 18 – RESOLUTION – CHANGE OF

PUBLIC PURPOSE AND LEASE OF CROWN
LAND AT VAUCLUSE, ST. THOMAS, TO BOLT
SOLUTIONS INC.....49

Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, 49, 51; Miss C. Y. Forde, 50.

PAPERS

Hon. C. P. SINCKLER.....51

SUSPENSIONS.....17, 32.

ADJOURNMENT.....51

Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, 51.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BOSTIC, Lt. Col. J. D.

BOYCE, Hon. J. D. E. (Christ Church South)

BRATHWAITE, Hon. A. D. (St. Philip South)

CLARKE, Mr. G. A. (St. George North)

FORDE, Miss C. Y. (St. Thomas)

HINKSON, Mr. E. G. (St. James North)

INNIS, Hon. D. O’N. (St. James South)

KELLMAN, Hon. D. St.E. (St. Lucy)

LOWE, Dr. the Hon. D. S. (Christ Church East)

MARSHALL, Mr. D. D. (St. Joseph)

PAUL, Mr. J. D. (St. Michael West Central)

SINCKLER, Hon. C. P. (St. Michael North West)

SUTHERLAND, Mr. D. G. (St. George South)

SYMMONDS, Mr. K. D. (St. James Central)

DISCLAIMER. This transcript was prepared with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools and is provided for reference only. It has not been reviewed, verified or approved by the Hansard Department of the Parliament of Barbados and does not constitute an official parliamentary record. It may contain errors or omissions, including inaccuracies in wording or speaker identification. For authoritative quotations or confirmation of proceedings, consult the official Hansard record when available.

EDITORIAL NOTES — NOT PART OF THE REPORT

Prepared with the transcript; for checking against the recording and the Minutes.

EDITORIAL QUERIES

Points noted while correcting and preparing this report. Members are named as in the 2013–2018 Parliament.

Q1. Front matter. The source does not record the PRESENT list or the officiant at Prayers. The Members listed are those identified from the record; the time of meeting, 10.00 a.m., is as stated in the source. Please supply from the Votes and Proceedings.

Q2. Throughout. The bracketed time-checks in the source are out of sequence (for example '[12.30 a.m.]' and '[1.00 a.m.]' during the morning and '[12.30 p.m.]' after the 2.00 p.m. suspension) and have been omitted.

Q3. Minutes. Mr. SPEAKER refers to the minutes of 'Tuesday, 20th August, 2015' and says he has not received those of 'Tuesday, 24th October'; the Leader of the House moves that the minutes 'of 20th October' be deferred. The dates are printed as in the source; the preceding sittings were held on Friday, August 28 and Tuesday, October 20, 2015. Please check.

Q4. Order No. 16, throughout. 'Vault Clues' in the source (speeches of Hon. D. O'N. Inniss, Mr. SPEAKER and Hon. J. D. E. Boyce) is printed as Vaucluse, the site named in the Order. The words 'You have five minutes', set as a procedural line within Hon. D. O'N. Inniss's speech, are printed under Mr. SPEAKER.

Q5. Order No. 16, Mr. D. G. Sutherland. The speaker says he is 'puzzled how the honourable member for Christ Church West achieved his engineering qualification'. The Member for Christ Church West in 2015 was Dr. M. M. Agard, of the Opposition; the remark appears to be directed at a Government Member, possibly Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, Member for Christ Church South, who had just raised relevance. Printed as in the source; please check against the recording.

Q6. Suspensions. The motion for the luncheon suspension is not recorded; the source has under MR. SPEAKER 'Yes, I remember. Suspended. Hon. John D. E. Boyce for lunch until 2:00 this afternoon', which is omitted, and records the suspension at 2.00 p.m. The later motion was to suspend 'until 4.30 this evening', and the source records that suspension as taken at 4.30 p.m. Please supply the times from the Votes and Proceedings.

Q7. Order No. 16, Mr. J. D. Paul. The speech after Mr. SPEAKER's call ('you are member for St. Michael West Central?') is headed 'HON. G. P. IAN GOODING-

EDGHILL, J.P., M.P.' in the source, in two parts; he was not a Member of the 2013–2018 House. The Member for St. Michael West Central in 2015 was Mr. J. D. Paul, and Mr. E. G. Hinkson later refers to the Member for St. Michael West Central having spoken on recycling, so both parts are printed under Mr. J. D. PAUL. Please confirm.

Q8. Order No. 16, Mr. D. D. Marshall. After Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair, the continuation of the speech ('Yes, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Minister of Finance has now exposed the soft belly...') is headed 'SPEAKER UNCERTAIN' in the source. It continues the argument of Mr. D. D. Marshall, Member for St. Joseph, and is printed under his name. Please confirm.

Q9. Resumption. The call of the Member for Christ Church East is headed 'HIS HONOUR NEIL G. H. ROWE, J.P., M.P. (Deputy Speaker)' in the source; he was not a Member of the 2013–2018 House. Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe addresses 'Madam Deputy Speaker', and the call is printed under Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Q10. Order No. 16, Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe. The intervention on the Arch Hall damages ('Incorrect characterisation of the process of law in Barbados...') is headed 'SPEAKER UNCERTAIN' in the source; Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe replies that 'the honourable member for St. Joseph is confirming' the payment, so it is printed under Mr. D. D. MARSHALL. The exchange on the Public Accounts Committee is split across Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. D. D. Marshall and Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe in mid-sentence in the source and is rearranged so that Mr. D. D. Marshall's remark is complete. The words 'during my presentation I made no mention of king grass nor any grass...' within the Minister's speech are printed under Mr. D. G. SUTHERLAND, Member for St. George South. Please check against the recording.

Q11. Order No. 16, during Mr. E. G. Hinkson. The point that 'the Honourable Member cannot refer to a document in parts', headed DEPUTY SPEAKER in the source, ends 'That is so, Madam Deputy Speaker' and refers to the speaker in the third person, and the later 'I have heard the Honourable Member misleading the House' is headed 'SPEAKER UNCERTAIN'. Both appear to be from Government Members and are printed under AN HON. MEMBER. Please identify the Members.

Q12. Order No. 16, Mr. G. A. Clarke. A stub '[Inaudible.]' headed 'MS. TONI N. S.-A. MOORE, J.P., M.P. (St. George North)' precedes the speech of Mr. G. A. Clarke; she was not a Member of the 2013–2018 House and the Member for St. George North in 2015 was Mr. G. A. Clarke. The stub is omitted. Part of the record may be

missing here, including Mr. SPEAKER's return to the Chair, which is not recorded.

Q13. Committee. Mr. CHAIRMAN is not named in the source; the Chairman of Committees, Mr. J. D. Paul, is presumed. The Committee stage of the Anti-Terrorism (Amendment) Bill is condensed to the Official Report formulae; all clauses and the Schedule passed without amendment.

Q14. Order No. 18, Miss C. Y. Forde. Miss C. Y. Forde's speech begins 'Manfred Thomas. Thank you.' in the source, after Mr. SPEAKER's call. The words are taken to be the end of the call and are printed in Mr. SPEAKER's words as 'Member for St. Thomas'. Please confirm.

DEBATE SUMMARY

(Editorial summary — not part of the record.)

The House of Assembly met at 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2015, with Mr. SPEAKER presiding. Minutes were confirmed and others deferred on the motion of the Leader of the House, Hon. J. D. E. Boyce, and Mr. SPEAKER announced the accounts and statements for March 2014 prepared by the Accountant General. Hon. J. D. E. Boyce moved the first readings of the Shops Bill, the Anti-Terrorism Amendment Bill and the Excise Tax Bill, 2015, and Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 were suspended.

Under Order No. 16 the Minister of Housing and Lands, Hon. D. St.E. Kellman, moved a Resolution under the Land Acquisition Act, Cap. 228, for the compulsory acquisition of about 10.93 hectares (27.01 acres) at Fort Lewis, Vacluse, St. Thomas, the property of BC Holdings Inc., for the Sanitation Service Authority's green energy programme, as agreed by Cabinet on March 10, 2014. Miss C. Y. Forde, Member for St. Thomas, said residents had not been consulted and sought disclosure on the Cahill project, which she put at US\$315 million or \$700 million; Mr. SPEAKER ruled that she was not anticipating a later Order. Hon. D. O'N. Inniss said the site had been chosen for waste management under the Barbados Labour Party before 2008, contrasted the Greenland landfill, and said some \$68 million a year was spent on solid waste; Mr. SPEAKER ruled that he could not accuse a Member of hypocrisy. Mr. D. G. Sutherland said the acreage matched that agreed for Cahill Energy's plasma gasification plant, a

\$700 million investment to burn 1 000 tons of garbage, and raised recycling and water use; Mr. SPEAKER ruled on relevance.

After the luncheon suspension Mr. J. D. Paul supported the Resolution and urged changes in how households separate garbage. Mr. K. D. Symmonds said the issue was one of governance and disclosure and called for recycling legislation. Hon. C. P. Sinckler said the Resolution was not a Cahill resolution, that negotiations had concerned a possible US\$350 million investment, and accused the Opposition of scaring away investors. Mr. D. D. Marshall described the approach as government by ambush and criticised a 90-second introduction of the Resolution.

After a further suspension, with Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair, Dr. the Hon. D. S. Lowe said landfills produced 16.7 per cent of the country's greenhouse gases and described four projects - waste to energy, landfill gas, a wind farm and up to 15 to 20 megawatts of solar - saying taxpayers would not pay for the plant. Lt. Col. J. D. Bostic raised Barbados' environmental treaty obligations. Mr. E. G. Hinkson said Cabinet had agreed on February 27, 2014 to acquire 27.13 acres at Vacluse for Cahill and was required to make the Prime Minister's letter of March 3, 2014 a document of the House. Mr. G. A. Clarke asked whether St. Thomas residents had been consulted and about plans for 54 acres. Replying, Hon. D. St.E. Kellman withdrew an unparliamentary remark, and the Resolution was passed.

Under Order No. 22 the Attorney General, Hon. A. D. Brathwaite, moved the Anti-Terrorism (Amendment) Bill, 2015, to correct deficiencies on terrorist financing identified by the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force; it passed without amendment. Under Order No. 18 Hon. D. St.E. Kellman moved a Resolution changing the purpose of Crown land at Vacluse from an abattoir to an administrative office building and leasing 3.354 hectares to Bolt Solutions Inc. for the Sanitation Service Authority; Miss C. Y. Forde asked why construction, begun in February 2014, had stalled, and the Minister spoke of opportunities for residents of Sharpe Hill, Arch Hall and Redmond Village. The Resolution was passed. Hon. C. P. Sinckler laid two Inter-American Development Bank loan contracts for the Enhanced Access to Credit for Productivity Project, and the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 10.00 a.m.